

Dissertation Grant Rating Rubric

Section 1: Qualifying Criteria

Reviewers use the criteria below to rate proposals. Answers of “No” in this section may disqualify the application. Items that are “unclear or missing” must be resolved by AIR staff prior to funding but will not stop an application from being fully reviewed and considered.

Overall, demonstrates a reasonable and defensible research methodology	Yes		No
Uses required dataset(s) or addresses NPEC focus: (check all that apply)	NCES dataset(s) NSF and/or dataset(s) or Addresses the NPEC focus on <i>Beyond Graduation Rates</i>		No: Does not address necessary datasets or focus area
The selected data and variables are appropriate for the proposed research	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Proposes a “doable” project within a one-year timeline	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Proposes an acceptable plan for disseminating results	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
IRB plan is appropriate for the proposed research	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Plan for use of restricted dataset(s) is appropriate	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Biographical sketch displays appropriate level of expertise	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Includes statement of prior, current, and pending funding	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No
Faculty advisor supports the application	Yes	Unclear/Missing	No

Section 2: Rating of the Proposed Research Project

Score

Importance & Timeliness:

Rate the proposed research on its national importance and timeliness. **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

Literature Review:

To what degree does the literature review show a complete understanding of the issue and prior research on this topic? **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

To what degree is the reference list complete and appropriate? **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

Research Method:

To what degree is the proposed research methodology appropriate for this project? **(10 points)**

Poor/Inappropriate	Adequate	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	4	7	10

To what degree is the theoretical grounding for the proposed research appropriate and fully developed? **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

To what degree is the proposed analysis of data appropriate for the proposed research? **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

Deliverables:

Rate the degree to which deliverables are appropriate and will be an important new contribution to knowledge. **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

Budget:

Rate the degree to which the budget is adequate to ensure success without being excessive. **(5 points)**

Low	Marginal	Acceptable	Strong	Exceptionally Strong
1	2	3	4	5

Total Score:

Section 3: Funding Recommendation

Should AIR fund this proposal?

- Fund
- Fund with Minor Revisions
- Do Not Fund

Section 4: Comments

Reviewer Comments: Please provide specific, constructive comments to help the applicant improve the quality of the proposed research. These comments will be shared with the applicant in the notification letter.