PRG Detailed Scoring Rubric

This rubric expands the PRG Scoring Rubric to include detailed descriptors for each scoring category. Each criterion is rated on a scale from Excellent to Proficient to Needs Improvement, with separate scoring ranges for Track 1 (Research Development) and Track 2 (Research Scholar) where applicable.

STANDARD CRITERIA

Background and Significance

Track 1: 15 points | Track 2: 15 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (13–15 pts)	Provides a compelling, well-organized background grounded in relevant literature that describes why the project is timely, necessary or innovative. Demonstrates scholarly merit, innovation, and feasibility. Articulates potential impacts.
Proficient (8–12 pts)	Provides some description of project importance or innovation. Literature review is adequate with some relevance but lacks synthesis or depth. Significance is present but not strongly justified.
Needs Improvement (1–7 pts)	Limited or outdated review with unclear connection to proposed study. Scholarly merit, and/or potential impact not well demonstrated.

Objectives

Track 1: 10 points | Track 2: 10 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (9–10 pts)	Objectives/aims are clear, specific, and address defined research gaps logically derived from literature or preliminary work, if applicable. Aims are distinct, logically sequenced, and aligned to the research strategy.
Proficient (6–8 pts)	Objectives/aims are generally clear but somewhat broad or not directly tied to prior research. Aims are mostly distinct, and logically ordered, and aligned to the research strategy.

Needs Improvement (1–5 pts)	Objectives/aims are vague, poorly articulated, missing, or not logically aligned with the research problem or strategy.

Plan of Work

Track 1: 25 points | Track 2: 35 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (22–25 / 31–35 pts)	Plan is comprehensive, feasible, and well-organized with timelines, milestones, and implementation strategies clearly defined. Project phases or components are well-integrated and easy to follow. Work environment is thoroughly described including space, facilities and resources that support successful completion.
Proficient (15–21 / 20–30 pts)	Plan is logical and mostly clear but may lack detailed milestones or specific implementation details. Environment is described with adequate detail; resources are generally appropriate but may lack specificity.
Needs Improvement (1–14 / 1–19 pts)	Plan is vague, unrealistic, disorganized or missing clear timelines and strategies. Environment and resources are minimally described or unclear or not well-aligned to project needs.

Roles

Track 1: 10 points | Track 2: 10 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (9–10 pts)	Roles and qualifications of PI, faculty collaborators, and students (if applicable)are clearly defined, appropriate, and demonstrate strong alignment with project needs.
Proficient (6–8 pts)	Roles and qualifications are described but may lack some clarity or alignment with specific project components.
Needs Improvement (1–5 pts)	Roles are vague or missing, with unclear responsibilities or qualifications or misalignment to project goals and activities.

Methodology and Design (Track 1 only)

Track 1: 25 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (22–25 pts)	Design is valid, well-described and aligned with objectives. Methods and analyses are detailed, justified, and scientifically appropriate. Study population or sampling strategy is described and relevant. Data collection techniques and statistical analyses are clearly explained. Methods demonstrate high feasibility and scientific rigor with likelihood of producing valid and reliabile results. Ethical considerations addressed.
Proficient (15–21 pts)	Design is generally valid and aligned to research goals, but may be missing some details. Tools, techniques, and analyses are described but may lack full justification or detail. Methods are generally feasible and rigorous with minor concerns about execution. Ethical considerations briefly noted.
Needs Improvement (1–14 pts)	Design is vague, unclear or inappropriate. Methods and analyses are not adequately described or justified and raise concerns about feasibility or risk of invalid or unreliable results.

External Funding Plan (Track 1 only)

Track 1: 10 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (9–10 pts)	Detailed, actionable strategies for pursuing future funding that includes specific agencies or opportunities, and proposal development timelines.
Proficient (6–8 pts)	Describes plan to pursue funding pursuit but may lacks specific targets or timelines.
Needs Improvement (1–5 pts)	Minimal or no discussion of future external funding plans.

COMPETITIVE PRIORITY POINTS

Ocean/Health Collaborative Projects

Track 1: 5 points | Track 2: 4 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (5/4 pts)	Demonstrates exceptional collaboration, with clear identification of partners,

	defined contributions, and complete current letters (external partners) or Dean's Commitment Forms (internal partners) consistent with roles, duration, and responsibilities outlined in the narrative. Description clearly describes integration with Ocean/Health research domains.
Proficient (3–4/2–3 pts)	Collaboration involving Ocean or Health domains is moderately described in the narrative with letters/Dean's Commitment Forms covering most required components. Roles and processes are clear but connection to project outcomes/aims or could be stronger.
Needs Improvement (1–2/1 pt)	Collaboration description is minimal or unclear, missing essential details or letters/Dean's Commitment Forms. The link between collaboration and research goals is weak.

Student Involvement

Track 1: 5 points | Track 2: 4 points

Rating	Description
Excellent (5/4 pts)	Shows significant student participation at author level (poster, paper, or presentation). Roles are clearly defined, promoting mentorship and research development.
Proficient (3–4/2–3 pts)	Students participate but roles lack clarity or depth. Some integration into project activities.
Needs Improvement (1–2/1 pt)	Limited or vague student involvement. Does not demonstrate meaningful engagement or authorship potential.

Budget and Budget Narrative

Track 1: 1 point | Track 2: 1 point

Rating	Description
Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Budget and justification are, reasonable and aligned with project goals and funding requirements.
Needs Improvement (0 pts)	Budget does not comply with project instructions orlacks justification for requested costs.

Dissemination

Track 1: 1 point | Track 2: 1 point

Rating	Description
Meets Expectations (1 pt)	Includes dissemination plan identifying audiences, venues, and timelines for sharing outcomes.
Needs Improvement (0 pts)	Dissemination plan is vague or missing.

Total Possible Points

Track	Total Points
Track 1 – Research Development	107 points
Track 2 – Research Scholar	80 points