

Rating Category	Exceptional (A)	Very Good (B)	Average (C)	Needs Improvement (D)
<b>1. Project Description</b>	The proposal identifies a motivating idea, problem, and/or question and clearly outlines the activities to be completed. Project description is well written, concise, and easy to understand.	The proposal identifies a motivating idea, problem, and/or question and provides a general outline of project activities. Project description uses some jargon or is sometimes hard to understand.	The proposal does not identify a motivating idea/problem/question, does not outline the proposed activities, and/or does not explain the project clearly.	The proposal is hard to understand or uses much field-specific jargon. It is not clear that the student wrote the proposal or not clear that the student understands the work to be completed.
<b>2. Significance</b>	It is clear how the project fits into the broader scholarly or creative field at the local, regional, and/or national level.	It is clear how the project fits into the broader scholarly or creative field at the local (UConn) level.	A link is suggested between the project and a broader scholarly or creative field, but it is not clearly stated.	The relationship between the project and a broader scholarly or creative field is not articulated.
<b>3. Goals and Products</b>	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Specific products (presentations, publications, or other appropriate outcomes) are described and seem attainable.	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Products (presentations, publications, or other appropriate outcomes) are identified, but little detail is provided.	Project goals are referenced, but could be stated more clearly. Products are described only vaguely and/or seem unattainable.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. Products are not described.
<b>4. Student Role in Project</b>	Student had creative input in the project's development. Student will play a central role in project activities, including analysis and dissemination of findings.	Student will play a central role in project activities, including analysis and dissemination of findings.	Student plays an important role in project activities, but will not be involved in analysis or dissemination of findings.	Student is mainly an observer or data collector. Student will not be involved in analysis or dissemination of findings.
<b>5. Student Qualifications</b>	The student is well qualified and prepared to carry out the project.	The student has sufficient knowledge and preparation to carry out the project.	The student's qualifications, preparation and knowledge on the subject are not clear or may be insufficient to carry out the project.	The application does not demonstrate sufficient background knowledge or qualifications to successfully engage in the project.
<b>6. Faculty Recommendations</b>	Recommenders provide a positive assessment of the significance of the project and its educational value for the student. Letters include a positive assessment of the student's ability to undertake the project. A plan for supervision and mentorship is described.	Recommendations provide a positive assessment of the student, the project proposed, and the educational value for the student. There is evidence that mentoring will be provided.	Recommendations include a positive assessment of the student but do not address the project or the student's ability to successfully undertake the proposed project. Role of mentor is vague.	Recommendations focus on student's academic performance and do not indicate knowledge of or support of the proposed project. Mentorship is not addressed.
<b>7. Feasibility</b>	Budget is clear and appropriate for the project. Timeline is feasible and consistent with activities described.	Budget is clear and appropriate for the project. Timeline lacks some detail but project is manageable in the time frame described.	Budget may lack detail. Timeline does not correspond to proposed activities or does not allocate sufficient time for some activities.	Budget lacks detail or is inappropriate for the project. Timeline is unsuitable and/or unrealistic for activities described.

Overall Rating:

**A (Outstanding/Definitely Fund)**  
**B (High Priority for Funding)**

**C (Medium Priority for Funding)**  
**D (Low Priority/Do Not Fund)**