Augusta University CURS Grant Rubric

Proposal Section	SCORE					
	Absent	Poor	Needs	Average	Good	Excellent
	0	1	Improvement	3	4	5
			2			
Clarity of Project Description for an interdisciplinary audience	Description of research is missing or lacks sufficient content to evaluate.	Research description is vague or overly technical, making it difficult for an interdisciplinary audience to understand the focus or purpose.	Research description is present and partially understandable, but lacks clarity, organization, or necessary background for an interdisciplinary audience.	Research is generally understandable to an interdisciplinary audience. Needs more detail, context, or clearer explanation to fully convey the project's purpose and relevance.	Research is clearly described in accessible language. The purpose, methods, and significance are well conveyed to a nonspecialist audience.	Research is communicated with outstanding clarity and precision. It is highly accessible to an interdisciplinary audience.
Significance of the contribution of the scholarship to the discipline, field, student education, university research goals	Proposal lacks any explanation of how the project contributes to research or scholarship. Academic justification for work is missing or entirely unrelated to the scholarly goals of the project.	Contribution to the field is negligible or unclear. Proposal acknowledges scholarly contribution, but the impact is questionable or poorly justified.	Proposal acknowledges scholarly contribution, but the impact is limited. An attempt is made to justify the work academically (e.g., data collection or presentation), but rationale is incomplete or unclear.	Clear relevance to the discipline or field. Travel or project work is reasonably justified. Contribution to the field is stated, but impact is modest or underdeveloped.	Project makes a meaningful contribution to the field and aligns with the university's research mission. Justification for work or travel is well-reasoned and clearly supports high-level scholarly dissemination.	Project demonstrates exceptional value to the discipline and strongly supports educational and research goals of the institution. Travel or work is essential and clearly supports high-level scholarly dissemination.

Augusta University CURS Grant Rubric

What I have learned from this experience STUDENT TRAVEL ONLY	Proposal is missing discussion of hard or soft skills or knowledge gained via research. Extremely poor reflection or writing.	How research has helped student to gain hard or soft skills or knowledge is brief, incomplete, or poorly thought out. Poor writing.	How research has helped student to gain hard or soft skills or knowledge is made clear. Answer lacks some detail or examples.	How research has helped student to gain hard or soft skills or knowledge is very clearly described and includes satisfactory detail or examples.	Hard and /or soft skills or knowledge gained through research is very clearly articulated with detail and examples. Professionally written answer.	Excellent description of what the student has gained through the research experience in content, hard and soft skills. Strong, professionally written answer.
Mentoring Philosophy FACULTY ONLY	Mentoring philosophy is absent. No description of mentor responsibilities or student involvement is provided.	Mentor roles are described briefly or vaguely. Lacks clear strategies for student learning or development. No evidence of thoughtful engagement in the mentoring process.	Student engagement in scholarly or discovery processes is stated. Mentor responsibilities are identified, but depth of mentorship and opportunities for student growth are limited or unclear.	Students are clearly integrated into scholarly work. Mentor responsibilities are thoughtful and support both intellectual and professional growth. Demonstrates an intentional mentoring approach.	Clear and compelling approach that fosters student learning, independence, and professional development. Designed for mutual benefit between mentor and student, with reflective and purposeful roles.	Exceptional depth and intentionality. Strong evidence of mutual benefit and student transformation. Includes vertical or multi-level mentoring. Promotes leadership, collaboration, and long-term growth.
Budget & Budget Justification	Budget and justification are entirely missing. No information is available for review.	Budget is incomplete, poorly organized, or shows inefficient or unjustified use of funds. Major categories are missing or unsupported.	Budget justification is attempted but lacks sufficient detail or rationale. Some requests may appear unreasonable or poorly aligned with project goals.	Budget is present and generally reasonable, but may benefit from clearer explanations or additional detail. Justification may be vague in some areas.	Budget is clear, complete, and the requested amount is reasonable for the scope of the project. Demonstrates an effort to use funds efficiently.	Budget is fully itemized, well-justified, and clearly aligned with project needs. Maximizes efficient use of funds with strong rationale for each item. Transparent, strategic use of resources is evident.

Augusta University CURS Grant Rubric

Please rate	Application is	Application is	Application follows	Application is	Application is well-	Application is highly
the Overall Quality	incomplete, or	partially complete	basic guidelines. It	complete,	organized, clearly	polished and clearly
of the application	wholly	and/or contains	attempts to justify	organized, and	written for an	tailored to an
	inappropriate. It	significant errors in	travel or project	mostly written with	interdisciplinary	interdisciplinary
	fails to follow the	grammar, spelling,	relevance but is not	an interdisciplinary	audience and	audience. The
	required format	or formatting. Does	written for an	audience in mind.	complete. Provides	application
	and lacks	not follow the	interdisciplinary	Justification for	a solid justification	demonstrates
	coherence.	requested format.	audience, is	activity support is	for how the activity	strong alignment
		Research is vague,	underdeveloped, or	present but could	supports student	with scholarly goals,
		underdeveloped, or	narrow in scope.	be more clearly or	involvement,	student impact, and
		of questionable		persuasively stated.	and/or aligns with	institutional
		scholarly value.			the university's	mission. Shows
		Shows minimal			academic and	clear purpose,
		benefit to faculty or			research missions.	vision, and
		students.				execution.