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Completeness

All materials received _____ Materials missing _____

Quality

1. Competence: the applicant’s vita shows relevant competence to carry out the proposed project, or demonstrates the manner in which such competence will be secured from others.
   • 3 points Applicant has produced similar scholarly works in the past which have been recognized in peer reviewed settings in the related field
   • 2 points Applicant has produced similar scholarly works in the past but without peer review
   • 1 point Applicant’s vita shows the requisite training to be minimally competent to conduct the proposed work

2. Originality
   • 3 points The proposal introduces something new which will make a significant contribution to the field
   • 2 points The proposal will make an incremental addition to present knowledge
   • 1 point It is doubtful that the proposal will make a contribution to the field

3. Audience
   • 3 points Proposed audience includes the element of external review
   • 2 points Audience lacks external review
   • 1 points Audience is not clearly identified

4. Extractable Abstract
   • 3 points Abstract includes statement of context, problem statement, description of methods and procedures, and shows potential contribution of proposed project
   • 2 points Abstract has two or three of the above, but is not complete
   • 1 point Abstract has one element of the above, but is not complete

5. Quality and currency of documentation of the existing knowledge or skill base of the discipline.
   • 3 points Proposal demonstrates good awareness of the present state of the discipline and how the proposed project will contribute
   • 2 points Proposal includes elements of elements of 3-point response but lacks clarity and completeness in detail
   • 1 point The proposal fails to address adequately the current knowledge or skill base of the discipline.

6. Materials and methods
   • 3 points The proposal describes the materials and methods in sufficient detail that a knowledgeable scholar in the discipline should be able to conduct the study
   • 2 points Materials and methods are generally described, but some details are vague or undecided
   • 1 point Elements of materials and methods are absent

7. Supporting materials
   • 3 points The proposal makes clear how the proposed project fits into the personal growth plan of the proposer, how it fits into the relevant academic discipline, and how it fits into GFU scholarship standards.
   • 2 points Some elements of a 3-point response are missing or details are vague or incomplete
   • 1 point The proposal does not address how the proposed project fits into the personal growth plan of the proposer, how it fits into the relevant academic discipline, and how it fits into GFU scholarship

8. Schedule and Expenses
   • 3 points Schedule seems reasonable given the scope of the project and the other responsibilities of the individual; expenses demonstrate a thoughtful balancing of necessary expenses to complete the proposed project and good stewardship
   • 2 points Schedule is provided but lacks one or more elements of 3-point response
   • 1 point Schedule and expenses not present

Final Comment: Any missing material potentially disqualifies a proposal—it implies that the author has not adequately addressed a major area of essential concern regarding the proposed project.