

honors Distinction Project Rubric – Roanoke College

Student: _____

Reviewed by: _____

TRAITS	Exceptional, Rating = 4 (except shaded)	Very Good, Rating = 3	Average, Rating = 2	Needs Improvement, Rating = 1	Poor, Rating = 0
Project Goals	Project and student goals are clearly explained. The project has a clear and significant tie to advancing the student's goals.	Project and student goals are clearly explained. The project has a clear, but not necessarily significant, tie to advancing the student's goals.	Project or student goals are not explained as clearly as they could be. Still, it seems likely that the project will help advance the student's goals.	Project or student goals are not explained very clearly. It is difficult to determine whether the project will advance the student's goals.	Project and student goals appear to be poorly matched.
Adequacy and feasibility of design	Processes and procedures are well-stated, manageable, appropriate, and comprehensive.	There is a logical and thoughtful plan for manageable execution of the project.	Processes and procedures for executing the project appear manageable, but there is some uncertainty.	Processes and procedures outlined are unclear, do not follow from project objectives, and/or do not seem entirely manageable.	Processes and procedures are either omitted, only vaguely stated, unmanageable, or are inappropriate for the project proposed.
Likelihood for success	Project has every reasonable expectation of being completed.	High likelihood of success.	Moderate likelihood of success.	Likelihood of success is questionable.	The project as designed has little chance of being successful.
Deliverables	The deliverables of the project are clearly stated and well-justified. (2 points)	The deliverables of the project are clearly stated. (1.5 points)	The deliverables of the project are not clearly stated, but there is sufficient narrative to infer adequate deliverables. (1 point)	The deliverables of the project are not clearly stated. (0.5 points)	The deliverables of the project are quite unclear, do not meet the Honors guidelines, or are nonexistent.
Project Influence	Significant products are described, such as presentations at national conferences, publications in peer-reviewed journals, submission of a grant proposal, projects with clear community influence.	Products of moderate impact are described, such as presentations at regional conferences, publications in non-peer reviewed sources.	The proposed products are of moderate impact, such as presentations at on-campus conferences, publications in non-peer reviewed sources.	The proposed products are not clearly stated.	Proposed products are unclear, do not meet the Honors guidelines, or are nonexistent.
Role, Involvement and Activities of Student and Faculty Mentor	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are carefully presented and explained. It is obvious that the proposed activities are student-focused. Students will not be merely observing or performing mental tasks—they will be actively involved in the process of inquiry, creative endeavor, and/or scientific discovery.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly presented. Roles are appropriate. Undergraduates play a central role in the planned activities though their creative input is limited.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are clearly described but are only generally presented. Undergraduates play a role in the planned activities but are mostly involved in the implementation and/or dissemination of the project and have little or no creative input.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor may be only vaguely presented. The plan for involvement of undergraduates is not clearly articulated and appears to be limited in scope. Students are mostly observers.	Role, involvement, and activities of student and faculty mentor are only vaguely presented. The student's role is merely as a bystander or the role of the faculty mentor is only superficially presented.

Timeline	Timeline is clearly presented and is clearly suitable for and meets all the activities described. (2 points)	Timeline may not be clearly presented but appears to be suitable for all the activities described. (1.5 points)	Timeline meets most of the activities proposed. Timeline may not be clearly presented. (1 point)	Timeline appears to meet less than half of the activities proposed. Not clearly presented. (0.5 points)	Timeline is not suitable for the activities described.
Budget (Appropriateness & Justification)	Budget is comprehensive, clearly explained, and appropriate for the activities proposed. All costs are justified, relevant and appropriately prioritized. Clear thought has been given, where applicable, to alternate funding sources.	Budget is comprehensive, clearly explained, and reasonable. The vast majority of costs are justified, relevant and appropriately prioritized. Some thought has been given, where applicable, to alternate funding sources.	Budget is comprehensive and reasonable but not clearly explained. Most costs are justified, relevant and appropriately prioritized.	Budget is not clearly explained and it is not appropriate for the activities proposed. Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable. Some costs are not justified, relevant, or appropriately prioritized.	Budget is unreasonable in multiple areas. Costs are not justified in the budget narrative. Many costs are not relevant nor necessary to this project.

Adapted from University of Wisconsin, Superior: http://www.uwsuper.edu/ursca/events/upload/SURF_Rubric.pdf and Southwestern University: <http://www.southwestern.edu/live/files/2215-hhmi-summer-research-proposalevaluation>

TOTAL POINTS (from Rubric) = _____

Reviewer Comments

Strengths:

Weaknesses: