Areas 1 through 4 are scored based on the rating scale provided for each area. A total score will range from 0 – 14. Typically, competitive proposals have a score of 8 and above.

Area 1: Project Goals/Feasibility

3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Project description is easily understood by a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are clearly explained and feasible within the given timeline; the tasks of the student and faculty are clearly described; the faculty member has demonstrated content/methodological expertise; a detailed proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of careful, detailed consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.	Project description is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are adequately stated; the tasks of the student and faculty are adequately described; the faculty member has sufficient content/methodological expertise; a proposed timeline is provided; there is evidence of reasonable consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project	Project description is not easily understood by a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are unclear and/or vague; the tasks of the student and faculty are not sufficiently described; the faculty member has not demonstrated content/methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is unclear and/or vague; there is minimal evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.	Project description is unclear to a non-specialist reader. Goals of the project are not present; the tasks of the student and faculty are not described; the faculty member did not address content/ methodological expertise; the proposed timeline is not feasible, or not present; there is no evidence of consideration of the budgetary and other resources necessary for completion of the project.

Area 2: Student Preparation and Motivation (URC Note: If résumé or CV is missing or poorly written, deduct 1 pt from this section)

4: Exceptional	*3: High*	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
This section is student driven and demonstrates a clear understanding of the project goals, methodologies, and nature of their contribution; they are highly qualified to pursue the project; they present compelling and clearly articulated learning goals, and how this experience will aid in achieving their professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects strong understanding of project goals and nature of their contribution; the student demonstrates that they are highly qualified to pursue the project; the student statement is compelling and clearly articulates their learning goals, as well as how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects an adequate understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; the student demonstrates that they are qualified to pursue the project; the student statement articulates their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects a limited understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; there are concerns about the student qualifications for the project; the student statement inadequately describes their learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals.	The student statement reflects an insufficient understanding of project goals and/or nature of their contribution; the student does not demonstrate that he/she is qualified to pursue the project; the student statement does not articulate learning goals or how this experience will aid in achieving professional and academic goals

Area 3: Mentorship/Apprenticeship Plan

4: Exceptional	3: High	*2: Medium*	*1: Low*	*0: Unacceptable*
Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described, explained, and tailored to the student applicant; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project, and this has been clearly described; the plan for the scholarly development of this student is clearly described and thoughtfully crafted.	Goals and mentoring approach are clearly described and explained; the student and faculty member have intentionally begun preparation for this project; the plan for the scholarly development of this student is clearly described.	Goals and mentoring approach are adequately described; the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is described.	Goals and/or mentoring approach are not adequately described; insufficient details on how the student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is not sufficiently described.	Goals and/or mentoring approach are missing; unclear if student and faculty member have begun preparation for this project; a plan for the scholarly development of a student is not provided.

Area 4: Commitment to Project

3: High	2: Medium	1: Low	0: Unacceptable
Both student and faculty member detail and describe their summer obligations and approach to balancing these, in a way that clearly prioritizes the MS3 project.	Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations and appear to prioritize the MS3 project.	Both student and faculty member describe their summer obligations but the MS3 project is not clearly prioritized.	Neither the student nor faculty member detail or describe their summer obligations and the MS3 project is not prioritized.