

**Assessment Rubric for Undergraduate Research Proposal for HASBSEB**

**The Office of Undergraduate Research, Lamar University**

**Name(s) of Student Researcher(s):**

**Area of research/Discipline:**

**Title of Proposal:**

**Part I. Point Rating of Categories (please give integer scores)**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Missing or Unacceptable (-5.0)</b>	<b>Developing (0.0)</b>	<b>Accomplished (3.0- 5.0)</b>	<b>Exemplary (7.0-10.0)</b>
Title and abstract  <b>Score:</b>	Title or abstract were missing or inappropriate given the problem, research questions, and method.	Title or abstract lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the proposed study or is too lengthy.	Title and abstract are relevant and of required size, offering details about the proposed study.	Title and abstract are concise, informative, and clearly indicate the relevant details of the proposed study.
Research Project/ Thesis/Purpose & configuration/ Critical thinking (CT)  <b>Score:</b>	Lacks ability to create a meaningful research project or thesis and to shape content into either a chronological or logical plan of configuration. Concepts, evidence, and definitions were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose or methods of the study. No meaningful contribution to the human condition. Lack of CT.	Demonstrates limited skills in crafting a clear research project or thesis that is supported by an equally clear plan of configuration. Concepts are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected, resulting in a thesis that lacks appropriate support. Limited contribution to the human condition. Minimal CT.	Although minor revisions could lead to a greater effect, demonstrates skills in crafting a coherent, unified, and restricted research project or thesis that is supported by an equally coherent, unified, and restricted plan of configuration. Appropriate contributions to the human condition. Good CT	Articulates clear, coherent, reasonable, and succinct research project or thesis that is well supported by interesting, innovative, and significant premises, concepts and ideas. Excellent contribution to the human condition. Excellent CT.
Development  <b>Score:</b>	Seemingly unaware of how to use rhetorical patterns to generate detail and sufficient evidence to support both research project or thesis and/or purpose.	Demonstrates some skills in using rhetorical patterns of development, but detail and supporting evidence lack the critical strength to carry forward the research project or thesis and/or purpose.	Demonstrates proficient skill in using rhetorical patterns of development in order to generate appropriate detail and supporting evidence for the purpose & audience.	Demonstrates superior skill in manipulating rhetorical patterns of development in order to generate appropriate detail and supporting evidence for the purpose and audience.
Organization and neatness of the proposal  <b>Score:</b>	The length of the narrative exceeds the suggested limit as indicated in the solicitation. The ideas are presented in a random manner with no focus.	The content and length of the proposal are inadequate (i.e. there is some logic in the narrative part, but the ideas lack of clear focus and structural argumentation).	Proposal format has been followed mostly. The narrative presents the ideas in an almost structural and logical manner.	The narrative has the appropriate length and the ideas are presented in a clear structural and logic manner identifying the reasons and means to achieve the goals.
Budget and timeline  <b>Score:</b>	Budget and/or timeline are missing or the timeline is beyond our suggested time.	Budget and/or timeline are present but not adequate to support the project.	Budget and/or timeline are present but not very well defined, not easy to understand.	Budget and timeline are adequate to support the project activities, costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project. The budget is clear to understand.
<b>Points</b>				

**Part II. Point Rating of the Mentor Support Letter**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Missing or Unacceptable (-2.5)</b>	<b>Accomplished (+2.5)</b>	<b>Exemplary (+5.0)</b>
Mentor support letter	The faculty mentor's support letter is missing or the letter doesn't indicate at all that the project can be completed within the timeline.	The faculty mentor's support letter doesn't strongly indicate that the student has enough qualification to run the project or the project can be completed within the timeline.	The faculty mentor's support letter strongly indicates that the research project is significant and gives strong evidence that the student has the qualifications to carry out the project successfully within the time period.
<b>Points</b>			

**Grand Total Points (Part I+ Part II):**

**Part III. Please type in this file at least one sentence on each of the following criteria; please list the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and a short overall summary of the proposal:**

**Title and Abstract:**

**Comment on the research question or hypothesis:**

**Research Design:**

**Organization and neatness of the proposal:** satisfactory or not satisfactory (please circle your option)

**Comment on the Budget and Timeline:**

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

**Summary:**