ISOES
Research Grant Application Rubric

Each application should be judged using the following 8 item criteria. Scores range from 0 to 5, with lower scores indicating lower assessment of the application's merit on that item. You are also able to give feedback for each category. The maximum score is **40.** Note: It is unlikely that a proposal would have a perfect score; the rubric is meant to provide consistency and suggest multiple ways that proposals can qualify. Reviewers are asked to explain their rationale for assigning a score of 0 to 40 for each rating. **Rubrics serve only as a general guideline. Please consider each application on a case by case basis.**

Criteria	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score =3	Score = 4	Score = 5
Background & Problem/Issue *To what extent does the applicant give specific examples of the literature and background of the problem? How well is the research gap/main issue articulated? How strongly connected to the research questions/significance?*	Provides no description of the background/ problem or this section is missing all together.	Provides a vague description of the background/ problem and its importance.	Provides a mediocre description of background/ problem.	Provides a reasonable description of the background /problem.	Provides a strong description of the background/ problem, but not as detailed or well reasoned as a 5.	Provides a detailed and well reasoned description of background/ problem.
Purpose/Objectives *To what extent does the applicant pro-vide a clear explanation of the purpose and objectives of the research project? Are the research question(s) and hypoth-esis(es) clearly stated? To what extent are they supported by the literature re-view?*	Provides no explanation of the purpose and objectives.	Provides a very vague description of the purpose and objectives.	Provides a mediocre description of the purpose and objectives.	Provides a reasonable description of the purpose and objectives.	Provides a strong description of the purpose and objectives, but not as well-articulated or as clear as a 5.	Provides a very Well-articulated and clearly identified purpose and objectives.
Significance & Project Impact *How well does the applicant describe the impact of the project on the field and the significance of their work?*	Provides no description of the impact of the project on the field.	Provides a vague description of the impact of the project on the field.	Provides a mediocre description of the impact of the project on the field.	Provides a reasonable description of the impact of the project on the field.	Provides a strong description of the impact of the pro-ject on the field, but not as well-articulated as a 5.	Provides a very well-articulated description of the impact of the project on the field.
Research Methods *How well does the applicant describe the research design and procedures that will be used to accomplish the specific aims and hypotheses of the project? To what extent are the methods justified and reasonable described? (Keep in mind this is an underline interdisciplinary review, score based on the applicant's writing, NOT based on your opinion of scientific methods).*	Provides no description of the research design and procedures.	Provides a vague description of the research design and procedures.	Provides mediocre description of the research design and procedures.	Provides a reasonable description of the research design and procedures.	Provides a strong description of the research design and procedures, but not as clear or detailed as a 5.	Provides a clear, detailed description of the research design and procedures.

Criteria	Score = 0	Score = 1	Score = 2	Score =3	Score = 4	Score = 5
Equipment/Materials *How well does the applicant provide justification for the list of materials/equipment?*	Provides no justification for the list of materials/ equipment.	Provides a vague justification for the list of materials/ equipment.	Provides a mediocre justification for the list of materials/ equipment.	Provides a reasonable justification for the list of materials/ equipment.	Provides a strong justification for the list of materials/ equipment, but not as well-reasoned or justified as a 5.	Provides a strong, well-reasoned justification for the list of materials/ equipment.
Project & Outline *How well does the applicant describe the plan for their research project, including their timeline? To what extent are potential roadblocks described? Are these addressed with reasonable and compelling strategies to ensure timely project completion?*	Provides no description of the plan for their research project.	Provides a very vague description of the plan for their research project.	Provides a mediocre description of the plan for their research project.	Provides a reasonable description of the plan for their research project.	Provides a strong description of the plan for their research project, but not as well-articulated as a 5.	Provides a very well-articulated description of the plan for their research project.
Budget Justification *How well does the applicant justify the itemized budget?*	Provides no justification for itemized budget OR itemized budget is entirely comprised of items that are not eligible for reimbursement	Budget is unrealistic OR provides a very vague justification for itemized budget OR budget contains items that are not eligible for reimbursement.	Budget contains items that are unreasonable OR provides only mediocre justification for itemized budget	Budget is reasonable OR makes a relatively good attempt at providing justification for the itemized budget OR budget contains some errors/ inconsistencies	Budget is reasonable AND provides a strong justification for the itemized budget	Budget is reasonable AND provides an outstanding justification for the itemized budget
Interdisciplinary Clarity *To what extent does the research project provide a concise overview and is easy to understand to an interdisciplinary audience? To what extent was the quality of writing, structure, and general flow?*	Hard to understand the overall proposal. Full of jargon and undefined technical terms.	Hard to follow the overall proposal. Imprecise word choice and/or awkward sentence structure; may contain unnecessary jargon or undefined technical terms; mistakes in spelling, grammar, and punctuation are common.	Adequate word choice; may contain unnecessary jargon or undefined technical terms; most spelling, grammar, and punctuation are correct.	Writing is generally clear and concise, but may contain some unnecessary use of jargon or technical terms that are not defined.	Concise overview and avoids unnecessary jargon; technical terms that may be unfamiliar to reviewers outside the applicant's field are defined; some errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.	Concise overview and avoids unnecessary jargon; technical terms that may be unfamiliar to reviewers outside the applicant's field are defined; no errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation.

Duration: While longer lasting impact does not necessarily give a grant greater merit, looking at duration can be a useful tool in measuring overall value. For discussion purposes, how would you categorize the duration of impact on students of this particular grant? Please choose one:

☐ Short-Term Impact (S) ~ one year or less
☐ Medium-erm Impact (M) ~ 2-4 years
☐ Long-Term Impact (L) ~ more than 4 years

Technology: Would you categorize this as a technology grant?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Maybe
If so, has the applicant provided a satisfactory plan for repair and maintenance?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

ISOES Policy: ISOES has a policy not to fund items part of the regular school budget. Regarding this policy, do you have any concerns about this proposal?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

(If yes, please detail your concerns.)

Overall Rank/Recommendation for this grant:
☐ Fully Fund
☐ Partially Fund
☐ Do Not Fund

Comments or feedback on any of the instruments or elements of this process?

Feedback to proposers:

Thank you so much for your service to ISOES.