



THE UNIVERSITY OF
TOLEDO
1872

Office of Undergraduate Research
Sullivan Hall SL2140, M/5504
2801 W. Bancroft St.
Toledo, OH 43606-3390
Phone: 419.530.2983
Fax: 419.530.6032
undergradresearch@utoledo.edu
www.utoledo.edu
www.utoledo.edu/honors/undergradresearch

To all,

Thanks for serving on the review panel for the First Year Summer Research Experience (FYSRE) and the Undergraduate Summer Research and Creative Activity Program (USRCAP). These programs are made possible through your efforts!

Please rate the enclosed proposals on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being outstanding. The criteria to use in your review include:

- **Intellectual merit**
- **Description**
- **Value to student**
- **Faculty support letter**

The scoring rubric is listed on the following page. The spreadsheet will automatically calculate an average score for each proposal. However, many proposals will be statistically equal. To help identify exceptional proposals, after reviewing all proposals overall rate them in one of the following categories:

- 5 Highest priority for funding. (Choose at most 6-FYSRE, 6-USRCAP in this category)
- 4 First level Alternates (next highest level for funding. (Choose at most 6-FYSRE, 8-USRCAP in this category)
- 3 Second level Alternates (No limit on the number in this category)
- 2 Third level Alternates (No limit on the number in this category)
- 1 Lowest level (lowest priority for funding. No limit on the number in this category)

FYSRE and USRCAP proposals should be judged separately, with separate limits on the numbers of 4's and 5's. For the highest priority funding category, I recommend the subject areas chosen for this ranking reflect the fact that UT is a comprehensive university.

In order for the proposal process as we have implemented to be of pedagogical value, please provide comments on each proposal that can be relayed to the student and their mentor.

Some of the faculty mentors have pledged funds to help support students in the cases where more than one student has requested to work with that faculty member. We will discuss these cases during our meeting to decide the awardees. If there are missing parts, please make your judgment on the material that was submitted. We will be making every effort to contact the student and/or faculty mentor to obtain the missing parts. Since we had to put together hundreds of files the students submitted, the fault may lie with us and when we receive and/or discover missing parts, we will be sending them to you electronically.

I would like to set up a meeting to make the selections the last week in March. Please call (x6030) or email (undergradresearch@utoledo.edu) to set up the meeting time.

Please rate the enclosed proposals on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being outstanding. The criteria to use in your review are listed on the following page.

Please keep these proposals confidential.

Thanks,
Tom Kvale
Director, Office of Undergraduate Research

Please note that the word “*research*” in the scoring rubric below is meant to also include “*creative activity*”. Also, the term “*refereed*” also includes “*juried*” or “*critically-reviewed*”.

Intellectual merit (including completion within the proposed time frame)*

- 5 Has potential to make a substantial contribution to the field (e.g., a refereed publication or presentation/poster at a professional conference/event).
- 4 Has potential to make a contribution to the field, but possibly not publication/presentation quality without additional work.
- 3 Has potential to make a limited contribution to the field.
- 2 Has little potential to make a tangible contribution to the field or contains errors.
- 1 Has very little/no potential to make any contribution to the field or contains serious errors.

* Project should be completed (or substantial progress made) in the ten weeks during the summer or summer plus Fall semester. Some projects will be for shorter periods for reduced stipend amounts, so the project should be judged based on the proposed time frame. The overall Timeline section of the proposal is important.

Note: Proposals that give the impression that they were written by their faculty mentor or heavily copied from existing theses or publications, without much effort by the submitter, will be rated LOW.

Articulation/Description of the project

- 5 Project is easily understood to persons both within and outside of the field of research.
- 4 Project is understood to persons both within and outside of the field of research with some effort.
- 3 Project is written for persons within the field of research but difficult for persons outside the field of research to comprehend.
- 2 Project is difficult to understand for persons both inside and outside the field of research.
- 1 Project is nebulous and/or difficult to understand for persons both inside and outside the field of research. Outcomes are not described, or offers little evidence that substantial progress can be accomplished in the time proposed.

Value of the project to student’s academic and professional development**

- 5 Project fits nicely in the student’s career aspirations and will greatly help their academic program.
- 4 Project fits in the student’s career aspirations and will help their academic program.
- 3 Project is of some value to the student’s academic program.
- 2 Project is of marginal value to the student’s academic program.
- 1 The student’s Academic Statement is missing or the academic value of the project is not well-described.

** The Value to Student is *more than just* students wanting to avail themselves of this opportunity simply to ‘be accepted in medical/graduate school’. Certainly this could be part of the value -- just not the *only* reason.

Faculty support letter***

- 5 Faculty support letter describes the highest level of confidence in the student and her/his ability to perform the project in the proposed time frame.
- 4 Faculty support letter describes confidence in the student and her/his ability to perform the project.
- 3 Faculty support letter is neutral about the student’s ability to perform the project.
- 2 Faculty support letter is slightly negative about the student’s ability to perform the project.
- 1 Faculty support letter expresses grave concerns about the student’s ability to perform the project.

*** The faculty letter should describe how this project could advance general understanding in the field of research in addition to the faculty mentor’s assessment of the student’s abilities in regards to the proposed project. The reviewers should NOT give a numerical score if the Faculty support letter is missing. We will contact the faculty to obtain their statement about this particular research project.