Truman State University
Interdisciplinary Research Community Proposal Evaluation Rubric
*Modified from UW-Superior's Student Undergraduate Research Fellowship Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Exceptional	Very Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Interdisciplinary collaboration	(8) Significant disparity of disciplines (i.e., collaboration between different schools).	(6) Some disparity of disciplines (i.e., collaboration between disparate departments, may or may not be in the same school).	(4) Limited disparity of disciplines (i.e., collaboration between different departments that commonly work together).	(2) Minimal disparity of disciplines (i.e., collaboration between related departments).	(0) Project does not have collaboration between different disciplines.
Research question or creative goal	(8) The goals or objectives of the project are clearly stated and described.	(6) The goals or objectives of the project are described well but could benefit from minor fine-tuning.	(4) The goals or objectives of the project are comprehensible but need further refinement.	(2) The goals or objectives of the project are insinuated but not explicitly stated.	(0) The goals or objectives of the project are nonexistent.
Interdisciplinary methodology and design	(4) Project significantly integrates knowledge and methods from different disciplines, moving beyond individual disciplinary perspectives.	(3) Project moderately integrates knowledge and methods from different disciplines.	(2) Project includes knowledge and methods from different disciplines, but methodology has limited integration between disciplines.	(1) Project includes knowledge and methods from different disciplines, but methodology has minimal integration between disciplines.	(0) Project does not include knowledge or methods from different disciplines.
Overall methodology and design	(4) Clear, concise, and it's easy to understand the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used. Based on their description, the approach is appropriate and manageable for the project. Written so a non-specialist can understand the methods and the topic that will be studied.	(3) Proposal is clear and it's easy to understand the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used to complete this project but further fine tuning/explanation is necessary. The approach seems appropriate and manageable. Some undefined field-specific terminology that makes the proposal less understandable or accessible.	(2) Outlines the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used, but some aspects are vague and need further clarification or explanation. Further clarifications are needed to show how this project is appropriate and manageable. Some undefined field-specific terminology that makes the proposal less understandable or accessible.	(1) Does not explicitly describe the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used, but has statements inferring some kind of methodological approach. Further detail is necessary to show how this project is appropriate and manageable. Generally not easy to follow (e.g., utilizes field-specific jargon without explaining its significance).	(0) Lacking any description of the methodology, design, research plan, processes, or procedures that will be used.

Timeline	(4) Clearly presented and shows that all project-described activities will be completed within the semester the grant is awarded.	(3) Shows the activities that will be completed within the semester the grant is awarded.	(2) Timeline is presented, but does not clearly describe which activities will be completed or when.	(1) No clear timeline, or it does not illustrate what will be completed or when.	(0) No timeline of activities, or the timeline is clearly not suitable for the activities described.
Mentoring plan	(4) Viable plan for mentoring and assessing student progress and mentors will be available and engaged in training the student.	(4) Viable plan for mentoring and assessing student progress and the mentor's role is clear.	(3) Mentoring plan and availability is included; however, the mentor's role is unclear.	(1) The mentor will not be available or play an active role in student mentoring.	(0) Mentoring plan and availability is not included.
Budget	(4) Expenses relevant to the project are clearly listed and justified, and expenses are allowable based on OSR guidelines.	(3) Expenses relevant to the project are listed and justified, and expenses are allowable based on OSR guidelines.	(2) Expenses allowable based on OSR guidelines are listed; however, relevance to project or justification is unclear.	(1) Budget may not list all items or item relevance and justification may not be provided at all.	(0) Budget lists expenses not allowed based on OSR guidelines, or no budget is included.
Proposal structure, length & completeness	(4) Complete and meets page limit, is very well written, and is easy to follow.	(3) Complete and meets page limit, and is clearly written with no errors.	(2) Complete and meets page limit, but contains errors.	(1) Incomplete with minor information missing or exceeds page limit.	(0) Significant information is missing.