Review Rubric for Panel Review: STEP Research Awards

Evaluation Criterion	Score Range
Alignment of Project with STEP purpose (25%)	
--The proposal fits perfectly into the program stated goals. Explicit language is used to draw parallels between the proposed project and program goals. --Reviewers have no question that the project is appropriate to the program and that projected outcomes of the proposal will meet the program goals.	Excellent [5]
--The proposal fits well into the program stated goals. Explicit language might be used to draw parallels between the proposed project and program goals. --Reviewers may have only minor questions about whether or not the project is appropriate to the program or if projected outcomes of the proposal will meet goals of the program.	Very Good [4-4.5]
-- The proposal fits into the program stated goals. Reviewers may need to infer some parallels between the proposed project and program goals, but these are not necessarily explicit. --Reviewers may want to see more explicit language demonstrating that the project is appropriate to the program and that projected outcomes of the proposal will meet the program goals.	Good [3-3.5]
--The proposal somewhat fits with the program goals. Reviewers have to work to see some parallels between the proposed project and program goals. -- The proposal contains little explicit language demonstrating that the project is appropriate to the program or that projected outcomes of the proposal will meet the program goals.	Fair [2-2.5]
--The proposal does not fit into the program stated goals. Reviewers do not see parallels between the proposed project and program goals. -- Little to nothing in the proposal demonstrates that the project is appropriate to the program or that projected outcomes of the proposal will meet the goals of the program.	Poor [1-1.5]
--Non/applicable, proposal does not address this criterion at all.	[0]

Evaluation Criterion	Score Range
Research proposal's potential for external funding (25%)	

-- The application shows excellent promise for external funding. --Target external agencies and programs are specifically named as fitting the proposed project. The proposal contains a justification for why the project and external program make a good match. --There are strong indications that a project may be funded by the agency if a proposal is submitted after the Graduate School grant period.	Excellent [5]
--The application shows good promise for external funding. --Target external agencies and programs are specifically named as fitting the proposed project. The proposal contains a justification for why the project and external program make a good match.	Very Good [4-4.5]
--The application may have potential for external funding, and the anticipated outcomes may have an impact on the applicant's field. The argument may need improvement. Reviewers may want to see more explicit arguments for this potential. --Target external agencies and programs are named. The proposal may or may not contain a justification for why the project and external program make a good match. Reviewers may not be certain that this project and the target agency are a good match.	Good [3-3.5]
-- The application only somewhat demonstrates potential for external funding or strong anticipated outcomes that have an impact on the applicant's field. --Target external agencies and programs are not named, or the argument for the match between the project and the agency is weak.	Fair [2-2.5]
-- The application does not demonstrate potential for external funding or anticipated outcomes that have an impact on the applicant's field. --Target external agencies and programs are not named, and/or the argument for the match between the project and the agency is unclear.	Poor [1-1.5]
--Non/applicable, proposal does not address this criterion at all.	[0]

Evaluation Criterion	Score Range
Originality/Creativity and significance of the proposed research or creative activity (20%)	

--The proposal contains an excellent and convincing argument that project will have a strong impact on the discipline. --The project is interesting and compelling to reviewers, framed in terms of the potential impact the project has on the field as well as broader social and intellectual implications for the research. --The proposal is accessible to the educated lay reader, enough so that it is easy to judge the project significance. --The literature review demonstrates work that has been accomplished in this area and how the project will contribute new knowledge. --Projected applications of the research may be mentioned. Reviewers understand how the results of the research will carry on into other outcomes and potential future research directions.	Excellent [5]
-- The proposal makes a convincing argument that it will have an impact on the discipline. -- The project is compelling to reviewers, framed in terms of the potential impact the project has on the field as well as broader social and intellectual implications for the research. -- The proposal is relatively accessible to the educated lay reader, enough so that one can judge the project significance. --A literature review demonstrates work that has been accomplished in this area and how the project will contribute new knowledge. -- Some more explicit details in any of these areas may be needed. Projected applications of the research may or may not be mentioned. Reviewers may or may not understand how the results of the research will carry on into other outcomes and potential future research directions.	Very Good [4-4.5]
--The proposal argues that it will have an impact on the discipline, but reviewers may have to make inferences based on their own background knowledge. -- The project may or may not be compelling to reviewers, and they may need to work to understand the potential impact the project has on the field as well as broader social and intellectual implications for the research. -- The literature review may need improvement to place the project within the existing context and demonstrate a contribution of new knowledge. --More details in any of the above areas may be needed. Projected applications may or may not be mentioned. Reviewers may have to infer how the results of the research will carry on into other outcomes and potential future research directions.	Good [3-3.5]
--It is difficult to judge the project's impact on the discipline. -- The project is not particularly compelling. -- The lit review is weak. -- Reviewers have a hard time understanding the potential future outcomes or may not consider them significant.	Fair [2-2.5]
--The proposal does not address impact on the discipline. -- The project is not compelling. -- The lit review is not present. -- Reviewers do not see significant future outcomes.	Poor [1-1.5]
--Non/applicable, proposal does not address this criterion at all.	[0]

Evaluation Criterion	Score Range
Clarity and appropriateness of the research design and procedure 30%	
-- The research design is clear, logically planned, and enables reviewers to easily picture the procedures. This section is devoid of technical jargon and accessible to the educated lay reader. --The scope of work and project aims are appropriate and feasible for the project funding period. --The research plan uses appropriate techniques for the proposed work and is up-todate with current research. A "Plan B" is in place for riskier techniques. --The method may be innovative and have potential strong impacts on the field and/or other disciplines.	Excellent [5]
--The research design is clear, well planned, and enables reviewers to easily picture the procedures. This section is devoid of technical jargon and accessible to the educated lay reader. --The scope of work and project aims are mostly appropriate and feasible for the project funding period. --The research plan uses appropriate techniques for the proposed work and is up-todate with current research. A "Plan B" is in place for riskier techniques. --The method might have potential impacts on the field and/or other disciplines. -- Reviewers may have some concerns in any of these areas and may request more clarity, but overall, the project can be accomplished as planned.	Very Good [4-4.5]
--The research design may be unclear in places and leave reviewers with questions regarding the project procedure. There may be technical jargon that makes the plan inaccessible to the educated lay reader. Gaps in procedures may exist. --The proposed scope of work and project aims are not necessarily appropriate or feasible for the project funding period. The scope may be too broad or too narrow for the time period. --Research techniques may or may not be up-to-date with current field. Researcher may not be properly prepared for the technique or different techniques are recommended. Researchers may not address a Plan B in case of experiment failure. -- A stronger argument may be needed for the methodological impacts on the applicant's field and/or other disciplines.	Good [3-3.5]
-The research design is unclear in places and leaves reviewers with many questions regarding the project procedure. There may be technical jargon that makes the plan inaccessible to the educated lay reader. Gaps in procedures exist. --The proposed scope of work and aims may not be appropriate or feasible for the project funding period. The scope may be too broad or too narrow for the time period. --Research techniques may not be up-to-date with current research. No Plan B. -- There is little evidence of methodological impacts on the applicant's field.	Fair [2-2.5]
-The research design is unclear and inaccessible to the reviewers. Gaps in procedures may exist. --The proposed scope of work and project aims are not appropriate or feasible for the project funding period. The scope may be too broad or too narrow for the time period. --Research techniques are not up-to-date with current research. No Plan B. -- There is no indication of methodological impacts on the applicant's field.	Poor [1-1.5]

--Non/applicable, proposal does not address this criterion at all.	[0]
Do you recommend for Funding based on these rankings?	
Yes　　　　　　　**No**　　　　　　　　　**Maybe**	