

Use the rating scale provided to score proposal components 1-4. A total score will range from 0 – 13, with scores of 11-13 corresponding to “strongly recommend,” scores of 9-10 “recommend,” scores of 8-7 “possibly recommend, but with reservations,” and scores below 7, or any proposal with a score of 0 on section 3, “does not qualify for funding.”

Section 1: Summary/Abstract

<i>2: High</i>	<i>1: Medium</i>	<i>0: Unacceptable</i>
Abstract/project summary are easily understood by a non-specialist reader, clear, and concisely summarize the project’s goals, methods and inclusion of UG students.	The abstract/project summary are less clear, may be difficult for a non-specialist reader to understand, exceed the word limit, or fail to summarize concisely the project’s goals, methods and inclusion of UG students.	An abstract/project summary are not provided, or are difficult to understand and fail to summarize concisely the project’s goals, methods and inclusion of UG students.

Section 2: Project Description & Timeline

<i>4: High</i>	<i>2-3: Medium</i>	<i>0-1: Unacceptable</i>
Project description is easily understood by a non- specialist and clearly articulates its purpose, place within the faculty’s overall scholarly program, methods/processes & student involvement. Includes a detailed timeline for work completion	Project description is reasonably clear to a non-specialist reader and articulates the project’s purpose, methods, student involvement & timeline at least minimally (or addresses most components in some detail)	Project description is unclear to a non-specialist reader, and/or does not address the project’s purpose, methods, student involvement & timeline at least minimally & with clarity.

Section 3: Engagement of Undergraduate Students

<i>3: High</i>	<i>2: Medium</i>	<i>0-1: Unacceptable</i>
Explains clearly and explicitly how the project will actively include undergraduate students & how capacity will be expanded in the future by the current project.	The explanation addresses undergraduate involvement and roles, and how capacity will be expanded, but in less clarity and/or detail than proposals ranked more highly.	Undergraduate involvement & expansion of capacity are not addressed clearly or completely; may be overly brief, vague, unclear, minimal or omitted.

Section 4: Budget Justification

<i>2: High</i>	<i>1: Medium</i>	<i>0: Unacceptable</i>
Budget is clear, detailed and appropriate for the project proposed; explains how budget items expand capacity. Additional sources of funding (internal and/or external) are addressed with clarity.	Budget & explanation includes some detail, but is less clear and/or less well-justified for the project proposed. Additional sources of internal/external funding are not addressed or vaguely mentioned.	No budget is provided, or the budget presented is unclear, lacks detail and/or inappropriate for the project proposed. Expansion of UG scholar capacity is not addressed. Additional sources of funding are not addressed.

Section 5: Updated CV

<i>2: High</i>	<i>1: Medium</i>	<i>0: Unacceptable</i>
C.V. demonstrates that faculty mentor is well-qualified to conduct the scholarly work proposed; may also indicate experience or aptitude necessary for mentoring UG students.	C.V. demonstrates that faculty mentor has completed scholarly work somewhat similar to the proposed project, though qualifications are somewhat questionable; may have limited experience with UG students.	C.V. does not provide evidence that faculty mentor has sufficient expertise/experience to complete the proposed work; C.V. may have evidence that the faculty member lacks interest in or expertise necessary to mentor UG students.