

Magellan Scholar Review Rubric

Student's clarity of explanation						
Criteria	EXEMPLARY	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEEDS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT
Scholarly topic, pursuit, or question points	Strongly articulated topic/question; clearly connects with background and project plan 32	Clear topic/question; may have minor issues with connection between topic, background and/or project plan 28	24	Topic/question good; may have some disconnect between topic, background, and/or project plan 20	16	Topic/question vague or weak and/or little connection between topic, background, and/or project plan 12 8
Project plan or how the question is to be answered points	Strong evidence of thought and planning (details clearly articulated) 80	Good evidence of thought and planning (e.g., some details missing or confusing) 70	60	Some evidence of thought and planning (e.g., few details or plan not presented logically) OR multiple minor flaws in plan 50	40	Little evidence of thought or planning (e.g., little to no details; confusing) OR significant flaws in plan 30 20
Significance or impact of project (can be limited to impact on student) points	Clearly articulated, strong statement of why this project is important 32	Good effort to describe project's importance; could be stated more clearly 28	24	Some effort to describe project's importance; explanation may be difficult to understand 20	16	Little to no reference to project importance or not understandable 12 8
Writing style points	Clear, persuasive, and logical; well organized with little to no errors 32	Good overall; minor issues with clarity, logic, or level of detail; few errors 28	24	Adequate writing; isolated areas lacking clarity/ details and/or too many errors 20	16	Poorly written overall; confusing, lacking necessary details; excessive or significant errors 12 8
Timeline points	Clear and detailed plan for completing work within project timeframe 24	Some details provided; additional specificity would be helpful 21	18	Vague references to project timing 15	12	Little to no details provided 9 6
						No impact statement 0
						No timeline provided 0

Mentor-Student collaboration (please consider both the form and information within the proposal itself)						
Criteria	EXEMPLARY	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEEDS SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT
Student readiness for project points	Strong evidence student is prepared for project (through previous experience, etc) 16	Good evidence of readiness AND/OR good plan/support for gaining needed skills 14	12	Little evidence of readiness AND/OR weak plan/support for gaining needed skills 10	8	Student does not seem ready for project and no structure/plan of support 6 4
Student gain (taking into account student's level of experience with project) points	Strong and clearly defined description of student gains 28	Good description of gains; may need additional project specific details 24.5	21	Generalized description and/or few project specific student gains 17.5	14	Vague description with no project specific gains 10.5 7
Outcomes, deliverables, and dissemination points	Clear and specific plan/outline 16	Good description; may need additional project specific details 14	12	Generalized description and/or few project specific details 10	8	Vague plans and/or outline 6 4
Mentoring plan (incl interaction, skill development, etc) points	Strong evidence of mentoring relationship; includes details and plans 60	Good evidence of mentoring relationship; some details provided 52.5	45	Some evidence of mentoring relationship; details vague 37.5	30	Little evidence of mentoring relationship; little to no details 22.5 15

Overall Merit									
points	Exceptional: no concerns with overall topic, project plan, or design	Very Good; strong with a few minor weaknesses		Good; with moderate weaknesses		Fair; at least one major weakness		Poor; numerous major weaknesses	
	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0