

CLA Summer Undergraduate Research Program (SURP): Evaluation Criteria

Phase I: Faculty Proposals

Proposals will be scored using the following criteria and ranked for funding recommendations using an average of reviewer scores.

Strength of the proposed project (0-4)

Is the project scientifically or creatively sound? Will findings/products advance knowledge and understanding in own field or across disciplines?

0	Not enough information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, and methodology is sound.
1	Adequate information provided to determine that the creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is not significant and/or methodology is not sound.
2	Adequate information provided to determine that the creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, or the methodology is sound.
3	Clear information provided to determine that the creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant, and methodology is sound.
4	Clear and relevant information provided to determine that the creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is extremely significant, and methodology is sound.

Proposal Quality (0-3)

Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well- organized, communicated effectively, and based on a sound rationale?

0	Poor quality that does not allow for full evaluation of proposed project.
1	Inadequate communication of proposed activities and/or activities are unconnected to rationale.
2	Adequate communication of proposed activities, but rationale, organization, or another key component is lacking.
3	Clear and relevant communication of proposed activities, connection to rationale.

Potential to lead to student presentations/publications (0-5)

Will the proposed activities advance student professional development through presentations or publications appropriate to the proposed activity?

0	Not enough information provided to determine if the proposed activities will advance student professional development.
1	Vague information provided and is difficult to determine if the proposed activities will advance student professional development.
2	Some information provided to suggest the proposed activities will advance student professional development, but objectives may not be feasible or appropriate for proposed activity.
3	Adequate information provided to suggest the proposed activities will advance student professional development, but specifics remain unclear.
4	Clear information provided and it is likely that the proposed research will advance student professional development.

5	Specific information provided on how the proposed activities will advance specific types of student professional development.
---	---

Alignment with SURP goals (0-5)

Does the proposed project closely align with the SURP goals (see RFP for goals).

0	The proposal does not address how the project might align with the SURP goals.
1	It is unclear if the proposed project aligns with SURP goals.
2	The proposed project aligns with one SURP goal.
3	The proposed project aligns with some SURP goals.
4	The proposed project clearly aligns with most SURP goals.
5	The proposed project clearly aligns with all SURP goals.

Feasibility and clarity of objectives to advance faculty scholarship (0-5)

What is the significance of the proposed project to the field and to the scholarly development of the proposer? How will this project advance professional development and identity?

0	The significance of the proposed project to advance faculty scholarship is unclear as written.
1	Vague information provided as to the significance of the proposed project to advance faculty scholarship.
2	Limited information provided to make some assessments as to the significance of the proposed project to advance professional development.
3	Adequate information provided to make some assessments as to the significance of the proposed project to advance professional development.
4	Clear information provided about both the significance of the project and its ability to advance professional development.
5	Specific and relevant information provided about the significance of the project and its ability to advance professional development.

Strength of mentoring plan (0-6)

Does the proposed activity clearly align with a mentoring plan for students that addresses research goals, expectations, timelines and outcomes, as well as for student professional development?

0	The proposal does not include a mentoring plan.
1	The proposal includes minimal discussion of mentoring.
2	The proposal includes a mentoring plan that fails to address several key components.
3	The proposal establishes that plan that mentions goals and expectations, check-ins, and/or professional development, but has no clear plan for student mentoring.
4	The proposal includes a mentoring plan that only addresses research goals, but fails to address student professional development through routine check-ins.
5	The proposal includes a mentoring that plan that discusses goals and expectations, check-ins, and professional development.

6	The proposal includes a mentoring plan that establishes clear goals and expectations, incorporates routine check-ins on both research and mentoring, and addresses professional development goals aligned with SURP goals.
---	--

Phase II: Student Applications

Student applications will be scored using the following criteria for each research project to which they apply. Students will then be matched with faculty projects in alignment with CLA SURP Goals.

Clarity and development of interest statement (0-5)

How well does the student statement describe their interest in this research project?

0	Not enough information provided to determine student interest in this research project.
1	Student interest does not align with this research project.
2	Vague information provided and it remains difficult to determine if student interests align with this research project.
3	Student interest somewhat aligns with this research project.
4	Student interest in undergraduate research and/or this project is a good fit.
5	Student interest in undergraduate research and/or relating to this project is an excellent fit.

Potential impact of SURP on academic success (0-5)

Will the proposed activities advance student academic success and/or professional development?

0	Not enough information provided to determine if SURP will advance student success.
1	The SURP will not advance student success.
2	Vague information provided and it is difficult to determine the extent to which SURP will advance student success.
3	Adequate information provided to suggest SURP will advance student success in one area.
4	Clear information provided and it is likely that the SURP will advance student success in one or more areas.
5	Specific and relevant information provided to establish the SURP will advance specific areas of student success.

Preparation for participation (0-3)

How well prepared is the student to participate in the research? This includes relevant academic, other formal, and informal preparation.

0	Not enough information provided to evaluate student preparation.
1	Vague information provided and is difficult to evaluate student preparation.
2	Adequate information provided to establish that the student is somewhat prepared to participate.
3	Clear and specific information detailing that the student is well prepared to participate.

Alignment of personal narrative with SURP goals (0-5)

How does the student's personal narrative align with SURP goals?

0	No personal narrative provided.
1	Student's personal narrative does not align with SURP goals.
2	Limited information provided on alignment with SURP goals.
3	Adequate information provided to suggest that the student's experiences and goals align with SURP goals, but specifics remain unclear.
4	Clear information provided to suggest that the student's experiences and goals are in alignment with SURP goals.
5	Specific information showing how student's experiences and goals align with SURP goals.