

### Schwartz Discover Grant Evaluator Rubric

**N.B.** If any section is missing, please provide a 0 throughout the right-hand column.

**CV/Resume:**

**\*\*\*Applicants need not have prior research experience but should be able to demonstrate how the skills/experiences they do possess are relevant/desirable for their proposed research experience.**

	Excellent (8 – 10 points)	Good (6 – 8 points)	Satisfactory (4 – 6 points)	Weak (1 – 3 points)
<b>Overall style, appearance, and accuracy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consistent formatting (use of bold, headings, italics, spacing).</li> <li>● Information is presented consistently and orderly in all sections (no duplication of information).</li> <li>● Text isn't overcrowded or too spaced out.</li> <li>● No spelling and grammatical errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A couple of minor formatting inconsistencies are present.</li> <li>● Information is mostly consistent and orderly.</li> <li>● A few areas of overcrowding with text.</li> <li>● A few minor spelling and grammatical errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Several areas are formatted inconsistently (use of bold, headings, italics, spacing).</li> <li>● Information is somewhat consistent and orderly, some duplication.</li> <li>● Text appears somewhat overcrowded or somewhat spaced out.</li> <li>● Significant number of spelling and grammatical errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Most sections are formatted inconsistently (use of bold, headings, italics, spacing).</li> <li>● Information is unorganized and inconsistent.</li> <li>● Text appears very overcrowded or too spaced out.</li> <li>● Document is riddled with spelling and grammatical errors making it difficult to read.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Skills and qualifications are contextualized in a concise manner, showing their relevance to this grant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Skills and qualifications are somewhat contextualized and an attempt to show their relevance to this grant is made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Little discernable contextualization of skills and qualifications with little attempt to tie to relevance of this grant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No contextualization of skills or qualifications. No relevance to this grant is made.</li> </ul>

**Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20**

**Research Statement:**

	<b>Excellent (8 – 10 points)</b>	<b>Good (6 – 8 points)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (4 – 6 points)</b>	<b>Weak (1 – 3 points)</b>
<b>Provides jargon-free context for the project (situates within field of study)</b>	Subject background is comprehensively described for a non-specialist audience.	Subject background described. A non-specialist can generally understand the project.	Subject background lacking. A non-specialist has a hard time understanding.	Background context not included. A non-specialist has great difficulty understanding.
<b>Provides the project's main aims/objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project attempts strong, compelling contribution to subject area.</li> <li>Specific, measurable, or identifiable tasks are explained that will address the research activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project makes original contribution to field.</li> <li>An attempt is made to explain specific, measurable, or identifiable tasks that will address the research activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project attempts contribution to subject area.</li> <li>Vague attempt at mentioning tasks that will address the research activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project does not make original contribution to subject area.</li> <li>No explanation is made of specific, measurable, or identifiable tasks that will address the research activity</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology</b>	Provides a clear, detailed explanation of how the research question/ problem is to be investigated.	Provides an explanation of how the research question/ problem is to be investigated.	Inadequate or confusing explanation of how the research question/ problem is to be investigated.	Explanation is lacking or poorly thought out.
<b>Provides the student's role/contributions to the work</b>	Student has fully explained their original ideas for project.	Student has explained their original contribution to project.	Student is carrying out someone else's work and ideas and connecting to personal interests.	Student is simply carrying out someone else's work and ideas.
<b>Proposed project seems well thought out and the student's role/contributions are feasible for an undergraduate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will produce strong skill and knowledge development for student.</li> <li>It is feasible in scope and a tangible product is likely (paper, conference presentation, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will produce skills and knowledge development for student.</li> <li>It may be feasible in scope and a tangible product is possible (paper, conference presentation, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project may produce skill and knowledge development for student.</li> <li>Does not seem feasible and a tangible product is unlikely.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student unlikely to develop new skills and knowledge.</li> <li>Is not feasible for an undergraduate student. A tangible product is doubtful.</li> </ul>
<b>Project timeline</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A general timing of the steps for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timing of steps doesn't seem as well thought out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate layout of the timing of steps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No attempt at a timing of steps is made</li> </ul>

	<p>research experience is provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable seems feasible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable seems potentially feasible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline does not appear feasible.</li> </ul>	
<b>Communicates clearly</b>	Writing quality is excellent—the writing has an easy flow and rhythm.	Writing quality is good—the writing is smooth and easy to read.	Writing quality is fair—the flow of writing is more mechanical than fluid.	Writing quality is poor—the writing is difficult to follow and read.

Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 70

**Personal Statement:**

	<b>Excellent (8 – 10 points)</b>	<b>Good (6 – 8 points)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (4 – 6 points)</b>	<b>Weak (1 – 3 points)</b>
<b>Clearly articulates why they are interested in research and why they are interested in this particular research experience</b>	Statement strongly conveys student’s individual voice and personality and powerfully sets them apart from other candidates.	In most places, statement conveys student’s individual voice and personality and sets them apart from other candidates.	In some place, statement conveys student’s individual voice and personality and sets them apart from other candidates. In other places, the statement may sound formulaic and/or relies on clichés.	Statement is formulaic and/or relies on clichés. Statement does not convey individual uniqueness or set them apart from other candidates. Student’s voice and personality are not evident in statement.
<b>Identifies alignment of goals and ambitions to the research</b>	Makes very strong arguments regarding their alignment of goals and ambitions to the research.	Makes arguments for the alignment of goals and ambitions to the research.	Makes at least one reasonable argument on the alignment of goals and ambitions to the proposed research.	Makes weak arguments on the alignment of goals and ambitions to the research.
<b>Articulates expectations for the summer</b>	Demonstrates a thorough reflection on what they can expect over the course of the summer and how the experience will meet their expectations.	Briefly reflects on what they can expect over the course of the summer and how the experience will meet their expectations.	Hasn’t spent much time thinking about what to expect over the summer and how to achieve those expectations.	Little to no time spent reflecting on what to expect over the summer and/or vague language is used showing a mere surface-level reflection.
<b>Communicates clearly</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing quality is excellent—the writing has an easy flow and rhythm.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing quality is good—the writing is smooth and easy to read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing quality is fair—the flow of writing is more mechanical than fluid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing quality is poor—the writing is difficult to follow and read.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a clear awareness of audience.</li> <li>• Thoughts are very well-connected, demonstrating sophistication in self-expression.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates a reasonable awareness of audience.</li> <li>• Thoughts appear connected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writer's awareness of audience is unclear.</li> <li>• Thoughts are somewhat connected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writer shows no awareness of audience.</li> <li>• Thoughts are unclear.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--	---

Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 40

Is your overall recommendation for this project to be funded?

Yes

No

Any additional notes/comments?