2022 SURE Proposal Evaluation				
Faculty Mentor:				
Faculty Department:				
Faculty College/Unit:				
Format & Cover Page	Yes / No			
Proposal in the correct format, all questions are answered, 4 pages maximum (added page ok if 2 students or for FQ9)?				
All aggreement statements checked?				
Clear itemized budget?				
Source(s) of additional funding required to carry out the project is/are described (if needed)?				
Project Plan	Score			
Problem addressed : adequate; clear to all on advisory board (FQ1)				
Project's purpose : clear; addresses problem directly (FQ2)				
<i>Project's Methodology</i> : covers core procedures clearly; timeline shows careful planning; timeline seems reasonable for one semester (FQ3)				
Student Outcomes & Mentoring Plan	Score			
<i>Student's role</i> : clear plan; active in multiple project key parts, not just grunt work (FQ4, SQ1)				
Student's qualifications : suitably prepared for the project (FQ4, SQ3)				
Learning outcomes : clear; valuable; beyond classroom experience (FQ5)		Tota	al Score =	0
<i>Mentoring Plan</i> : clear; thorough; thouhgtful; supports meaningful learning outcomes. (FQ6 & SQ4)			Total % =	0%
Budget Plan	Score	(calculated automatically from section scores)		
Budget Justification I : expenses explained completely; items have clear role in <u>project</u> (not just to boost a general team fund) (FQ7); "N/A" is pre-inserted if no budget was requested.				
Budget Justification II : clearly supports this student's outcomes (FQ7); "N/A" is pre-inserted if no budget was requested.				
Student's Statement	Score			
<i>Consistency with mentor's plan</i> : student displays clear grasp of roles, project's methods, & mentoring schedule (SQs 1, 2, & 4)				
<i>Project value</i> : clear connection of the project to student's future goals. (SQ5)				
Overall Evaluation	Exceptional	Good	Fair	Poor
Summary judgment of full proposal's quality (select w/ a 'X')				
Additional Comments, esp. any reservations (optional)	(sel	ect a catego	ory above w	(a 'X')