

Evaluation Rubric

	Excellent= 4	Very Good = 3	Acceptable = 2	Improvement Needed = 1	Not included/ignored = 0	Score
Incorporates transdisciplinary concepts	Perspectives from multiple disciplines integrated into a new way of framing central problem, multiple methodologies from different disciplines explained, collaborative across CGU and outside of University, project teams and dissertation committee are multi-disciplinary	Evidence of multiple disciplines in central issue and committee make-up, multiple disciplinary perspectives acknowledged, multiple methodologies across disciplines included	Multiple disciplines represented in committee, methodologies from different disciplines	Methodologies used from different disciplines. Investigation completed without multiple disciplinary perspectives from diverse team.	Unidisciplinary framework, methods, and committee make-up	
Addresses issues of cross-disciplinary relevance and impact	Central issue has high societal relevance and potential impact, relevance to field high, more than one discipline finds it important, project includes application-based approaches as well as theory, articulates possible outcome(s) of research and implications	Articulates relevance to more than one discipline, include perspective of non-academic stakeholders, address societal implications of research	Addresses a major issue to the world or society. Doesn't necessarily articulate the multiple disciplinary involvement, or the POV of stakeholders outside the university	Central questions of research not clearly related to multiple fields, nor is relevance explained	Broader relevance is not explained, even within single disciplinary context	

<p>Demonstrates mastery of different disciplinary theories and concepts</p>	<p>Superior arguments, well defined objectives, critical thinking demonstrated, subject matter expertise addressed with associated literature, multiple masteries of theoretical concepts, well-formed hypotheses and support, clear language and organized writing</p>	<p>Strong arguments, objectives defined, critical thinking demonstrated, subject matter expertise addressed, hypotheses stated with support, writing is generally clear and organized, with a few small errors and logical gaps</p>	<p>Developed arguments, objectives defined, critical thinking demonstrated but inconsistent at times, subject matter expertise addressed, hypotheses stated but may lack appropriate support, writing is generally clear and organized, but errors and logical gaps make it difficult to follow at times</p>	<p>Arguments and objectives underdeveloped and flawed, critical thinking not clearly demonstrated, hypotheses unclear, writing has many errors and logical gaps that make it difficult to follow</p>	<p>Inadequate argumentation, style errors prevent communication of major ideas, mastery in one or more subject areas cannot be determined</p>	
<p>Explains study rationale, methodologies, and feasibility</p>	<p>Logical organization, methodology appropriate for answering question, reasonable to complete given environmental constraints. Proposal addresses alternative explanations and outcomes</p>	<p>Evidence clearly cited for rationale, methods laid out in logical order, feasibility is clear</p>	<p>Design and organization are logical, validity and feasibility might be acknowledged but not fully articulated</p>	<p>Logic not spelled out for research design and validity, assumptions of audience understanding topic required to make sense of approach</p>	<p>Illogical/unfeasible approach without any further explanation</p>	

<p>Presents feasible project timeline and case for how the grant will affect prospects of completion</p>	<p>Clearly planned out with evidence to support, documents appropriate faculty, staff and collaborator support, steps mapped out in detail to stay on target deadline, case made for how fellowship will facilitate dissertation plan success</p>	<p>Evidence of project planning, reasonable, forecasted deadlines and detailed steps listed for project completion that are feasible at face value</p>	<p>Evidence of project planning with reasonable deadlines with 'best case scenario' optimism.</p>	<p>Lacking evidence of project planning. Does not explain inconsistencies in academic progress and ambitious nature of project if they exist.</p>	<p>No timeline included, or timeline lacks necessary details for tracking completion. Timeline seems unfeasible.</p>	
<p>Record of academic excellence</p>	<p>4.0 > GPA >3.5, demonstrated publication record, evidence of conference participation, other signs that work will be completed within time frame</p>	<p>GPA >3.5, demonstrated participation in academic community outside of CGU</p>	<p>GPA>3.0. Demonstrated participation in academic activities (conferences, student talks) within CGU</p>	<p>3.0<GPA <3.5, no documentation of intellectual contribution beyond coursework</p>	<p>GPA < 3.0</p>	
<p>Comments</p>					<p>Total</p>	