

Miller Arts Scholars: Rising Third- and Fourth-year Awards

Advisory Committee Rubric for Award Review

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Needs Work
Quality	Proposal adheres to the application guidelines, the project represents significant progress in the student's ongoing creative growth as an artist/scholar, and the narrative is clear and describes all aspects of the proposed project. (25 points)	Proposal strays from the application guidelines. The project is only partially related to the student's ongoing creative growth as an artist/scholar, or the narrative is unclear at times or fails to describe some aspects of the proposed project. (20 points)	Proposal significantly violates the application guidelines. The project is not related to the student's ongoing creative growth as an artist/scholar, or the narrative is unclear and fails to describe some aspects of the proposed project. (15 points)
Feasibility	The timeline and design of the proposed project effectively use the available resources to significantly further the student's creative scholarship or artistry. The scope of the proposed work is supported by the student's existing scholarship or previous work, rather than an unsupported departure from existing work. (25 points)	The timeline and/or design of the proposed project are overly ambitious or have minor missing components. The scope of the proposed work is related to, but not directly supported by, the student's existing scholarship or previous work. (20 points)	The timeline and/or design of the proposed project are not realistic or have major missing components. The scope of the proposed work is not supported by the student's existing scholarship or previous work. (15 points)
Budget	All costs are accounted for, justified, and detailed in a budget table. The budget details additional funding sought or obtained, and the categories of the budget are complete and fully support the proposal. The student has effectively researched actual costs of the proposed project. (25 points)	Most costs are accounted for, justified, and detailed in a budget table. Minor areas of the project are not supported by the budget. The student has not researched actual costs of the proposed project but has reasonable estimates. (20 points)	Significant costs are unaccounted for or unjustified. Major areas of the project are not supported by the budget. The student has not researched actual costs of the proposed project or has unrealistic estimates. (15 points)
Mentorship	The mentor is an expert in the field of the proposal and has an ongoing appointment at UVA or an appropriate history of ongoing employment, such as a lecturer who has been teaching within a department for years. The proposal and the mentor's letter of support detail a specific plan of mentorship, including a timeline of regular project review by the mentor. (25 points)	The mentor is in the appropriate field and has appropriate appointment, but another faculty member would be an obvious, better fit for the proposed project. The proposal or the mentor's letter of support give a general plan of mentorship with some detail lacking. (20 points)	The mentor is inappropriate to the field of the proposal. The proposal or the mentor's letter of support lack any plan of mentorship. (15 points)