

NAU Scholarly and Creative Activity (SCA) Awards Rubric (page 1)

Proposal Element	Missing or Unacceptable (0 – 1 pt)	Developing (2 pts)	Accomplished (3 pts)	Exemplary (4 pts)
Abstract	Abstract was omitted or inappropriate given the goals, context, and methods of the proposed project/creative activity.	Abstract lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the goals, context, and methods of the proposed project/creative activity.	Abstract is relevant, offering an appropriate summary of the goals, context, and methods of the proposed project/creative activity.	Abstract is informative, succinct, and offers a sufficiently specific summary of the goals, context, and methods of the proposed project/creative activity.
Introduction/ Background: Value and significance of the scholarly project or creative activity	Statement of value and significance was omitted or is inappropriate.	Although the value and significance are stated, the statement is too broad or fails to establish the project/activity's importance.	Statement of value and significance is relevant and clear.	Statement of value and significance is specific and significant.
Introduction/ Background: originality of the project and how it will bring new creative ideas or knowledge to the field	Statement of the innovative nature or originality of the scholarly project or creative activity is missing or inappropriate; connections to literature and/or previous work are missing.	Description of the innovative nature or originality of the scholarly project or creative activity is present but under-developed or weakly compelling; connections to the literature and/or previous work are unclear, debatable, irrelevant or insignificant.	Description of the innovative nature or originality of the scholarly project or creative activity is present and adequate; connections are established with the literature and/or previous work.	Description of innovative nature or originality of the scholarly project or creative activity is clear, well-articulated, and likely to contribute to an advancement in the discipline; connections to the literature and/or previous work are well articulated and clearly establish relevance to the discipline.
Project Description: artistic activities or scholarly goals	Artistic goals or scholarly questions, assumptions and limitations were omitted or inappropriate.	Artistic goals or scholarly questions, assumptions and limitations are poorly formed, ambiguous, or not logically connected to the project.	Artistic goals or scholarly questions, assumptions and limitations are stated and connected to both the discipline and the project.	Artistic goals or scholarly questions, assumptions and limitations are clear, reasonable, and succinct.
Methods: the methods and/or modes of inquiry that will be used	The methods or modes of inquiry for carrying out the project/activity are inappropriate or have not been clearly identified/described.	The methods or modes of inquiry for carrying out the project/activity are confusing or incomplete.	The methods or modes of inquiry for carrying out the project/activity have been identified and are described in sufficient detail.	The methods or modes of inquiry for carrying out the project/activity are mutually supportive, coherent and applicable.

NAU Scholarly and Creative Activity (SCA) Awards Rubric (page 2)

Proposal Element	Missing or Unacceptable (0 – 1 pt)	Developing (2 pts)	Accomplished (3 pts)	Exemplary (4 pts)
Workplan and Timeline	The plan and timeline for carrying out the proposed project are inappropriate or has not been clearly identified or described; applicant has not demonstrated access to all resources needed to complete the project.	The plan and timeline are confusing or incomplete given the artistic or scholarly goal; materials and resources have not been identified or access sufficiently demonstrated.	The plan and timeline for carrying out the proposed project have been outlined and described in sufficiently detailed terms; applicant has demonstrated access to needed resources.	The plan and timeline for carrying out the proposed project are clearly articulated; applicant has access to all required resources.
Competencies	Applicant has not demonstrated that s/he is qualified to carry out the project/creative activity.	Applicant seems to lack the qualifications to carry out some of the work; applicant also lacks suitable collaborators or support staff.	Applicant seems qualified to carry out the work; collaborators and/or support staff are adequate.	Applicant is well-qualified to carry out the work; collaborators and support staff are well justified, highly qualified, and accessible.
Final Product and Dissemination	Final product is not appropriate, unlikely to be realized or not described; dissemination plan is weak or missing.	Final product is insufficiently described; dissemination plan lacks obvious mechanisms.	Final product is appropriate and adequately described; dissemination plan is adequate.	Final product is appropriate and well-described; dissemination plan is well-articulated, believable, and attainable within the timeline articulated.
Budget Justification	Budget justification is missing and/or doesn't reflect costs described in or implied by the narrative.	Budget justification does not explain the basis for some or all costs; salary request(s) seem(s) excessive for the project and/or level of effort is not adequately justified.	Budget justification is adequate; levels of effort are justified and overall project costs seem appropriate.	Budget justification is comprehensive; costs are appropriate and tie back to the narrative; effort justification is thorough and appropriate.