

Criterion	4 – Excellent	3 – Good	2 – Fair	1 – Needs Improvement
<b>1. Potential for Securing External Funding</b>	Strong likelihood of external funding; clearly articulates targeted funding sources and compelling rationale	Moderate likelihood; identifies potential sources with general alignment	Limited potential; vague or mismatched funding sources	Unclear or unrealistic funding potential; lacks any identified sources
<b>2. Research Methods / Creative Activity</b>	Methods or approach are rigorous, well-designed, and appropriate; study protocol or creative activity is detailed and justified	Methods are sound with minor limitations; protocol/activity is generally well-structured	Methods lack some rigor or clarity; important details are missing	Methods are poorly defined, inappropriate, or missing
<b>3. Innovation and Originality</b>	Project demonstrates strong innovation; offers a novel approach or unique contribution	Some original aspects; offers minor enhancements to existing work	Limited innovation; mostly builds on existing work with minimal new insight	Lacks originality; replicates existing work without meaningful differentiation
<b>4. Contribution to Field or Community</b>	Clearly articulates a significant and meaningful impact on the field or target community	Contribution is evident but not fully developed or supported	Contribution is minor or not well connected to broader impact	Contribution is unclear or unsupported
<b>5. Alignment with Strategic Goals</b>	Strongly aligned with strategic goals at multiple institutional levels (university, college, department).	Generally aligned, with some connection to key goals	Weak alignment; connections are implied but not clearly stated	No discernible alignment with strategic goals
<b>6. Timeline and Budget Feasibility</b>	Timeline is detailed and realistic; budget is well-justified, appropriate, and feasible	Minor issues with timeline or budget clarity, but overall feasible	Timeline or budget lacks detail or has questionable feasibility	Timeline and/or budget are unrealistic, missing, or poorly justified

**Additional Comments:**

**Scoring Guide:**

- **22–24:** Outstanding Proposal – Highly recommended for funding.
- **18–21:** Strong Proposal – Recommended with minor revisions.
- **14–17:** Moderate Proposal – Revisions required before funding.
- **10–13:** Weak Proposal – Major revisions needed.
- **5–9:** Not Recommended for Funding.