

Use the rating scale provided to score proposal components 1-4. A total score will range from 0 – 10, with scores of 9-10 corresponding to “strongly recommend,” scores of 7-8 “recommend,” scores of 5-6 “possibly recommend, but with reservations,” and scores below 5, or any proposal with a score of 0 on section 2b, “does not qualify for funding.”

#### Section 1a: Project Description & Significance

<i>3: High</i>	<i>2: Medium</i>	<i>0-1: Unacceptable</i>
Project description is easily understood by a non-specialist and clearly articulates the goals & ideal outcome of the student’s work. Addresses the significance of this work to the project.	Project description is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader and articulates the project’s significance, goals for the student’s work & its likely outcome at least minimally.	Project description is unclear to a non-specialist reader or omits addressing the student’s goals & likely outcome or the project’s significance.

#### Section 1b: Project Timeline & Research Tasks

<i>2: High</i>	<i>1: Medium</i>	<i>0: Unacceptable</i>
Project timeline and tasks clearly detail the student’s responsibilities and significant research tasks. Project completion is feasible given the timeline and tasks proposed. Easily understood by a non-specialist.	Project timeline outlines the student’s responsibilities and research tasks, but in less detail or with less clarity, and completion may be less feasible compared to other proposals. The timeline and tasks may be less clear to non-specialists.	Project timeline & tasks are omitted, unclear, lack details and/or are not written for non-specialists. The student’s responsibilities are not clear. Project will be difficult to complete as proposed (timeline is not feasible).

#### Section 2a: Quality of the Student Learning Experience

<i>3: High</i>	<i>2: Medium</i>	<i>0-1: Unacceptable</i>
Student-centered goals are explained clearly & explicitly; pedagogical techniques, approach to oversight & steps to independence are addressed in thoughtful detail.	Student-centered goals, pedagogy, approach to oversight & student independence are addressed in less clarity & detail compared to higher-ranked proposals.	Student-centered goals, pedagogy, approach to oversight & student independence are unclear, minimal and/or omitted, and/or demonstrate a lack of understanding of mentoring UGs.

#### Section 2b: Work Environment

<i>2: High</i>	<i>1: Medium</i>	<i>0: Unacceptable</i>
Proposal describes the work space, supplies and resource needs clearly and in explicit, clear detail.	Proposal describes work space, supplies & resource needs, but in less detail or less clearly.	Work space is not described, and/or supplies & resource needs are not provided, or are very unclear.

**Recommendation:** Fund Fund, but with reservations Do not fund

**Notes/Feedback to author(s):**