

---

<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Research Award Criteria</b>
------------------	--------------------------------

---

Procedure Number:	303.30
Date Adopted:	2/14/06
Last Revision:	2/14/06
Approved by:	Graduate Council

---

If funds are available, a call will go out for proposals in October. The proposals should have advisor support/signature, title, and intent of thesis or dissertation, and how the money will be used.

### Research Award criteria

1. Double-spaced prospectus describing the proposed research project totaling no more than 1000 words including the following:
  - a. Title of study
  - b. Purpose: hypothesis, thesis, and/or research question(s)
  - c. Significance: why is the project worth doing and what contribution will it make
  - d. Methodology to be used
  - e. Feasibility: can project be completed with available resources or is additional subsidy needed
  - f. Name of the Chair of your master's or doctor's dissertation/thesis committee
  - g. Projected date of study
2. One-page itemized budget and a narrative that includes:
  - a. A list of any funding you have or may have available specifically for this research project
  - b. Information about level of progress on your project, such as if it has been approved by your committee at this point in time
  - c. Signature of your supervising faculty member in support of your study/funding and verifying the information provided in the first two bullets in this section
3. One-page letter of support from your dissertation/thesis Chair or another faculty member associated with your study that is able to attest to the quality of your study.

[Any materials received in excess of the page limits given will not be reviewed].

The Graduate Council will review applications and announce the awardees early in December. Applications will be evaluated on the basis of adherence to the guidelines, quality of study, and with consideration given to budget needs.

Graduate Council will rank each application based upon the following 5-pt rubric:

- 5 – excellent: purpose, significance, methodology, and feasibility clearly articulated.
- 4 – good: quality and clarity of proposal somewhat less rigorous
- 3 – adequate: satisfactory articulation of project but qualitatively inferior
- 2 – inadequate: deficient in one or more of the above stated criteria
- 1 – unacceptable – lacking documentation and/or articulation of the above

