

Scoring Rubric for FUSE Proposals

	Exceptional 7	6	Very Good 5	4	Average 3	2	Needs Improvement 1	Score
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.	
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.		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 community, scholarly partners or other stockholders will benefit from the proposed activities.		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.	
Long-term Contributions to Undergraduate Research	The proposal <i>will</i> cultivate long-term undergraduate research programs.		The proposal <i>may</i> cultivate long-term undergraduate research programs.		The proposal <i>will likely not</i> 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.	

If you need this document in another format, please email Allison Grundel at curca@ung.edu or call 706-867-3013.

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 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 clearly described, and undergraduates play a role in the planned activities. However, students are mostly involved in the implementation and/or dissemination of the project and have little or no creative input.	The plan for involvement of undergraduates is not clearly articulated and appears to be limited in scope. Students are mostly observers.	
Goals and Products	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Significant 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.	
Timeline	Timeline is suitable for and meets all the activities described.	Timeline meets most of the activities proposed.	Timeline appears to meet less than half of the activities proposed.	Timeline is not suitable for the activities described.	
Productivity from previous CURCA funded projects	Previous projects met all grant requirements and provided documentation of their grant in a timely manner. Outcomes included 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 and provided documentation of their grant in a timely manner. Outcomes included 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.	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.	The products of previous CURCA-funded projects are not described. Previous grants may not have met all requirements.	

If you need this document in another format, please email Allison Grundel at curca@ung.edu or call 706-867-3013.

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

Total score: Project description _____ + Significance _____ + (Long Term Contributions X 1.5 = _____) + Methodology _____ + (Involvement of undergraduates X 2 = _____) + Goals and Products _____ (Timeline X 0.5 = _____) = _____.

Total _____/56 (maximum score): _____

Proposals from individuals who have been previously funded by CURCA:

Total score: Project description _____ + Significance _____ + (Long Term Contributions X 1.5) _____ + Methodology _____ + (Involvement of undergraduates X 2 = _____) + Goals and Products _____ + (Timeline X 0.5 = _____) + (Productivity from previous CURCA funded projects X 2) = _____.

Total _____/70 (maximum score): _____

Note: All Proposals will undergo Budget review prior to being evaluated. Proposals which do not meet Budget requirements will not be considered for funding. Please ensure that your budget meets the requirements set forth on the CURCA FUSE page (<https://ung.edu/undergraduate-research-creative-activities/faculty-resources-and-opportunities/index.php>)

Proposals will receive a zero in any category that is not addressed. Proposals receiving a zero in any category CANNOT be considered for funding.

Prepared by Dr. Miriam Segura-Totten, July 2010. Revised September 2013 (M. Cosgrove & D. Spence). Revised September 2015, 2017 (A. Lin)

If you need this document in another format, please email Allison Grundel at curca@ung.edu or call 706-867-3013.