

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Abstract/Summary is original, accurately reflects the proposal, concise and specific.	
<b>1. DESCRIPTION OF SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH</b>	
Clear narrative describes the project, the background research, and the need for the project. Objectives/outcomes are clear and specific.	
Provides a compelling argument for the proposal	
<b>2. PREPARATION</b>	
Compelling evidence of student's academic preparation for pursuing this project.	
<b>3. PROCESS</b>	
Clear description of the process. Project method and timeline appropriate and feasible. The role of each researcher addressed and appropriate.	
<b>--COLLABORATOR OR MENTOR</b>	
Role of NWU faculty as primary "mentor" or "collaborator" is clarified. Their responsibilities are specified. Faculty role is integral to the project.	
<b>5. PLAN FOR DISCIPLINE APPROPRIATE REVIEW</b>	
Describes the process to "peer-review" for the activity; demonstrates realistic expectations that are consistent with the project.	
<b>6. BUDGET and EXPLANATION</b>	
Describes the resources needed to complete the activity. Indicates priorities.	
The budget form is fully completed and is reasonable. Provides an itemized price-list (website or order form).	
<b>7. PROPOSAL PRESENTATION AND WRITING CLARITY</b>	
Proposal is written concisely and fully meets each application part. Proposal is organized in exact accordance with proposal sections. Proposal exemplifies correct grammar and spelling and formal, academic register.	
<b>8. FACULTY RECOMMENDATION</b>	
Demonstrates significant value of this student activity and describes meaningful student/faculty collaboration on the project. Supports legitimacy of the project (appropriateness of project, ability of	