

## **Rubric for Assessing LMU Mini-Grant Applications**

### **1. Abstract**

0-2 points: Provides a vague or unclear overview of the project.

3-4 points: Gives a general but not comprehensive summary of the project.

5 points: Clearly and succinctly summarizes the project, presenting key objectives and potential impacts.

### **2. Background & Supporting References**

0-4 points: Provides limited or no context and lacks substantial supporting references.

5-8 points: Provides decent context but may have weak or minimal supporting references.

9-10 points: Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context with strong and relevant supporting references.

### **3. Objectives**

0-2 points: Objectives are unclear or not directly related to identified issues.

3-4 points: Objectives are clear but lack specificity or alignment with issues.

5 points: Objectives are clear, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART).

### **4. Methodology**

0-4 points: Methodology lacks clarity, detail, or feasibility.

5-8 points: Methodology is clear but may lack detail or thorough justification for chosen methods.

9-10 points: Methodology is clear, detailed, well-justified, and logically planned.

### **5. Timeline**

0-2 points: Timeline is unrealistic or not provided.

3-4 points: Timeline is somewhat realistic but lacks detail.

5 points: Timeline is detailed, realistic, and aligns with project methodology and objectives.

### **6. Intellectual Merit**

0-4 points: Provides minimal insight into the project's intellectual merit or contribution to the field.

5-8 points: Articulates some level of intellectual merit but may lack depth or specificity.

9-10 points: Clearly and convincingly demonstrates substantial intellectual merit and potential contribution to the field.

## **7. Potential Broader Impacts**

0-4 points: Little to no discussion of broader impacts or societal relevance.

5-8 points: Some discussion of broader impacts but may lack depth or thorough consideration.

9-10 points: Comprehensive, detailed discussion on substantial broader impacts and societal relevance.

## **8. Dissemination of Results**

0-2 points: No clear plan for dissemination or focused solely on academic publication.

3-4 points: Basic dissemination plan but may lack varied strategies or focus on diverse audiences.

5 points: Robust, detailed dissemination plan that targets multiple audiences and ensures wide reach.

## **9. Potential for External Funding Opportunities**

0 points: Does not discuss or vaguely discusses potential for external funding without identifying specific sources or providing justification.

1-3 points: Identifies potential funding sources but provides limited justification for why the project might be attractive for further funding.

4-5 points: Clearly identifies specific potential funding sources and provides robust justification of the project's attractiveness for further funding, explaining how the project might meet the interests and requirements of these sources.

## **10. Biosketch**

0-2 points: Provides a biosketch that lacks detail, relevant qualifications, or fails to highlight experience pertinent to the proposed project.

3-4 points: Includes a biosketch with clear qualifications and experience but may lack specific details or direct relevance to the project objectives.

5 points: Presents a comprehensive biosketch that effectively highlights relevant qualifications, expertise, and experience directly aligned with the proposed project.

## **Score Interpretation**

46-50 points: Exceptional – Exceeds expectations in all areas, demonstrating comprehensive planning, exceptional alignment with objectives, and high potential for impactful outcomes.

41-45 points: Strong – Meets or exceeds expectations in most areas, showcasing solid planning, clear alignment with objectives, and notable potential for positive outcomes.

36-40 points: Satisfactory – Meets expectations in several areas but may lack depth, thoroughness in planning, or clear articulation of certain objectives and impacts.

31-35 points: Fair – Partially meets expectations with noticeable shortcomings in depth and thoroughness of planning and articulation of objectives and impacts.

0-30 points: Insufficient – Does not meet expectations in most areas, demonstrating significant gaps in planning and minimal potential for achieving outlined objectives and impacts.

### **Overview of Point Allocation**

1. Abstract: 0-5 points
2. Background & Supporting References: 0-10 points
3. Objectives: 0-5 points
4. Methodology: 0-10 points
5. Timeline: 0-5 points
6. Intellectual Merit: 0-10 points
7. Potential Broader Impacts: 0-10 points
8. Dissemination of Results: 0-5 points
9. Potential for External Funding Opportunities: 0-5 points
10. Biosketch: 0-5 points