****

**Scoring Rubric form
CAES Research Hub Funds**

 Name of Applicant:

 Amount requested: $          Tier 1 < $500. Tier 2 $500-$1000

 Title of project:

Please enter a score at right for each of the following 5 items using the 5 point scale below.

A consistently “excellent” proposal would thus have the higher score.

The average score for all members’ rating will be provided to the Dean
for determination of funding.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **5-4 Meets or exceeds expectations** | **3-2 Meets some, but not all expectations** | **1-0 Meets few expectations** | **scores** |
| **Application Packet** | Provided a complete application packet addressing Merit, Quality, Feasibility, & Budget, including relevant abbreviated vita(e) | Application provided three of the four required elements, OR vita(e) did not meet requirements. | Application less than three of the fours required elements AND/OR vita(e) did not meet requirements. |  |
| **Merit** | Clearly connects research or activity to scholarly goals of individual. Explains how it benefits college and university. | Connects research or activity to scholarly goals of individual but not to the college or university. | Fails to provide connections of scholarly merit to either the individual, the college, or the university. |  |
| **Quality** | Clear descriptions, terminology was defined and clarified. No questions as to meaning or purpose exist. | A question exists as to the terminology and/or purpose, or validity/significance/feasibility of the proposal is not clear to all readers. | Fails to provide connections to merit, feasibility &/ or budget. |  |
| **Feasibility** | Timeline is clearly articulated and provides evidence the task can be accomplished. Indicates specific elements of project related to grant, if a multi-stage project. | Timeline is vague or does not indicate task can be accomplished in the timeline provided. | Lacks a timeline and evidence for feasibility. |  |
| **Budget** | Provides an itemized budget that observes university regulations. Addresses other sources of funding as stated in the criteria (other than N/A), with specifics about how those sources are used for the grant. | Budget appears to lack items, or does not completely observe university regulations. Other sources of funding are partially addressed. | Does not provide an itemized budget nor shows evidence of, or observance to, university regulations OR does not provide information about other sources of funding. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |  |
|  | Evaluation of Tier 2 proposals ($500-$1000) will be held to more stringent standards than Tier 1 proposals (<$500). Minimum averaged score **to fund Tier 1 = 12.5**Minimum averaged score **to fund Tier 2 = 18.75** |  |