BURST Application Rubric

Criteria 1-2 evaluate the faculty mentoring statement. Criterion 3 evaluates the scholar statement of interest.

Score	3: Outstanding	2: Satisfactory	1: Fair
1. Project description, goals, and suitability	Clear project overview with specific, attainable goals for the BURST scholar. Strongly demonstrates project is well-suited for student with little or no research experience.	Good overview with goals, but some aspects lack realism for BURST scholar who has little or no research experience.	Project overview and goals lack specificity and realism for BURST scholar who has little or no research experience.
2A. Mentoring plan details training, professional development, & other logistics	Well-conceived plan in training the scholar with necessary skills to ensure project success. Clearly articulates realistic and effective activities (e.g., types of interactions, meeting frequency and rationale) that align with project goals. Professional development opportunities (e.g., specific conference presentations, publications) are tailored to the scholar.	Training plan lacks some detail. Somewhat realistic and effective activities (e.g., types of interactions, meeting frequency and rationale) that partially align with project goals. Professional development opportunities lack some specificity, only somewhat tailored to the scholar.	Training plan lacks important details. Activities (e.g., types of interactions, meeting frequency and rationale) are unrealistic or ineffective, and there is little alignment with project goals. Professional development opportunities are very generic and vague, not tailored to the scholar.
2B. Mentoring plan is individualized and supportive	Mentoring philosophy clearly tailored to individual scholar, showing intentional conversations about their goals, strengths, and background. Very thoughtful and specific for creating a supportive environment.	Mentoring philosophy partially tailored, showing some conversations to learn about the student. Mentoring plan for a supportive environment lacks some specificity.	Mentoring philosophy not tailored to scholar, indicating only passing conversations. Very generic and vague ideas to create a supportive environment.
3A. Scholar motivation*	Scholar clearly and specifically articulates motivation for BURST in relation to potential future goals.	Scholar articulates motivation but lacks specificity or relation to potential future goals.	Scholar articulates motivation but quite vague with no relation to potential future goals.
3B. Scholar Preparation	Student statement demonstrates meaningful discussions with their mentor and a clear understanding of the project's goals, research approach, and planned activities.	Student statement demonstrates project discussion with mentor but lacks specificity.	Student statement demonstrates little or no project discussion with mentor.

**Note: Scholars should specifically describe their motivation for applying to BURST but do not need concrete career goals or sophisticated understanding of research given their limited research experience.*