| 2015 CURCA Mini-Grant Rubric |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **Score**                     | **Exceptional**             | **Very Good**               | **Average**                 | **Needs Improvement**      |
|                               | 7                           | 5                           | 3                           | 1                           |

### Project Description
- Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand. The proposed project contains original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).
- Description depicts the project well, but uses some jargon or is otherwise hard to understand. Project contains original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).
- Description does not explain project concisely, or it does not give a general picture of the proposed activities. The project contains no or few original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).
- Description is hard to understand, verbose, or utilizes a lot of field-specific jargon. It is not clear that the project is creative or innovative.

### Goals and Products
- The goals of the project are clearly stated and reasonable. Significant and valuable products are described (e.g. presentations at regional or national conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, participation in a juried show, submission of a grant proposal, etc.).
- The goals of the project are clearly stated. Products of moderate impact and value are described, such as presentations at the local level, publications in non-peer reviewed sources, participation in non-juried shows, or presentations to local community partners.
- The goals of the project are not clearly stated. There are either no products described, or they are of minimal impact.
- The goals of the project are not clearly stated. No products are described.

### Long-term Contributions to Undergraduate Research
- The proposal will cultivate long-term undergraduate research programs.
- The proposal may cultivate long-term undergraduate research programs.
- The proposal will likely not cultivate long-term undergraduate research programs.
- No mention of impact on long-term undergraduate research programs.

### Methodology
- Proposed methodology is sound and complete; the project design reflects an understanding of current research in the field.
- Proposed methodology may contain some slight flaws or questions. The proposal may not include significant support from other research.
- Proposed methodology has at least one major flaw. The project description also lacks a clear evaluation of current research in the field.
- Proposed methodology not workable for this project. No outside research or support is given.
| Plan for involvement of undergraduates | The plan for involvement of undergraduates is clearly described, and it is obvious that the proposed activities are student-focused. Students will not be merely observing or performing menial tasks—they will be helping to drive the project forward. Students will have creative input in the project. The number of students involved is not as critical as the quality of their involvement. | The plan for involvement of undergraduates is clearly described, and undergraduates play a central role in the planned activities. Although students will be intimately involved in the project, their creative input is limited. | The plan for involvement of undergraduates is not clearly articulated and appears to be limited in scope. Students are mostly observers. |
| Significance | It is clear how the proposed activities fit into the broader scholarly or creative field at the local, regional, or national level. Others will benefit from the new knowledge, applications, or creative works produced through the project; the proposed project impact extends beyond one particular field of study. | It is clear how the proposed activities fit into the broader scholarly or creative field at the local, regional, or national level. The impact on the outside community is modest. | The contributions of the proposed activities to the broader community or field are not clearly stated. Alternatively, the proposed project will not impact the broader community or scholarly field. |
| Budget | Budget is clearly explained and is appropriate for the activities proposed. | Budget is clearly explained and is appropriate for the activities proposed. | Budget is not clearly explained and is not appropriate for the activities proposed. |

If you need this document in another format, please email Anastasia Lin at curca@ung.edu or call 706-867-3234.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Timeline</strong></th>
<th>Timeline is suitable for and meets all the activities described.</th>
<th>Timeline meets most of the activities proposed.</th>
<th>Timeline appears to meet less than half of the activities proposed.</th>
<th>Timeline is not suitable for the activities described.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Productivity from previous CURCA funded projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous funded projects have led to high-impact products, such as: award-winning student presentations at conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, exhibition of work in a juried show, submission of a grant proposal, or submission of a report to a local, regional or national business. Previous projects met all grant requirements, were fiscally responsible, and provided documentation of their grant in a timely manner.</th>
<th>Previous funded projects have led to products of moderate impact, such as: student presentations at local, regional or national conferences, publications in non-peer reviewed sources, participation in non-juried shows, or presentations to local groups. Previous projects met all grant requirements, were fiscally responsible, and provided documentation of their grant in a timely manner.</th>
<th>The products of previous CURCA-funded projects are not clearly stated. There are either no products described, or they are of minimal impact. Previous projects met all grant requirements and were fiscally responsible.</th>
<th>The products of previous CURCA-funded projects are not described. Previous grants may not have met all requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Proposals from individuals who have not been previously funded by CURCA:

**Total score:** Project description _____ + Significance _____ + Goals and Products________ + Long Term Contributions______ + Methodology_______+ (Involvement of undergraduates X 2 = ____ ) + (Budget X 0.5____) + (Timeline X 0.5 = ____ ) = ________.

Total _____/56 (maximum score): ________

Proposals from individuals who have been previously funded by CURCA:

**Total score:** Project description _____ + Significance _____ + Goals and Products________ + Long Term Contributions______ + Methodology_______+ (Involvement of undergraduates X 2 = ____ ) + (Budget X 0.5____) + (Timeline X 0.5 = ____ ) + (Productivity from previous CURCA funded projects X 2) = ________.

Total _____/70 (maximum score): ________

*If you need this document in another format, please email Anastasia Lin at [curca@ung.edu](mailto:curca@ung.edu) or call 706-867-3234.*
Proposals will receive a zero in any category that is not addressed. A proposal that does not address how students will participate in the proposed activities will receive a zero in the “Plan for involvement of undergraduates”. Proposals receiving a zero in any category CANNOT be considered for funding. Proposals receiving a score of 1 in the “Project Description”, “Significance”, “Goals and Products”, or “Plan for involvement of undergraduates” categories CANNOT be considered for funding.