HHMI　　　Southwestern

Student-Faculty Collaborative Summer Research Program
Summer 2013 Evaluation Rubric

	Exceptional	Very Good	Average	Needs Improvement	Poor
Project Description	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand.	Description is clear and generally easy to understand with a few exceptions (e.g. uses some jargon)	The description is adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent. Description may not explain project concisely or with a clear general picture of proposed activities.	Description is not clear. It may be verbose or utilize a lot of field-specific jargon.	It is unclear what is being proposed.
Adequacy & feasibility of design	Processes and procedures are well-stated, manageable, appropriate, and comprehensive.	There is a logical and thoughtful plan for manageable execution of the project.	Processes and procedures for executing the project appear manageable, but there is some uncertainty.	Processes and procedures outlined are unclear, do not follow from project objectives, and/or do not seem entirely manageable.	Processes and procedures are either omitted, only vaguely stated, unmanageable, or are inappropriate for the project proposed.
Likelihood for success	Project has every reasonable expectation of being completed.	High likelihood of success.	Moderate likelihood of success.	Likelihood of success is questionable.	The project as designed has little chance of being successful.
Originality	The proposed project contains many significantly original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	Project contains some original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	The project contains no or few original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	It is not clear that the project is creative or innovative.	The project is not creative or innovative.
Scholarly Significance	The proposed activities are clearly linked into the broader scholarly field at the local, regional, or national level. The scholarly impact is significant.	The proposed activities are clearly linked into the broader scholarly field at the local, regional, or national level. The scholarly impact is moderately significant.	A link is made between the proposed work and the broader creative or research field. The impact is modest.	A link is made between the proposed work and the broader creative or research field. It is not clear how the proposed activities will further the field as a whole, or how the scholarly community will benefit from the proposed activities.	Contributions of the proposed activity to the broader field or community are not clearly stated or are nonexistent.
Potential for Learning (Academic, career and personal development)	Project will significantly enhance all three student development aspects.	Project will enhance at least two student development aspects.	Project may enhance one student development aspect.	Enhancement of any development aspect of is less clear or likely.	Project does not speak to student's development or only in the weakest manner

Goals & Products	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Significant products are described, such as presentations at regional or national conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, submission of a grant proposal, projects with quantifiable community impact	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Products of moderate impact are described, such as presentations at the local level, publications in non-peer reviewed sources	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. The proposed products are of moderate impact.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. The proposed products are of minimal impact.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated or are nonexistent. No products are clearly described.
Role, Involvement and Activities of Student and Faculty Mentor	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are carefully presented and explained. It is obvious that the proposed activities are student-focused. Students will not be merely observing or performing menial tasks—they will be actively involved in the process of inquiry and scientific discovery. The number of students involved is not as critical as the quality of their involvement.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly presented. Roles are appropriate. Undergraduates play a central role in the planned activities though their creative input is limited.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly described are only generally presented. Undergraduates play a role in the planned activities but are mostly involved in the implementation and/or dissemination of the project and have little or no creative input.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor may be only vaguely presented. The plan for involvement of undergraduates is not clearly articulated and appears to be limited in scope. Students are mostly observers.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are only vaguely presented. The student's role is merely as a bystander or the role of the faculty mentor is only superficially presented.
Budget (Appropriate-ness & Justification)	Budget is comprehensive, clearly explained, and appropriate for the activities proposed. All costs are justified, relevant and essential.	Budget is comprehensive, clearly explained, and reasonable. Vast majority of costs are justified, relevant and essential to this project.	Budget is comprehensive and reasonable but not be clearly explained. Most costs are justified, relevant and essential to this project.	Budget is not clearly explained *and* it is not appropriate for the activities proposed. Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable. Some costs are not justified, relevant, or essential.	Budget is unreasonable in all areas. Costs are not justified in the budget narrative. Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project.

Timeline	Timeline is clearly presented and is clearly suitable for and meets all the activities described.	Timeline may not be clearly presented but appears to be suitable for all the activities described.	Timeline meets most of the activities proposed. Timeline may not be clearly presented.	Timeline appears to meet less than half of the activities proposed. Not clearly presented.	Timeline is not suitable for the activities described.

Comments: