

Magellan Scholar Proposal Review Rubric

Revision date 09/2010

Criteria Weight		EXEMPLARY (x4)	GOOD (x3)	ADEQUATE (x2)	NEEDS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT (x1)	MISSING
20	Overall Merit	Excellent overall topic, project plan, and design (80 pts)	Good but some concerns with topic, plan, or design (60 pts)	Adequate but weak project plan or design (recommend revise & resubmit) (40 pts)	Project plan or design is vague or has significant flaws (recommend revise & resubmit) (20 pts)	Not an appropriate topic, project, or plan (0 pts)
36 Student's clarity of explanation						
8	Research topic or question	Clearly articulated topic/question with logical, supportive background information (32 pts)	Clear topic/question but some background confusing/unclear; additional details needed (24 pts)	Topic/question vague and background missing needed details (16 pts)	Topic/question weak with little to no background provided (10 pts)	
15	Project plan or how the question is to be answered	Strong evidence of thought and planning (details clearly articulated) (60 pts)	Good evidence of thought and planning (some details missing or confusing) (45 pts)	Some evidence of thought and planning (few details or plan not presented logically) OR multiple minor flaws in plan (40 pts)	Little evidence of thought or planning (little to no details; confusing) OR significant flaws in plan (15 pts)	
8	Significance or impact of project	Clearly articulated, strong statement of why this project is important (can be limited to student impact) (32 pts)	Shows some effort to describe project's importance; could be stated more clearly (can be limited to student impact) (24 pts)	Vague references to project importance or explanation difficult to understand (can be limited to student impact) (16 pts)	Little to no reference to project importance or not-understandable (can be limited to student impact) (8 pts)	No impact statement (0 pts)
5	Writing style	Clear, persuasive, and logical and well organized with little to no errors (20 pts)	Good overall; minor issues with clarity, logic, or level of detail; few errors (15 pts)	Adequate writing; isolated areas lacking clarity/ details or too many errors (10 pts)	Poorly written overall; confusing, lacking necessary details; excessive or significant errors (5 pts)	
25 Mentor form						
10	General recommendation from mentor	Strong recommendation with knowledge of student, abilities, and skills (40 pts)	Very good recommendation; some details of student, abilities, and skills (30 pts)	Good recommendation; few details of student, abilities, and skills (20 pts)	Weak recommendation; little known about student, abilities, and skills (10 pts)	No recommendation (0 pts)
15	Mentor's role: How mentor & student will interact (skill development, meetings, etc)	Strong evidence of mentoring relationship; includes details and plans (60 pts)	Good evidence of mentoring relationship; some details provided (45 pts)	Some evidence of mentoring relationship; details vague (30 pts)	Little evidence of mentoring relationship; little to no details (15 pts)	No description of how mentor & student will interact (0 pts)
7	Readiness for project	Strong evidence student is prepared for project (through classes, previous experience, etc) (28 pts)	Some evidence of readiness OR good plan/support for gaining needed skills (21pts)	Little to no evidence of readiness AND weak plan/support for gaining needed skills (14 pts)	Student does not seem ready for project and no structure/plan of support (7 pts)	
5	Sharing results	Clear and specific plan for sharing work with appropriate audience (beyond Discovery Day) (20 pts)	Vague plans to share work with others (beyond Discovery Day) (15 pts)	Only mentions Discovery Day (10 pts)		No plans to share work described in proposal (0 pts)
7	Timeline	Clear and detailed plan for completing work within project timeframe (28 pts)	Some details provided on the timing of various stages of the project plan (21 pts)	Vague references to project timing (14 pts)	Little to no details provided (7 pts)	