

# GSS Research Grant Rubric

## Section 1: Applicant and Project Information (3 points possible)

	<i>3 points</i>	<i>1-2 points</i>	<i>0 points</i>
<b><i>Applicant and Project Information (3 points possible)</i></b>	All applicant and project information is clearly and correctly listed, including address, name of project, necessary supporting documents (files are visible and not corrupted). Research dates are correct and fall within the dates of the current granting cycle.	Most applicant and project information is present and accurate, with only minor errors or omissions. All necessary documents are uploaded, visible, and not corrupted.	Significant applicant or project information is missing or incorrect. Necessary documents are missing, corrupted, or unreadable. Research dates fall outside of the current grant cycle.

## Section 2: Research Information (10 points possible)

	<i>5-8 points</i>	<i>2-4 points</i>	<i>0-1 points</i>
<b><i>Content and Clarity (8 points possible)</i></b>	Research topic/title is included. Description is clear and informative. Description provides helpful contextual information to guide the grader and is well organized.	Research topic/title is not included or is unclear. Overall, the description is clear and informative but lacks some important details or context to guide the grader. Description is well organized.	Research topic/title is not included or is unclear. Description is lacking in detail overall and is unclear, uninformative, or disorganized.
<b><i>Jargon (2 points possible)</i></b>	<i>2 points</i> Applicant does an excellent job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Content is clearly and easily followed. Jargon is	<i>1 point</i> Applicant does a good job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Content can mostly be followed. Contains some	<i>0 points</i> Heavy use of jargon. Applicant does a poor job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Grader cannot

	absent or, when used, is adequately explained. Use of jargon is clearly justified. Jargon is justified if it does not detract from a non-expert grader's general understanding of the project and no alternative words are appropriate in context.	jargon that detracts from the clarity of the content.	clearly or easily follow this content.
<b>Section 3: Statement of Importance and Participation (42 points possible)</b>			
	<i>26-37 points</i>	<i>11-25 points</i>	<i>0-10 points</i>
<b>Statement</b> <i>(37 points possible)</i>	Explanation is exceptionally clear and accessible to a non-expert audience. Jargon is minimal or well-defined. Grader is able to read the application without having to Google any terms or language.	Explanation is generally clear but contains some jargon that may hinder understanding for a non-expert audience. Grader is able to read and understand the application but may have had to Google some specific terminology.	Explanation is heavily reliant on jargon and is difficult for a non-expert audience to understand. Even after Googling relevant terminology, the Grader is still confused by the language of the application.
	<i>5 points</i>	<i>2-4 points</i>	<i>0-1 points</i>
<b>Jargon</b> <i>(5 points possible)</i>	Applicant does an excellent job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Content is clearly and easily followed. Jargon is absent or, when used, is adequately explained. Use of	Applicant does a good job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Content can mostly be followed. Contains some jargon that detracts from the clarity of the content.	Heavy use of jargon. Applicant does a poor job of describing this section in accessible/laymen's terms. Grader cannot clearly or easily follow this content.

	jargon is clearly justified. Jargon is justified if it does not detract from a non-expert grader's general understanding of the project and no alternative words are appropriate in context.		
<b>Section 4: Budget and Travel (30 points possible)</b>			
	<i>8-10 points</i>	<i>4-7 points</i>	<i>0-3 points</i>
<b>Budget (10 points possible)</b>	<p>Line-item descriptions are clear and match the budget justification and/or expense receipts. All items in this section are clear and correctly filled out. IF APPLICABLE: Travel details are clear and match the budget justification and/or expense receipts. Per diem is accurate to the specific location of the applicant's stay. ATTACHMENTS: Provide excellent evidence of participation and/or needed expenses. Files are readable and uncorrupted.</p>	<p>Line-item descriptions are mostly clear and somewhat match the budget justification and/or expense receipts. Most, but not all, items in this section are clear or correctly filled out. IF APPLICABLE: Travel details are clear and match budget justification and/or expense receipts. Per diem is accurate to the specific location of the applicant's stay. ATTACHMENTS: Provide sufficient evidence of participation and/or needed expenses but are missing some minor details. Files are readable and uncorrupted.</p>	<p>This section is unclear. Line-item descriptions are confusing or do not match the budget justification and/or expense receipts. Much of this section is poorly filled out or lacks overall clarity. IF APPLICABLE: Travel details are missing, unclear, or inaccurate. Per diem is far beyond the expected amount for the specific location. ATTACHMENTS: Provide insufficient evidence of participation and/or needed expenses. Justification is missing all or major details. Files are unreadable or corrupted.</p>

<b>Justification</b> (20 points possible)	15-20 points	6-14 points	0-5 points
	Justification of expenses is excellent. Justification is clearly written and comprehensive. It fully each line-item and demonstrates an effort to reduce costs.	Justification is good for some line-items but is missing detail for some line-items. It is clearly written but may not fully address key funding requests or may not demonstrate efforts to reduce cost.	Justification is lacking and does not adequately address the requested line-items. It is not clearly written or comprehensive and does not demonstrate efforts to reduce cost.
<b>Section 5: Academic Sponsor Recommendation (15 points possible)</b>			
<b>Contribution to Field and Professional Development</b> (5 points possible)	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 points
	Recommendation clearly articulates the contribution that the applicant's research will make to their field. It also clearly articulates how this research will contribute to the student's professional development.	Recommendation mentions the contribution to the field and to the student's professional development but lacks detail or specific examples.	Recommendation is vague and does not adequately address the contribution to the field or to the student's professional development.
<b>Endorsement</b> (5 points possible)	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 points
	Sponsor strongly endorses the applicant and clearly conveys the importance of their participation. The sponsor's enthusiasm and support are evident.	Sponsor endorses the applicant, but the endorsement may be somewhat generic or lack specific details about the importance of their participation.	Sponsor's endorsement is vague or not overtly positive. The endorsement does not address the importance of the applicant's participation.
<b>Quality and Insight</b> (5 points possible)	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 points

	Recommendation provides meaningful insight into the applicant's abilities and potential. Recommendation adds significant value to the application.	Recommendation provides some insight into the applicant's abilities and potential but may lack depth or specific examples.	Recommendation does not add meaningfully to the application and does not offer a clear assessment of the applicant's potential or abilities.
<b>Total Points Possible: 100</b>			

Notes:

- Research activity dates must fall within the current granting cycle (Fall: July 1-December 31, Spring: January 1-June 30). Applications that fall outside of the current granting cycle are ineligible for funding and will be disqualified. Applications that do not list dates for the conference/activity will also be disqualified as ineligible for funding.
- Funds cannot be used to pay student salaries or wages (of the applicant or any other student). If student salaries or wages are included in the budget, the application is ineligible for funding and will be disqualified. Funds can be used to purchase gift cards or other items to incentivize participation in some studies.
- Questions about GSS grant applications, rubrics, and eligibility should be directed to the Ways and Means Committee ([gsswam@ou.edu](mailto:gsswam@ou.edu)).