Review Criteria for DRI Summer Research Grant

Proposal Body: Please rate the proposal on each of the following aspects of the proposal body.

Below Average = 1 point

Close To Average = 2 points

Average = 3 points

Above Average = 4 points

Excellent = 5 points

Introduction*

Below Average

Close to Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

Is a clear and concise overview provided that helps put the proposed research in the context of the field? Is the "big picture" relevance of the work clear from the introduction? Is the wring jargon free and easily understood by the reader?

Justification*

Below Average

Close to Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

How does the proposal contribute to the advancement of the student's field of study? Does the proposed project represent a new direction or approach? Will the project simulate new questions/opportunities for future studies? Is the writing clear, concise and jargon free and are references provided?

Implementation*

Below Average

Close to Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

Does the proposal contain a clear series of processes, procedures and/or methods that will be used to achieve the proposed project? Are proposed processes/procedures/methods appropriate and comprehensive for the proposed work? Where will the work be performed?

Preparation*

Below Average

Close to Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

Did the student list and elaborate on influential courses and experiences/opportunities that helped them prepare for the research project?

Dissemination*

Below Average

Close to Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

Is the student's presentation plan feasible for the type and scope of their research project? Does it include an online alternate in case travel is prohibited?

Other Considerations

Introduction: Did the student follow the instructions? *

Major Errors

Minor Errors

Error Free

Note: Major Errors are (1) point. Minor Errors are (3) points. Error Free equals (5) points.

Feasibility: Is the project feasible in the timeframe given? Does the student have the background and or resources available to complete the project? *

Not Feasible (neither timeframe nor resources are adequate)

Somewhat Feasible (either timeframe or resources are inadequate)

Very Feasible (both timeframe and resources are adequate)

Note: Not Feasible (1 point); Somewhat Feasible (3 points); Very Feasible (5 points)

Advising Contract/Mentoring Plan: Has the faculty member established that they have read and approved of the proposal? Has the faculty member provided a short mentoring plan. *

The faculty mentor approves of the project, demonstrates an understanding of the project, and outlines a plan to mentor the student (4 points)

The faculty mentor approves the project and demonstrates an understanding of the project, but the mentoring plan lacks clarity and/or specificity (3 points)

The faculty mentor approves the project but does not demonstrate a complete understanding of the project (2 points)

The faculty member does not approve the project or did not submit a mentoring plan (0 points).