

BSI/CHASE Scholar Evaluation V 2.0

Criteria	Poor	Fair	Average	Very Good	Exceptional	Weighting
Abstract	No abstract is included	Abstract is vague OR is missing two of the following: rationale, primary objectives, key findings	Abstract is inconsistent in focus and clarity OR is missing one of the following: rationale, primary objectives, key findings	Abstract is clear and focused and includes rationale, primary objectives, and key findings written for a specialist audience	Abstract is clear and focused and includes rationale, primary objectives, and key findings written clearly for a general audience	/10
Rationale and Central Objective	No rationale or objective is included	Rationale and/or objective is vague with little or no support from existing literature	Rationale and objective are clear with some support from existing literature	Rationale is clear and focused with extensive support from existing literature. Objective is specific but may lack full connection to rationale.	Rationale is clear, focused, and concise with significant support from existing literature. Objective relates directly to rationale.	/10
Literature Review	No literature review is included	Literature review does not include significant scholarly citations OR lacks relevance to rationale and objectives	Literature review lacks detail AND/OR has inconsistent connection to rationale and objectives	Literature review is generally comprehensive but does not fully connect to rationale and objectives	Literature review is detailed and comprehensive with clear connections to study rationale and objectives	/10
Methodological Process	Methodology is absent OR lacks explicit description	Methodology lacks one of the following elements: design, procedure, OR analysis plan	Methodology includes design, procedure, AND analysis plan BUT is frequently vague	Methodology is detailed BUT requires minor revision in design, sequencing, AND/OR analysis	Methodology is detailed and logically sequenced in its design, procedure, AND analysis plan	/10
Methodological Appropriateness	Methodology is not appropriate to the proposed rationale and objectives	Methodology could be appropriate BUT does not align to the proposed rationale and objectives	Methodology is generally appropriate BUT requires major revision to address proposed rationale and objectives	Methodology is mostly appropriate , BUT requires minor revisions to address proposed rationale and objectives	Methodology is completely appropriate to the rationale and objectives being proposed	/10
Personal Interest	Personal goals are not addressed OR no personal interest statement is included	Personal goals alluded to but not explicitly stated	Personal goals are referenced BUT do not explicitly describe how project meets goals	Personal goals are listed AND generally describes how project meets goals	Personal goals are listed AND clearly reflect how this project meets goals	/5
Feasibility	Timeline AND/OR statement of required resources/ approvals are absent	Timeline AND/OR required resources/approvals lacks realistic execution within the BSI/CHASE timeframe	Timeline AND statement of required resources/approvals are present BUT requires significant revision to allow realistic execution within BSI/CHASE timeframe	Timeline AND statement of required resources/approvals are present BUT requires slight revision to allow realistic execution within BSI/CHASE timeframe	Timeline AND required resources/approvals are clearly and realistically presented within BSI/CHASE timeframe	/5

Writing Quality	Proposal is so poorly written that it prevents effective communication	Proposal is not clear OR lacks logical connections OR includes excessive errors	Proposal is written clearly and logically BUT is written casually OR includes many errors	Proposal is written clearly, logically, and professionally BUT includes minor spelling/ grammatical errors	Proposal is written clearly, logically, and professionally AND is free of spelling/ grammatical errors	/20
Audience • General—Rationale, Objective, Literature Review • Specialist-Methodology	Writing fails to differs between specialist and general audience in indicated sections	Writing rarely distinguishes between needs for specialist and general audience in indicated sections	Writing occasionally meets expectations of specialist AND general audience	Writing mostly addresses expectations of specialist AND general audience	Writing fully addresses expectations of specialist AND general audience	/10
Originality	Proposal lacks original contribution by student OR relies entirely on mentor's work for design and presentation	Proposal shows little original contribution by the student OR relies primarily on mentor's work for design and presentation	Proposal shows some originality BUT relies strongly on mentor's work for design and presentation	Proposal is primarily created by the student BUT includes several elements from the mentor's work for design and presentation	Proposal is unique to the student AND fully represents the originality of the student	/10
Mentor Support	No faculty mentor support	Mentor has reservations for the completion of the project OR presents an inadequate plan for mentoring the student	Mentor tentatively supports the completion of the project OR presents a partial plan for mentoring the student	Mentor supports the completion of the project, with a clear plan for mentoring the student	Mentor strongly supports the completion of the project, with a clear plan for mentoring the student	/5
Future Plans • 2 presentations (including BU URC) 1 publication	Includes no plan for presentation or publication	Lacks realistic AND specific plan for presentation/ publication	Lacks one potential presentation or publication AND plan is not appropriate to the discipline	Lacks one potential presentation or publication OR plan is not fully appropriate to the discipline	Includes 2 potential presentations AND 1 potential publication venue appropriate to the discipline	/5
Exceptionality	Up to 2 points at the discretion of committee member for exceptional proposal					+
					Total	/110

Comments: