

University of Cincinnati – Bearcats AI Grants Rubric

| Criterion | 5 Points | 3 Points | 1 Point |
|------------------------|---|--|---|
| Innovation | Proposes a highly original and transformative use of AI that significantly advances current practices or opens new avenues for exploration | Proposes a somewhat innovative use of AI, building on existing methods but demonstrating unique adaptation or application. | Offers a relatively conventional use of AI with limited originality or novel contribution to the field. |
| Feasibility | The project plan is well structured, resource allocation is clear, and timeline is realistic. Demonstrates technical expertise. | The project plan may require further clarification but is generally feasible. | Lacks a convincing implementation plan, with unclear timelines, insufficient resources, or unrealistic expectations. Raises concerns about project feasibility. |
| Impact | Clearly articulates the potential impact of the project in Curriculum Development/ Pedagogy / Research/ Student Life. Defines specific metrics for measuring success and demonstrates potential for broader dissemination or scalability. | Identifies potential impacts but lacks clear definition of success metrics or limited explanation of potential to scale. | Impact unclear/ limited, with negligible contribution to pedagogy, student success, or academic advancement. |
| Clarity & Organization | The proposal is well-written, logical, and easy to understand. Information is presented concisely and effectively, with clear headings, subheadings, and visuals. | The proposal is generally clear and organized but may have some sections that are unclear or repetitive. | The proposal is poorly organized, difficult to follow, and may contain factual errors or inconsistencies. |
| | | | |

| Criterion | 5 Points | 3 Points | 1 Point |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ethics | Provides a thorough ethical analysis with safeguards to address biases, privacy concerns, and societal impacts. | Addresses some ethical considerations with basic strategies for mitigating issues but lacks comprehensive safeguards. | Neglects to address ethical considerations with minimal discussion of biases, privacy, or societal impacts. |
| Alignment with UC's Strategic Direction "Next Lives Here" | Explicitly and effectively links the project "Next Lives Here" Shows a deep understanding of Academic Excellence, Urban Impact, and Innovation Agenda | Aligns with some university strategic goals, or the connection is superficial or lacks sufficient detail. | Weak or nonexistent connection to university strategic goals. Fails to demonstrate how the project contributes to Academic Excellence, Urban Impact, and Innovation Agenda. |

Additional Considerations:

- Interdisciplinary collaboration will be positively weighed.
- Budget clarity and justification will be assessed.