

Laker Venture Grant Scoring Rubric and Criteria (9/7/2023)

Area 1: Project Goals and Scope

<p>3: High Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context, is easily understood by a non-specialist reader, and clearly articulates why the project is significant and interesting.</p>	<p>2: Medium Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context, is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader and articulates why the project is significant and interesting.</p>	<p>1: Low Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context, is not easily understood by a non-specialist reader, or it is not easily understood why the project is significant and interesting.</p>	<p>0: Unacceptable Project description, including how the project is situated within the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context, is unclear to a non-specialist reader, or it is unclear why the project is significant and interesting.</p>
---	---	---	--

Area 2: Project Feasibility

<p>3: High There is a clear and compelling description of how the project will take place and the goals the student intends to achieve. The student demonstrates a sophisticated understanding and provides a clear explanation of the steps and methods they will use; a careful, detailed plan for the timeline, travel plans (if relevant), budget, etc. necessary for completion of the project is included.</p>	<p>2: Medium The student's description of the project goals is adequately stated; the steps within the project are adequately described; the student has sufficient content/methodological knowledge to pursue the project; a proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of reasonable consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.</p>	<p>1: Low Project goals are unclear and/or vague; the steps or phases within the project are not sufficiently described; the student has not demonstrated sufficient content/methodological knowledge to undertake the project; the proposed timeline is unclear and/or vague; there is minimal evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.</p>	<p>0: Unacceptable Stated goals for the project are absent; the steps or phases of the project are not described; the proposal does not address the approach(es) required for the project; the proposed timeline is not feasible given the scope of the project or not present; there is no evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.</p>
---	---	--	--

Area 3: Student Preparation and Motivation (and 'Venturesomeness!')

<p>4: Exceptional The proposal compellingly presents the scope and significance of the project with demonstration of the student's exceptional qualifications for the project (coursework, prior research, relevant skills and knowledge); the student compellingly articulates their project goals with the context of larger academic and/or career goals and interests with thoughtful sophisticated and clearly explains the reason for off-campus pursuit of the project.</p>	<p>3: High The proposal reflects a sound understanding of the scope and significance of the project with demonstration of the student's very sound qualifications for the project (coursework, prior research, relevant skills and knowledge); the student articulates their project goals within the context of their larger academic and/or career goals and clearly explains the reason for off-campus pursuit of the project.</p>	<p>2: Medium The proposal reflects an adequate understanding of the scope and significance of the project; the student demonstrates that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student articulates project goals with some larger contextualization of academic and career plans and goals and the reason for off-campus pursuit of the project.</p>	<p>1: Low The proposal reflects a limited understanding of the scope and/or significance of the project; there are concerns about the student's qualifications for the project and ability to carry it through; the proposal inadequately describes their project goals and larger context of academic and/or career goals. The student does not explain why the proposal needs to occur away from campus.</p>	<p>0: Unacceptable The proposal reflects an insufficient understanding of scope and/or significance of the LVG project; the student does not demonstrate that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student does not articulate goals or how this experience will aid in achieving career and academic goals. The student does not explain why the proposal needs to occur away from campus.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

Area 4: Commitment to Project

<p>3: High The student describes their grant-period obligations and approach to balancing these, in a way that clearly prioritizes the LVG project and matches the specifics of their timeline and description of proposal steps or phases.</p>	<p>2: Medium The student describes their grant-period obligations and appears to prioritize the LVG project. This description accords reasonably well with timeline and description of project steps or phases.</p>	<p>1: Low The student describes their grant-period obligations, but the LVG project is not clearly centered and/or this description does not match the timeline description or description of project steps or phases.</p>	<p>0: Unacceptable The student does not describe their grant-period obligations and/or the LVG project is not explained as fitting into their work-life responsibilities.</p>
--	--	---	--

Area 5: Dissemination Plan

<p>3: High</p>	<p>2: Medium</p>	<p>1: Low</p>	<p>0: Unacceptable</p>
-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

<p>Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project beyond the required event (Student Scholars Day [SSD]) are described. The plan describes why the proposed venues for sharing outcomes were selected (disciplinary or interdisciplinary appropriateness; opportunities for collegial networking, etc) and how they support the student's development as a scholar, researcher or artist.</p>	<p>Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project beyond the required event (Student Scholars Day [SSD]) are described. But the description does not include why the venues were selected and how they support the student's development.</p>	<p>Plans for disseminating the outcomes of the project only describe the required event (SSD).</p>	<p>No plan for dissemination is proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---