

Review Guidelines for URA Award

Score each question from 1-5, with 1 being the lowest score and 5 the highest. Then give a total score for each applicant, along with a written comment and recommendation.

Statement of aim(s), purpose, or goals

- 1 Clarity and specificity of statement of aims, purpose, or goals of project/study.
- 2 Originality of the project/study.
- 3 Is the statement convincing in its language and intentions?

Motivation

- 4 Significance of the project and benefits to UMBC and the greater community.
- 5 Student's academic background and prior knowledge of subject.
- 6 Has the student completed any groundwork or preparation for the project/study?

Methods

- 7 Is methodology appropriate to the goals?
- 8 Are appropriate resources available (including time, equipment, and space)?
- 9 Is the approach to the work original and innovative?

Dissemination

- 10 Are there plans to publicly present the results of the project - publication or presentation? Likelihood that the entire project (ie. gathering and evaluating the data/creating the finished artwork) can be completed within the allotted time frame?

Evaluation

- 11 Is there a final product and is it clearly defined?
- 12 Is there a plan to evaluate the final product (e.g., external reviewers)?

Budget

- 13 Is the budget clearly itemized and defined?
- 14 Is the budget appropriate to the project/study?
- 15 Can the project be completed within the budget constraints?

Role of the Faculty Mentor/Advisor

- 16 Will the mentor make resources available to student?
- 17 In the statement of support, is the mentor enthusiastic and is there a plan for interaction?
- 18 Is there a plan for accountability by the mentor?

Other

- 19 Is the applicant able to take a leadership role in the project/study (or is it, for example, part of a mentor's established research project)?
- 20 Overall strength of writing (clarity, length, structure/logic, spelling, grammar, and punctuation)

Based on original rating scale prepared by Professor Tim Topoleski, Mechanical Engineering, and Professor Sam McCready, Theatre

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARD RATING SHEET

Applicant's Name _____ Proposal # (i.e., IB, IVC, etc.) _____

Circle: 1=Worst, 5=Best

STATEMENT OF AIM, PURPOSE, OR GOALS

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Clarity and Specificity | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Originality | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Convincing | 1 2 3 4 5 |

MOTIVATION

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 4. Significance | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Student's Academic Background | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Prior groundwork or preparation | 1 2 3 4 5 |

METHODS

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| 7. Appropriate methodology | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Appropriate resources | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Original and innovative approach | 1 2 3 4 5 |

DISSEMINATION

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|
| 10. Public presentation/timeline | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|

EVALUATION

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 11. Final project clearly defined | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Evaluation Plan for final product | 1 2 3 4 5 |

BUDGET

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| 13. Itemized and defined | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Appropriate budget | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. Completion within budget | 1 2 3 4 5 |

ROLE OF THE FACULTY MENTOR/ADVISOR

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 16. Resources available to student | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17. Enthusiastic, interactive | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18. Accountability Plan | 1 2 3 4 5 |

OTHER

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| 19. Leadership role | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20. Strength of writing | 1 2 3 4 5 |

TOTAL POINTS: _____

Comments for the Committee: