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Proposal/PI: ________________________________
Reviewer: ________________________________

Note: Categories are not weighted. Scores are used to ensure consistency among reviewers and as a guide to differentiate and rank-order proposals prior to final funding decisions.

---

Project Importance
Does the proposal make a compelling case that the project:
• Addresses an issue or problem of importance to Penn State teaching and learning?
• Has the potential to impact other Penn State faculty?

Comments:

Points Earned ______ (5 = exceeds criteria, 3-4 = partially meets criteria, 0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria)

---

Project Objectives
• Are the expected outcomes realistic?
• Does the evidence align with the expected outcome?

Comments:

Points Earned ______ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)

---

Project Activities and Timeline
• Are the activities reasonable within the project timeline?
• Are the activities achievable by the individual or group listed?

Comments:

Points Earned ______ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)
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---

**Budget**
- Do the budget items appear to contribute to the successful completion of the project?
- Do the amounts appear to be based on tangible expected costs?

**Comments:**

---

**Points Earned ______ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)**

---

**Project Longevity**
- Is the plan for continuing the project without additional funding feasible?

**Comments:**

---

**Points Earned ______ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)**

---

**Total Points Earned ______ /25**

**Final Comments**

---

**Recommendation (choose one)**
- Fully fund
- Partially fund
- Do not fund
- Revise/resubmit