

## Criteria for Evaluation

We are interested in supporting projects that enable early-career scientists to increase their level of engagement with public officials (elected/nonelected) and community leaders and members. The project can encompass a single event or a series of activities or workshops.

### Highly competitive proposals will address the following:

The most competitive proposals will facilitate collaborations across STEM disciplines. Collaborations including the following STEM disciplines are encouraged (and are not limited to): psychology, sociology, anthropology, physical sciences, biological sciences, biomedical sciences, computer science and related technologies, engineering, economics, math, and medicine.

Goals/Impact: Goal(s) are clearly stated; the outcomes and their maximum impact are described.

Activities: Proposed activities are clearly stated, non-partisan in nature, engaging, impactful, and clearly show engagement with public officials (elected/non-elected) and leaders and members of the local community.

Quality: The different factors related to quality are described below:

- Sustainability: How will the project or similar activities continue once the grant is completed?
- Collaboration and skill building: How will the project engage students/post-docs to work together and learn new skills (communication, program planning, etc.) How will the project bring together students/post-docs across STEM disciplines?
- Diversity: Does the proposal engage with ethnically and socio-economically diverse communities both on and off campus?
- Accessibility: Will the group generate materials (i.e. flyers, infographics, podcasts) that will be available as community resources?
- Innovation: Does the project/program explore a new idea or present a new twist on a program model?

Budget: A line-item budget is clearly explained and expenses are justified. A fiscal sponsor with direct contact information (phone number and email address) is included.

	Meets All Expectations (3)	Meets Many Expectations (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Missing Key Elements (0)	Score
Description	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand.	Description is mostly clear and/or some aspects are hard to understand.	Description does not explain project concisely, or it does not give a general picture of the proposed activities.	Description is hard to understand.	
Goals/Impact	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Outcomes of <i>maximum</i> impact and value are described.	The goals of the project are clearly stated. Outcomes of <i>significant</i> impact and value are described.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. Outcomes of <i>moderate to minimal</i> impact are described.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated. No outcomes are described.	
Activities	The activities of the project are clearly stated, non-partisan, engaging and impactful. Activities <i>will clearly</i> engage public officials (elected/non-elected) and community leaders.	The activities of the project are clearly stated, non-partisan, engaging and impactful. Activities <i>likely to</i> engage public officials (elected/non-elected) and community leaders.	The activities of the project are clearly stated, but may not be non-partisan, engaging or impactful. Activities are <i>not likely</i> to engage public officials (elected/non-elected) and community leaders.	The activities of the project are not clearly stated, partisan, and/or do not engage public officials (elected/non-elected) and community leaders.	
Quality	Project clearly addresses all 5 of the following: sustainability, collaboration and skill-building, accessibility, diversity, innovation.	Project clearly addresses 3-4 of the following: sustainability, collaboration and skill-building, accessibility, diversity, innovation.	Project clearly addresses 1-2 of the following: sustainability, collaboration and skill-building, accessibility, diversity, innovation.	Project does not clearly address any of the following: sustainability, collaboration and skill-building, accessibility, diversity, innovation.	
Budget	Budget is clearly explained, with line items and appropriate for the activities proposed. A fiscal sponsor is identified and contact information (direct phone number and email address) is included.	Budget is clearly explained, with line items but may not fully support proposed activities. A fiscal sponsor is identified and contact information (direct phone number and email address) is included.	Budget is somewhat clear, may not include line items, and/or may not fully support proposed activities. A fiscal sponsor is identified with no contact information.	Budget is not clearly explained, without line items or will not support proposed activities. A fiscal sponsor was not identified.	
STEM Collaborations	There is an interdisciplinary science team already in formation. The proposal clearly indicates how combining expertise will maximize impact.	An interdisciplinary science team needs to be formed. The proposal indicates how combining expertise will impact the proposal.	It is unclear whether an interdisciplinary science team will form. The proposal does not clearly indicate how combining expertise will impact the proposal.	It is unlikely an interdisciplinary science team will form. The proposal does not indicate how combining expertise will impact the proposal.	
Total Score				(Max: 18)	

**Applicant Name and University:**

**Reviewer Name and Notes:**