

Assessment Rubric for Undergraduate Research Proposal for **STEM**
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)

Criterion	Missing or Unacceptable (-5.0)	Developing (0.0)	Accomplished (3.0- 5.0)	Exemplary (7.0-10.0)
Title and abstract Score:	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 question, hypothesis Score:	Research question(s), definitions, assumptions and limitations were omitted or inappropriate given the context, purpose or methods of the study.	Elements are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the description of the problem, purpose or research methods.	Research questions are stated clearly and are connected to the research topic.	Articulates clear, reasonable, and succinct research questions, and questions are fresh, interesting and significant.
Research design Score:	The research design is erroneous for its hypothesis or has not been identified and or described using standard terminology. Limitations and assumptions are omitted.	The research design is confusing or incomplete given the research questions. Important limitations and assumptions have not been identified.	The research design has been identified and described in sufficiently detailed terms. Some limitations and assumptions were identified.	The purpose, questions, and design are mutually supportive and coherent. Appropriate and important limitations and assumptions have been clearly stated.
Organization and neatness of the proposal Score:	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 reasonable well the reasons and means to achieve the goal of the proposal.
Budget and timeline Score:	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.		

Part II. Point Rating of the Mentor Support Letter

Criteria	Missing or Unacceptable (-2.5)	Accomplished (+2.5)	Exemplary (+5.0)
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.
Points			

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: