Student Name:

Student college/department:

Judge name:

Fill in the score for each category in the column on the far right side. Half point intervals (e.g. 2.5 ) are allowed for scoring.

Each application packet will include the following: Project Narrative, Budget, Personal Statement, Transcript, and a Faculty Recommendation Form. Submitting a CV/resume is optional.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LSU Discover – **Research Grant application scoring rubric** | | | | | | | |
| Category |  | Excellent | Good | Average | Poor | No/failed attempt | Points Awarded |
| Point scale | \*half point intervals are allowed | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| **Proposal** | | | | | | | |
| Project Narrative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Introduction | Provides a clear and strong justification and context for the research. | Provides a clear justification and context for the research, but has some terminology that makes it difficult for a non-specialist to understand. | Provides an adequate justification and context for the research, but is vague and needs more explanation. | Provides a justification and context which are difficult to follow because it is too vague or uses excessive technical terms making the text hard for a non-specialist to understand. | No introduction describing the project justification and context is provided. | /4 |
| Goals, Objectives, Hypothesis or Study Question | The goals, objectives, hypothesis or study question are clearly stated and described. | The goals, objectives, hypothesis or study question are described well but could use some minor edits. | The goals, objectives, hypothesis or study question are described competently but need further clarification. | The goals, objectives, hypothesis or study question are not clearly stated. | No goals, objectives, hypothesis or study question are stated. | /4 |
| Methodology and/or design | The proposal clearly describes the methodology, design, research plan, processes or procedures that will be used to complete the project. Based on the description, the approach is appropriate for the project and manageable. | The proposal describes the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but further explanation and details are necessary. Otherwise, approach seems appropriate and manageable. | The proposal outlines the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but further clarifications are necessary as to how these are appropriate or manageable. | The proposal does not explicitly describe the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete the project but there are statements inferring some kind of methodological approach. | No methods or similar elements are stated. | /4 |
| Budget justification and available resources | The budget and resources needed are clearly described. | Quality is between ‘average’ and ‘excellent.’ | The budget and resources needed are missing details or are too vague. | Quality is between ‘no/failed attempt’ and ‘average.’ | There is no discussion of the budget and resources needed. | /4 |
| Broader Impacts | Clearly explains their project’s potential impact on both their discipline and on society | Quality is between ‘average’ and ‘excellent.’ | The discussion of broader impacts is vague or does not address either the impact on the discipline or on society | Quality is between ‘no/failed attempt’ and ‘average.’ | No discussion of broader impacts is provided | /4 |
| Literature Cited | An organized citation page with a consistent style is provided. | Quality is between ‘average’ and ‘excellent.’ | A citation page is provided but the citation style is not consistent. | Quality is between ‘no/failed attempt’ and ‘average.’ | No citation page is provided. | /4 |
|  | Quality of Writing | Proposal is written clearly, logically, and intelligibly, with no errors in spelling or grammar. | Proposal is written clearly, logically, and intelligibly but has minor errors in spelling and grammar. | Proposal is written logically and intelligibly but has numerous spelling and grammatical errors; or has few errors but lacks clarity and a high quality of writing. | Proposal is not very clear, there are no logical connections, and there are numerous spelling and grammatical errors. | Proposal is completely unintelligible. | /4 |
| Faculty recommendation form |  | Details student’s background in research, demonstrates knowledge of student’s proposed research, and provides insight into student’s ability to complete the project. | Details student’s background in research and demonstrates knowledge of student’s proposed research but lacks some insight into student’s abilities to complete the project. | Lacks details of student’s background in research and/or does not demonstrate knowledge of student’s proposed research. | Lacks any meaningful details about the student’s background in research, the proposed project, or the student’s ability to complete the project. | No form was submitted. | /4 |
| Total points |  | /32 | | | | | |
| Budget spreadsheet | Use this space to write any comments about the budget spreadsheet |  | | | | | |
| Personal Statement | Use this space to write any comments about the personal statement. |  | | | | | |
| CV/ Resume  (Submitting a CV or resume is optional for the student.) | Use this space to write any comments about the CV or resume if provided. |  | | | | | |
| Reviewer overall comments |  | | | | | | |
| Do you recommend this student project for funding? | [highlight or bold your choice] Highly recommend Recommend Do not recommend | | | | | | |
| Thank you for reviewing this student’s proposal! Please know that we accept undergraduate project grant applications each fall, spring, and summer so please encourage your own students to apply in the future. | | | | | | | |