**Evaluation Form: Rowan University CATALYST Funding Program**

**APPLICANT NAME AND DEPARTMENT:**

**REVIEW CRITERIA:**

Please use the following scoring: 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=excellent.

**SCORE**

\_\_\_\_ 1. **Qualifications:** is the applicant professionally qualified to conduct the proposed project?

COMMENTS:

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. **Originality**: is the project at the forefront of the applicant’s professional field?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. **Professional Impact:** is there potential for the proposed project to result in a significant advancement in the applicant’s field of interest?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. **Institutional Impact**: what is the potential for benefiting the mission of Rowan University?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. **Educational Impact**: what is the potential for directly benefiting students via research experience, including them in the creative / artistic work, etc.?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. **Budget:** is the proposed budget appropriate for the proposed scope of activities?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 7. **Clarity:** is the proposal well-written with appropriate technical content, style and language? *COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. **Potential for Future Funding:** will this proposed work be a strong contender for competitively awarded funding from agencies and organizations external to the university?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. **Scope:** are the proposed project work and timeline adequate for the desired goals?

*COMMENTS:*

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. **Deliverables:** are the proposed deliverable activities appropriate for this applicant’s background and the proposed funding (e.g., caliber of proposed papers, presentations, recitals, etc.) in comparison to comparable peer activity deliverables?

*COMMENTS:*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL SCORE (MAXIMUM=50)**

**Additional Comments:**