

Summer Faculty Fellowship Rubric

1. Clarity of proposal – needs to be easily understood by readers not in the discipline

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Reader with general knowledge is given field-specific information needed to understand project purpose and context. Proposal is easy to follow and informative.			Purpose uses terms not generally understood or is not clear on specifically how purpose relates to project. There may be distracting errors in grammar.				Unclear, very general or vague. Proposal difficult to follow. Reader has to work to understand the purpose or project. Poorly written.			

2. Significance to the academic discipline

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Clear statement of project and how its goals and results will contribute to existing knowledge in the applicant's discipline. Reader (without specific knowledge of the field) is convinced of project's importance to discipline. Or clear and convincing evidence is provided to the general reader as to the importance of the project.			Project is described without clear statement of goals or of how research furthers the field. Points may be vague so the connection with academic discipline is unclear. Yet the project appears to have the potential to contribute to knowledge in the discipline.				Goals are missing or writer fails to describe potential contribution of research to the discipline. Expected results may be vague or missing. Reader is unconvinced that this project will further the discipline. Routine project.			

3. Project's potential to advance the applicant's program of research

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Reader is convinced that the project has the potential to elevate the applicant's research to a higher level. A must-do for this applicant.			Some benefits are to be realized, but the potential advance to the applicant's program is not as great or as convincing.				Unconvincing, or benefits are not delineated clearly, or there may be some key points or questions that remain unanswered.			

4. Realistic project completion timeline

5	4	3	2	1	0
Timeline is realistic for completion of project. Project scope is realistic for time period. Adequate information is provided to assist the reader in judging the timeline for the project.			Timeline lacking in detail or relationship to project completion is unclear.		

5. Previous levels of research support and promise of continued scholarship

5	4	3	2	1	0
Previous support gives reader confidence that the project will be successful. Clear evidence of promise for continued scholarship.			Previous support not described in detail or results were not clearly described. Record of accomplishment is thin. Had a previous SFF without record of enhancement.		