Criteria	0 - Nonexistent	1 - Unsatisfactory	2 - Lacking	3 - Satisfactory	4 - Good	5 - Excellent
Proposal Overview						
Proposal Clarity: The proposal is written in a manner that makes the topic understandable to an educated, but non-specialist, audience. (Does the applicant use 'plain language' and avoid the undefined use of jargon and technical terms?) /5	Illegible.	The proposal is very difficult to follow, lacks cohesion and clarity. Not written to an educated non-specialist audience.	The proposal is difficult to follow and the overall intention and actionability of the project lacks clarity. Specific elements may be understood but their connection and relevance is less clear.	Aspects of the proposal lack clarity, but the overall intention and actionability of the project is understood.	The proposal is mostly understandable with only slight vagueness, ambiguity or use of technical / jargon terminology.	The proposal is written in a manner that makes the topic understandable to an educated, but non-specialist, audience. Uses 'plain language' and avoids undefined use of jargon and technical terms.
Feasibility: How likely is that the project will be completed effectively within timelines. /5	Not feasible. No confidence in the proposals goals	Overall feasibility is highly unlikely as outlined in the proposal.	A critical feasibility element (see description) is unlikely.	One or two elements are called into question, but the proposal still seems feasible.	Minor elements exist but they do not call into question the feasibility of the proposal as outlined.	Very confident in the feasibility of the proposal as outlined.
Research Program: Project is situated (placed in the context of) previous and/or future research program of the applicant and is positioned to lead to external funding. (How does this project fit into the scholarship activities of the applicant?) /5	Project alignment to current or future research program is omitted.	No connection to current or future research program.	Project alignment to current or future research program may exist but is not adequately articulated.	Project alignment to current or future research program is provided, but not positioned to lead to external funding.	Project alignment to current or future research program is provided and is positioned to lead to external funding.	Project alignment to current or future research program is clearly articulated and is positioned to lead to external funding.
Proposal Elements						
Literature review: Literature review is clear and situates the proposed research. Selected references are current or seminal and there is evidence of information/knowledge synthesis. A gap in the literature or potential area for contribution is identified. (What do we know and need to know about the proposed area of research, scholarship or community engagement?) /5	No literature review.	Literature Review is disconnected from the proposed research.	Literature Review lacks depth, clarity and current or seminal literature.	Literature review is clear and selected references are current or seminal.	Literature review is clear and situates the proposed research in the extant literature. Selected references are current or seminal. A gap in the literature is identified.	Literature review is clear and situates the proposed research in the extant literature. Selected references are current or seminal and there is evidence of information/knowledge synthesis. A gap in the literature is identified.
Research Question and Contribution: Problem and/or research question is clearly articulated. (To what question/problem is this project the answer?) The applicant describes how the work will contribute to the proposed field of study and/or community impact. (What is the potential significance and originality of the project outcomes?) /5	Problem and/or research question and contribution are BOTH missing.	Problem and/or research question and/or contribution are missing.	Problem and/or research question and/or contribution are only vaguely alluded to.	Problem and/or research question is adequately articulated and contribution to the field of study and/or community impact is defined at a high level.	Problem and/or research question is clearly articulated and the applicant describes how the work will contribute to either the proposed field of study (theory) or community impact (practice).	Problem and/or research question is clearly articulated and the applicant describes how the work will contribute to the proposed field of study (theory) and community impact (practice).

Methodology: The methods to conduct the work are described in enough detail to understand all phases of the project from data collection to analysis. (Is it clear what the applicant intends to do and how it will be done?) /5	Method section is missing.	The method is unclear.	The qualitative or quantitative method is defined, but a detailed approach is not provided.	The qualitative or quantitative method is defined (though lacking in clarity) and the planned approach from data collection to analysis is outlined. References are omitted.	The qualitative or quantitative method is defined (though lacking in clarity) with appropriate references and the planned approach from data collection to analysis is outlined.	The qualitative or quantitative method is clearly defined with appropriate references and the planned approach from data collection to analysis is outlined.
Dissemination Plan: A plan for communicating research outcomes is clearly presented, including timelines.. (How will the results of the research be shared with the appropriate communities of interest – including knowledge mobilization if appropriate?) /5	No plan.	The Dissemination Plan is unclear, vague and without impact.	Dissemination Plan that seems misaligned with the proposed research and appears unlikely to execute.	Dissemination Plan that includes academic dissemination (peer reviewed journal articles and conference presentations) OR community engaged activities (workshops, presentations, op-eds, case studies) and lacks clarity.	Dissemination Plan that includes academic dissemination (peer reviewed journal articles and conference presentations) AND community engaged activities (workshops, presentations, op-eds, case studies) but lacks clarity.	Well-articulated Dissemination Plan that includes academic dissemination (peer reviewed journal articles and conference presentations) AND community engaged activities (workshops, presentations, op-eds, case studies).
Student Engagement: The role/benefit and training of undergraduate researchers is included in the project, or an explanation is provided as to why this is not needed or appropriate to conduct the work. (What are the benefits to undergrad students in the project? What is the potential role of undergraduates in the project? If undergraduate students are not included, is the rationale understandable?) /5	Neither Student researchers nor application to teaching are included in the proposal.	Inclusion of student researchers or application to teaching is vague/unclear.	Application to teaching is included in the proposal.	Student researchers are included in the proposal.	Student researchers and applications to teaching are included in the proposal but there is some vagueness or lack of clarity in the explanation.	Student researchers and applications to teaching are included and clearly defined in the proposal.
Budget: The proposed budget is reasonable. (Are the proposed expenditures appropriate for the activities being conducted?) /5	No budget.	Budget is not complete or not appropriate for the proposed work; Explanation and justification for items identified in the budget were missing.	Budget is nearly complete and somewhat appropriate for the proposed work, with little to no explanation and justification provided for most items.	Budget is nearly complete and somewhat appropriate for the proposed work; provides some explanation and justification for most of the items identified in the budget.	Budget is complete and appropriate for the proposed work; provides an explanation and justification for each item identified in the budget.	Budget is complete and very appropriate for the proposed work; provides a detailed explanation and justification for each item identified in the budget.
Total						