

2021 Rubric for Research Fellow Award proposal

Member Information				Score
Contact information	0 = missing information		2 = all parts filled out	
Brief Bio (150 word max)	0 = did not explain how project ties in with work/areas of interest	1.5 = some details provided as how project ties in with work/areas of interest, but more details would have been helpful	3 = clearly articulated how work/areas of interest tie in with the project listed in the request for funding	
Total for section =				/5

Research Project Abstract (200 words max.)						Score
Clarity of purpose:	1 = very vague as to what this project is about	2 = description of the project is discernable, but more details would be helpful for clarification	3 = description provides sufficient amount of information to determine purpose of the project	4 = very good description of what the project is about.	5 = excellent description that includes specific details of what the project is about	
Goals/outcomes	0 – not listed	1.5 – provided, but most are vague or generalizable goals that could be applied to anything	3 – goals/outcomes may not be feasible or achievable based on the amount of funding requested		5 – goals and outcomes are clearly defined and appropriate based on funding amount requested	
Lists targeted audiences/stakeholders	0 = not listed		3 = some notation/detail provided, but vague or missing group committee thought should be included		5 = listed in detail	
Total for section =						/15

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Research Project Justification (300 words max.)						Score
Clarity of need:	1 = very vague as to the importance of this project	2 = description of the need/impacts/ importance is discernable, but more details would be helpful for clarification	3 = description provides sufficient amount of information to determine potential impact of the project	4 = very good description of what gap the project is aimed at filling with few questions about the importance.	5 = excellent description that includes specific details of the purpose behind the project, importance, and/or possible impacts	
Lists achievable outcomes/ potential impact of work	0 = not listed or not feasible based on description to attain		3 = some notation/detail provided but seems vague		5 = listed in detail, clear articulation	
Stand-alone/part of larger project discussion	0 = not clear if this is a stand-alone project or part of a larger project		3 = provided some details as to how the work will address the need as a stand-alone or as part of a larger project		5 = clearly articulated how as a stand-alone or part of a larger project, the work will help to achieve meeting the need defined.	
Total for section =						/15

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Research Support Request (300 words max.)				Score
Amount requested adequate for proposal	1 = seems to have unreasonable expectations based on project and funding amounts	3 = potentially do-able, but some questions if feasible	5 = articulated costs that seemed appropriate for the amount of work to be conducted for each aspect of the project	
Itemized list of proposed expenses provided	0 = not listed	3 = some detail provided, but seems to be missing some possibly pertinent expenses	5 = listed in detail	

Included professional development activities as part of expenses	0 = yes	3 = difficult to determine based on what was listed, but not outright stated would be using funds for professional development activities	5 = no (<i>the application specifically stated the funds were not to be used for professional development</i>)	
Total for section =				/ 15

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Research Project Timeline (300 words max.)				Score
Timeline presented is adequate for proposal	1 = seems to have unreasonable expectations based on project and amount of work to be done in the timeline	3 = potentially do-able, but some questions if feasible	5 = articulated timeline that seemed appropriate for the amount of work to be conducted for each aspect of the project	
Specific target dates for steps provided	0 = not listed	3 = some detail provided, but more deadlines would have been helpful based on scope of the project	5 = listed in detail for the scope of the project	
Identification of delays and potential contingency plans	0 = none listed	3 = some ideas provided, but vague or not well thought out on how to potentially address	5 = clearly articulated what may cause a delay and potential contingencies listed, or what would cause an absolute halt to the project as no contingency available to use as a work-around	
Total for section =				/ 15

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Research Support Justification (300 words max.)						Score
Description of how support will benefit research was provided	1 = very vague as to how support would be beneficial	2 = description of the support is discernable, but more details would	3 = description provides sufficient amount of information to determine how	4 = very good description of what the support would do to benefit the project	5 = excellent description that included specific details as to how the	

		be helpful for clarification	support would be beneficial		support would benefit the project	
Description of how project relates to an area of agriculture	1 = very vague as to how project ties in with agriculture	2 = description is discernable, but more details would be helpful for clarification	3 = description provides sufficient amount of information to determine how project ties in with agriculture	4 = very good description of how the project ties in with agriculture	5 = excellent description that included specific details as to how project ties in with agriculture	
Description of how research will benefit USAIN (either the organization as a whole or the members)	1 = very vague as to how research would benefit anyone other than researcher	2 = description of how research would benefit anyone other than researcher is discernable, but more details would be helpful	3 = description provides sufficient amount of information to determine how others will benefit	4 = very good description of how research could benefit either the organization or members	5 = excellent description that included how research could benefit both the organization and members	
Total for section =						/15

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Dissemination of Results (150 words max.)				Score
Description of dissemination of results was provided	1 = very vague as to how results would be disseminated	3 = description provides some level of detail regarding how plans to disseminate results	5 = excellent description that included specific details as to how the results would be disseminated	
Total for section =				/5

Notes/overall impression of this aspect of the proposal:

Deductions

Subtract 2 points for each section that went over the listed word count	# of sections ____ X 2 =	-
---	--------------------------	---

Total points of all sections = /85

Overall thoughts of this proposal:

Ways to improve this proposal: