Criteria for Evaluation

We are dedicated to 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.

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.

Highly competitive proposals will address the following:

1. Goal(s): The goal(s) of the proposal attempt to address the problem(s) explained in the application and are clearly explained.

2. Potential Impact: The proposal describes how the activity will create dialogue with the target audience and how the project organizers will develop new skills.

3. Activities: Proposed activities are clearly stated, non-partisan in nature, and clearly show engagement with public officials (elected/non-elected) and community members.

4. Budget: A line-item budget is laid out clearly 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 but some aspects are hard to understand.	Description somewhat explains the project but needs more detail.	Description is difficult to understand.	
Goal(s)	The goal(s) are clearly stated and address the problem described.	The goal(s) are somewhat broad and address the problem described.	The goal(s) are somewhat broad and do not address the problem described.	The goal(s) are not clearly stated and do not address the problem described.	
Potential Impact	The proposal clearly indicates how the activity will create dialogue with the target audience and how the project organizers will develop new skills.	The proposal somewhat indicates how the activity will create dialogue with the target audience and how the project organizers will develop new skills.	The proposal minimally indicates how the activity will create dialogue with the target audience and how the project organizers will develop new skills.	The proposal does not indicate how the activity will create dialogue with the target audience and how the project organizers will develop new skills.	
Activities	The activities of the project are clearly stated, non-partisan, and have a feasible timeline. Activities *will clearly* engage public officials and/or community leaders.	The activities of the project are clearly stated, non-partisan, but have a somewhat feasible timeline. Activities are *likely to* engage public officials and/or community leaders.	The activities of the project are mostly clear but may not be non-partisan or don't have a feasible timeline. Activities are *not likely* to engage public officials and/or community leaders.	The activities of the project are unclear, partisan, do not have a feasible timeline, or do not engage public officials and/or community leaders.	
Budget	Line-item budget is clearly explained and is appropriate for the activities proposed. A fiscal sponsor is identified, and contact information is included.	Line-item budget is clearly explained but may not fully support the activities proposed. A fiscal sponsor is identified, and contact information is included.	Budget is somewhat clear but does not include line items or may not fully support proposed activities. A fiscal sponsor was not identified.	Budget is unclear, does not include line items or will not support proposed activities. A fiscal sponsor was not identified.	
Total Score				(Max: 12)	