2016 Undergraduate Summer Research and Creativity Grants
Evaluation Form

REVIEWER:

Reviewer Guidelines

The Summer Research and Creativity grants are intended to be a cooperative venture between a student and their faculty sponsor; therefore, the proposal should give evidence that the student was involved in planning the project. Unlike many mentored research projects, in which the student is assigned to study a portion of the mentor’s existing research, the summer research and creativity awards are intended to support a student’s own research and creativity, with the faculty member acting as guide and sponsor. We have asked the applicants to provide a description of their research by outlining the nature of the project, the methods they will employ, and the expected benefits that they will receive from the activity. We have asked them to articulate the role of their faculty advisor in the project.

The faculty sponsor’s assessment and endorsement is extremely important in the review process. You should view it as a first review of the proposed work. You should then apply your own scholarly judgment to the proposal. In making your judgment, please consider both the scholarly quality of the proposed project and its educational impact on the student. We are seeking projects that will make a significant contribution to the student’s academic growth. Where appropriate, we are also seeking projects that will make a scholarly contribution in their discipline. For example, a student attending a special summer school for the arts might make a significant contribution to that student’s education, although it would not be appropriate to consider it as a scholarly contribution to the discipline. On the other hand, a student spending the summer replicating classical biological experiments might also be of considerable educational value but, because it would be appropriate to expect a scholarly contribution in a natural science experimental project, it might not be rated as highly.

Please use the rubric below to assign a quantitative assessment of the proposal. However, during the discussion phase, other aspects of these proposals may become relevant and add a qualitative component. All forms of assessment will be taken into account in determining the awardees.

Scores may be adjusted to obtain a final score after input from each of the reviewers has been discussed. However, the proposals may be discussed by only a subset of the committee, depending upon annual circumstances.
Thank you for your time, your professional contributions, and mentoring!

SRG RUBRIC

Student Name:

Reviewer:

Provide a numerical assessment for each of the statements below using the following scale:
5=Strongly agree, 4=Agree, 3=Do not agree or disagree, 2=Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree

_____1. The proposal is well-written (clear, concise, well-developed and scholarly.)

_____ 2. The methods or procedures are stated clearly and reasonable to accomplish the project.

_____3. The value of the project to the field is articulated.

_____4. The roles of the student researcher and mentor are stated clearly.

_____5. The goals of the project stem from an interest of the student, and represent an independent project with faculty mentor oversight.

_____6. The faculty letter demonstrates strong support for the student applicant and the project.

_____7. The budget is reasonable and realistic for the proposed project.

_____8. The proposal contains all of the required elements: 1) name and contact information, 2) title, 3) hypothesis or purpose, 4) background, 5) methods and potential outcomes, 6) general budget, 7) letter from mentor.

TOTAL SCORE (of possible 40): ____________

Compared to the other applications you review, please provide your overall impression of the application:

_____ Excellent; must be funded  _____ Fair; fund only if money remains
_____ Very Good; fund if at all possible  _____ Poor; do not fund
_____ Good; fund if possible