Magellan Scholar Proposal Review Rubric

Revision date Fall 2019

Criteria Weight		EXEMPLARY (x4)	VERY GOOD (x3)		GOOD (x2)		NEEDS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT (x1)		MISSING
50	Student's clarity of explanation								
8	Scholarly topic, pursuit, or question	Strongly articulated topic/ question; clearly connects with background and project plan	Clear topic/question; may have minor issues with connection between topic, background and/or project plan		Topic/question good; may have some disconnect between topic, background, and/or project plan		Topic/question vague or weak and/or little connection between topic, background, and/or project plan		
	points	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	
20	Project plan or how the question is to be answered	Strong evidence of thought and planning (details clearly articulated)	Good evidence of thought and planning (e.g., some details missing or confusing)		Some evidence of thought and planning (e.g., few details or plan not presented logically) OR multiple minor flaws in plan		Little evidence of thought or planning (e.g., little to no details; confusing) OR significant flaws in plan		
	points	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	
8	Significance or impact of project (can be limited to impact on student)	Clearly articulated, strong statement of why this project is important	Good effort to describe project's importance; could be stated more clearly		Some effort to describe project's importance; explanation may be difficult to understand		Little to no reference to project importance or not understandable		No impact statement
	points	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	0
8	Writing style	Clear, persuasive, and logical; well organized with little to no errors	Good overall; minor issues with clarity, logic, or level of detail; few errors		Adequate writing; isolated areas lacking clarity/ details and/or too many errors		Poorly written overall; confusing, lacking necessary details; excessive or significant errors		
	points	32	28	24	20	16	12	8	
6	Timeline	Clear and detailed plan for completing work within project timeframe	Some details provided; additional specificity would be helpful		Vague references to project timing		Little to no details provided		No timeline provided
	points	24	21	18	15	12	9	6	0
30	Mentor-Student collaboration (please consider both the form and information within the proposal itself)								
4	Student readiness for project	Strong evidence student is prepared for project (through classes, previous experience, etc)	Good evidence of readiness AND/OR good plan/support for gaining needed skills		Little evidence of readiness AND/OR weak plan/support for gaining needed skills		Student does not seem ready for project and no structure/plan of support		
	points	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	
7	Student gain	Strong and clearly defined description of student gains	Good description of gains; may need additional project specific details		Generalized description and/or few project specific student gains		Vague description with no project specific gains		
	points	28	24.5	21	17.5	14	10.5	7	
4	Outcomes, deliverables, and dissemination	Clear and specific plan/outline	Good description; may need additional project specific details		Generalized description and/or few project specific details		Vague plans and/or outline		No plans and/or outline
	points	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	0
15	Mentoring plan (incl interaction, skill development, etc)	Strong evidence of mentoring relationship; includes details and plans	Good evidence of mentoring relationship; some details provided		Some evidence of mentoring relationship; details vague		Little evidence of mentoring relationship; little to no details		
	points	60	52.5	45	37.5	30	22.5	15	
20	Overall Merit								
		Exceptional: no concerns with overall topic, project plan, or design	Very Good; strong with a few minor weaknesses		Good; with moderate weaknesses		Fair; at least one major weakness		Poor; numerous major weaknesse
	points	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10 0

100