**KU Undergraduate Research Award (UGRA) Evaluation Rubric-Arts projects**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Disciplinary Context/Vision** | **1=Poor or Absent** | **2=Fair** | **3 = Good** | **4 = Exceptional** | **Score** |
| 1. Synthesizes other creative works in the field and characterizes current trends in the discipline. | Minimal discussion of other creative works suggests lack of understanding or effort. No attempts at insights or analysis. | Vague discussion of other creative works. Some conventional or underdeveloped insight or analysis is provided about individual work, but no connections are made. | Good discussion of other creative works. Adequate depth of insight/analysis. Is able to describe trends and connections that are clearly related to the proposed work. | Excellent discussion of other creative works. Impressive depth of insight/analysis. Makes meaningful connections among artists and communicates trends that are clearly related to proposed work. Student has a firm grasp on relevant concepts. |  |
| 1. Proposal articulates a creative vision for the project. | Proposal is purely descriptive and does not describe the inspiration or creative vision for the project. | Proposal articulates a vision for the project, but it is under-developed. | Proposal articulates a creative vision for the project. | Proposal clearly articulates a compelling and innovative creative vision for the project.  Proposal clearly describes the themes, questions, or issues that the work will explore and the potential significance of the final project. |  |
| **Project Design** | **1=Poor or Absent** | **2=Fair** | **3= Good** | **4= Exceptional** | **Score** |
| 1. Describes appropriate methods or techniques for the project, with explanation of choices. | Methods or approach is not described. | Inadequately explained or inadequate approach. There is no relationship between what the student proposes to do and why. | Student explains the techniques and approach to be used and why the methods are good for the project. | Shows evidence of exceptional insight and reflection about the creative process; methods are appropriate for topic and discipline.  Makes insightful connections between the creative process (choice of materials, forms, etc.) and the vision for the project. |  |
| 1. Proposal outlines an achievable project with a realistic timeline for a semester-long project.   *\*\*Note: While we want to encourage students to make provisions for key steps in the project, we also do not want to only award those projects that are “safe.” Feel free to give a student a higher score if there are more unknowns in a project because it is ambitious.\*\** | The scope of the proposal is unreasonable in terms of time and resources available. Student has not considered and made plans for key steps of the project. | The scope of the proposal is of some concern in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for some steps of the project. | The scope of the proposal is moderately reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for most steps of the project. | The scope of the proposal is reasonable in terms of time and resources available. The student has considered and made plans for all steps of the project. |  |
| **Writing Skills** | **1=Poor or Absent** | **2=Fair** | **3= Good** | **4= Exceptional** | **Score** |
| 1. Proposal is clearly written for a non-expert audience and follows conventions for academic writing. | Proposal includes an unacceptable number of grammatical errors. Proposal fails to properly cite sources. Description does not provide a general picture of the proposed activities or uses too much jargon. | The proposal includes some grammatical errors. Writing style is sometimes difficult to read. Description is hard to understand, verbose, or  uses too much jargon. | The proposal includes occasional grammatical errors. Writing style is easy to follow. Description depicts the project well, but uses some jargon or is otherwise hard to understand. | The proposal is free from grammatical errors. Description is clear, concise, and uses appropriate non-technical  descriptions and terms. |  |
| **Student Preparation** | **1=Poor or Absent** | **2=Fair** | **3= Good** | **4= Exceptional** | **Score** |
| 1. Proposal describes the student’s qualifications to carry out the project. | Student does not appear to have the skills or background needed to carry out the project. The proposal does not describe relevant coursework or training. Proposal does not address how student will gain needed skills to complete project. | Student has some of the skills or background needed to carry out the project. Proposal mentions some coursework or training, but the connection to the project is unclear. Proposal gives some information about how student will gain skills needed to complete project. | Student has most of the skills or background needed to carry out the project. Proposal describes relevant coursework or training. Proposal addresses how student will gain needed skills to complete project. | Student is well prepared for the project. Proposal makes a strong case for the student’s preparation through relevant prior experience, coursework, or training. Proposal clearly addresses how student will gain needed skills to complete project. |  |

**Strengths of the Proposal:**

**Areas for Improvement:**