

Scoring Rubric for 2012-13 UPD Grants

Applicant Name: _____

Title: _____

For items 1-5 below, rate each criterion using the following scale based on the quality of the proposal:

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

1.	The project is clearly described. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
2.	The end result/anticipated outcome(s) of the project is/are clearly described. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The relevance of the project to its field is well defined. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The project components/activities are clear and feasible. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The project timeline is clear and appropriate. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The description of how the project will enhance the applicant's professional growth is clear. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
7.	<i>If students are involved in the project,</i> the description makes clear the nature of student involvement and how this involvement promotes the faculty member's professional development. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
8.	<i>If multiple faculty submit a single proposal,</i> the description makes clear the collaborative nature of the project as well as each faculty member's role in the project. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
9.	The budget is clearly described and justified <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
10.	The budget is appropriate and itemized <i>Comments:</i> If appropriate, current CSU mileage and per diem rates are used ___Yes ___No If appropriate, is an assigned time request adequately justified? ___Yes ___No	1	2	3	4	5

11. Are final reports of Previous UPD/RSCA Grants on file? ___Yes ___No ___ N/A