

Evaluation Rubric – Seeger Fellowship in the Humanities

Area 1: Project Description & Background

<i>3: exceptional</i>	<i>2: satisfactory</i>	<i>1: emerging</i>	<i>0: needs more work</i>
Project description thoroughly addresses all the components outlined in the application instructions. The description effectively demonstrates the significance of the proposed project, situating it within larger issues in the humanities. It is succinct, well-organized, and free of technical jargon.	Project description addresses almost all the components outlined in the application instructions. The description generally demonstrates the significance of the proposed project, situating it within larger issues in the humanities. It is generally succinct, well-organized, and free of technical jargon.	Project description begins to address all the components outlined in the application instructions. The description minimally demonstrates the significance of proposed project and/or situate it within larger issues in the humanities. The organization is somewhat unclear, and there may be instances of jargon that hinder understanding.	Project description does not address all the components outlined in the application instructions. The description does not demonstrate the significance of proposed project and/or situate it within larger issues in the humanities. The description may be poorly organized and may contain excessive jargon or be unclear.

Area 2: Student Engagement & Motivation

<i>3: exceptional</i>	<i>2: satisfactory</i>	<i>1: emerging</i>	<i>0: needs more work</i>
The application clearly explains the student's reasons for working in the area of their project, appropriate intellectual preparedness and describes how deep engagement with the project's key questions/subject will benefit the student's learning.	The application adequately explains the student's reasons for working in the area of their project and describes how deep engagement with the project's key questions/subject will benefit the student's learning.	The application minimally explains the student's reasons for working in the area of their project and begins to describe how deep engagement with the project's key questions/subject will benefit the student's learning.	The application does not explain the student's reasons for working in the area of their project and inadequately describes how deep engagement with the project's key questions/subject will benefit the student's learning.

Area 3: Mentorship Plan & Faculty Expertise

<i>3: exceptional</i>	<i>2: satisfactory</i>	<i>1: emerging</i>	<i>0: needs more work</i>
The application clearly demonstrates relevant faculty expertise and capacity to support student's deep engagement with the area of inquiry. Mentoring or apprenticeship approach is thoughtfully described and clearly aligns with student's goals. The plan for collaboration and fostering independence is well-developed; strategies for moving the student toward active scholarly engagement are well-developed and clear.	The application demonstrates relevant faculty expertise and capacity to support student's engagement with the area of inquiry. Mentoring or apprenticeship approach is described and adequately aligns with student's goals. The plan for collaboration and fostering independence is included; strategies for moving the student toward active scholarly engagement are present.	The application demonstrates some faculty expertise and capacity to support student's engagement with the area of inquiry. Mentoring or apprenticeship approach is minimally outlined and/or lacks specific alignment with student's goals. The plan for collaboration and fostering independence is limited; strategies for moving the student toward active scholarly engagement are underdeveloped or unclear.	The application does not demonstrate relevant faculty expertise or capacity to support student's engagement with the area of inquiry. Mentoring or apprenticeship approach is vague or absent and does not align with student's goals. The plan for collaboration and fostering independence is missing; strategies for moving the student toward active scholarly engagement are not addressed.

Evaluation Rubric – Seeger Fellowship in the Humanities

Area 4: Commitment to the Project

<i>3: high</i>	<i>2: medium</i>	<i>1: low</i>	<i>0: needs more work</i>
The application clearly outlines the existing obligations of both the student and faculty member during the project period and provides a thorough plan to balance these commitments. There is a clear prioritization of the project.	The application adequately outlines the existing obligations of both the student and faculty member during the project period and provides a plan to balance these commitments. They appear to prioritize the project.	The application minimally outlines the existing obligations of both the student and faculty member during the project period. The plan to balance commitments is minimally developed, and there is insufficient clarity on how the project will be prioritized.	The application does not describe the existing obligations of the student or faculty member, and no plan to balance commitments or prioritize the project is provided.

Area 5: Intended Outcome/ Plan

<i>3: high</i>	<i>2: medium</i>	<i>1: low</i>	<i>0: needs more work</i>
Plan for reflection is clearly described. If relevant, the application provides a thoughtful plan for sharing project outcomes, clearly articulating why this plan is appropriate for the subject matter and intended audience.	Plan for reflection is described in general terms. If relevant, the application provides a plan for sharing project outcomes. The reasoning for why these plans are appropriate for the subject matter and intended audience may lack depth or specificity.	The application provides a limited description of the plan for reflection. If relevant, there may be initial thoughts on sharing project outcomes, but the plan lacks clarity and does not adequately explain the appropriateness for the subject matter and audience.	Plan for reflection is unclear or absent. If relevant, there is little to no discussion of sharing project outcomes, and no reasoning is provided regarding the plan's appropriateness for the subject matter and intended audience.

Last updated 12/2024