

Scoring Rubric for FUSE Proposals

	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
	Exceptional		Very Good			Average	Needs Improvement		Score	
Project Description (including Originality, & Methodology) (x 1.5)	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand. The proposed project contains original, innovative, or creative aspect(s). Proposed methodology is sound and complete; the project design reflects an understanding of current research in the field		Description depicts the project well, but uses some jargon or is otherwise hard to understand. Project contains original, innovative, or creative aspect(s). Proposed methodology may contain some slight flaws or questions. The proposal may not include significant support from other research			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). Proposed methodology has at least one major flaw. The project description also lacks a clear evaluation of current research in the field		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. Proposed methodology not workable for this project. No outside research or support is given.		
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 UNG	The proposal clearly explains how the project <i>will</i> contribute to a culture of undergraduate research at UNG by cultivating long-term undergraduate research within or beyond the classroom. Other examples may include containing research engagement beyond the summer project, serving as a		The proposal offers some indication as to how the project <i>may</i> contribute to a culture of undergraduate research at UNG by cultivating long-term undergraduate research programs within or beyond the classroom. Impact on UNG's undergraduate research culture is moderate.			The proposal does not clearly explain how the project will contribute to a culture of undergraduate research at UNG. The long-term impact may be unfeasible or unlikely.		No mention of long-term impact on undergraduate research and/or UNG.		

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

	pilot project for future classes, growing research in service-learning opportunities, contributing to SoTL, etc.				
Plan for faculty-student collaboration and mentorship (x 2)	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 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 Expected 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 or performance, 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 (x .5)	Timeline is feasible for the completion of an 8 week project. All activities described can be completed.	Timeline is possible for an 8 week project. The planned activities can plausibly be completed.	Timeline is ambitious for an 8 week project. Many activities may not fit within the time frame.	Timeline is not suitable for the activities described.	
Productivity and development of previous CURCA funded projects	Previous projects met all grant requirements and <i>exceeded</i> goals and expected products of submitted proposal (either in quantity or visibility).	Previous projects met all grant requirements and <i>met</i> goals and expected products of submitted proposal. Evidence of meeting goals	Previous project met most, but not all, of the grant requirements, goals, and expected projects. Project outcomes did not result in	Previous project did not meet requirements and fell well short of meeting goals and expected products.	

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

<p>(This section will be evaluated by the CURCA administrative team)</p>	<p>Evidence of exceeding goals or products may include: award-winning student presentations at conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, exhibition of creative works, submission of a grant proposal, or submission of a report to a local, regional or national business, etc.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>If current project is related to previously funded project, it is clear how the current project extends, builds off of, or is different from the previously funded project (e.g. in scope, methodology, focus, etc.)</p>	<p>and products may include: student presentations at local, regional or national conferences, publications in non-peer reviewed sources, participation in non-juried shows, or presentations to local groups.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>If the current project is related to a previously funded project, the current project differs somewhat from previous project; some updates are noted.</p>	<p>student presentations, publications, or shows.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Description of current project is only slightly updated from previous project.</p>	<p>OR</p> <p>Current project is same as previous project.</p>	
---	--	--	--	---	--

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

Scoring Formula: (Project description X 1.5 ____) + Significance ____ + Long Term Contribution ____ + (Plan for Collaboration X 2 = ____) + Goals and Products ____ (Timeline X 0.5 = ____) = ____.

Total ____/56 (maximum score): ____

Proposals from individuals who have been previously funded by CURCA:

Scoring Formula: (Project description X 1.5 ____) + Significance ____ + Long Term Contributions ____ + (Plan for Collaboration X 2 = ____) + Goals and Products ____ + (Timeline X 0.5 = ____) + (Productivity from previous CURCA funded projects X 2) = ____.

Total ____/72 (maximum score): ____

Notes: Proposals will receive a zero in any category that is not addressed. Proposals receiving a zero in any category CANNOT be considered for funding. All Proposals will undergo Budget review prior to being evaluated. Proposals may also be reviewed by the Assistant Director for Research Integrity to confirm IRB requirements prior to scoring.

Prepared by Dr. Miriam Segura-Totten, July 2010.

Major revisions September 2013 (M. Cosgrove & D. Spence),

September 2015, 2017 (A. Lin), January 2022 (V. Hightower, D. Pinheiro, A. Lin), January 2024 (D. Pinheiro & A. Grundel)

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