

Undergraduate Research, Creativity and Innovation – Travel Grant Scoring Rubric

First Tier Criteria	2.0 points	1.5 points	1.0 points	0.5 points	0 points	Score
Role of Student	All aspects of the project are primarily performed by the undergraduate, including: 1) project design 2) creative/research activity 3) presentation preparation 4) presentation at the event	Three out of four are primarily performed by the undergraduate.	Two out of four are primarily performed by the undergraduate.	One out of four are primarily performed by the undergraduate.	No aspects of the project are primarily performed by the undergraduate. The undergraduate serves in a minor technical role.	
Abstract Quality	Abstract or description is well-written, void of mistakes, and makes purpose, methods/approach, conclusions, and relevance clear.	Abstract or description is mostly well written, leaving only minimal lack of clarity in the purpose, methods/approach, conclusions, and relevance.	Abstract or description is mostly well written, but leaves out one of the following: 1) introduction/purpose 2) methods/approach 3) conclusions/relevance	Abstract or description is poorly written, leaving multiple questions about the purpose, methods/approach, and conclusions/relevance of the project.	Poor writing quality and clarity make it difficult to judge the abstract or description at all.	
Event Scope	A majority of attendees are traveling internationally.	A majority of attendees are traveling nationally.	A majority of attendees are traveling within a less than ten state region.	A majority of attendees are traveling within Texas.	A majority of attendees are not traveling.	
Second Tier Criteria	1.0 points	0.75 points	0.5 points	0.25 points	0 points	Score
Impact/Innovation	The project is innovative and original with relevance to the field. The application clearly <u>explains</u> and demonstrates with <u>language appropriate for a general audience</u> the relevance and the innovative and/or original aspects of the work.	The project is original* with clear relevance to the field. *Reviews and performances of existing compositions can be regarded as substantially original when the <u>new interpretations</u> are clearly stated.	Originality is clear, but relevance is less clear. For example, the project involves basic data collection or new composition but with vague/questionable relevance to the field.	Originality is questionable or implied but vague. For example, the project appears to be a review of previous work or a performance of an existing composition without new interpretations.	Originality is clearly lacking. The project is merely a summary of previous work and/or involves plagiarism.	
Presentation Type	Oral presentation at a conference. OR Juried art show or juried performance which includes a live oral presentation about the piece.	Poster ONLY conference. OR Juried art show or juried performance which includes a non-synchronous written/recorded presentation about the piece.	Poster presentation at a conference that has both oral and poster presentations. OR Non-juried Art Show or Non-juried Performance.		Conference/event attendee is not a presenter.	
Event Demographics	Mostly professionals and graduate students; few undergraduate students.	Mostly graduate students; few professionals and undergraduate students.	Mostly undergraduate students; few professionals and graduate students.	Only undergraduate students.	Nonacademic event.	
Highest Classified Undergraduate Contributor	Senior	Junior	Sophomore	Freshman	Graduate (Undergraduate at beginning of project)	