Reviewer Name: Principle Investigator Name:

	Needs Improvement (1 pt)	Adequate (2 pts)	Exemplary (3 pts)	Points Awarded
General Presentation	☐Fails to use acceptable style and grammar; errors encountered in multiple areas of the proposal.	☐Uses adequate style and grammar; errors minimally encountered in the proposal.	☐ Uses acceptable style and grammar; errors not encountered in the proposal.	
	☐ Does not follow proper format in providing citations or no citations provided.	☐Follows proper format in providing citations, but not consistently throughout the proposal.	□Follows proper format in providing citations.	
	Needs Improvement (3 pts)	Adequate (6 pts)	Exemplary (10 pts)	Points Awarded
Study Rationale	□Provides an introduction and background that is irrelevant to the research.	☐ Provides an introduction and background that is only somewhat relevant to the research.	☐ Provides clear and thorough introduction, specific aims, and background.	
	□Presents rationale and significance of proposed research in the form of a weak, unstructured argument.	☐Shows some effort to present the rationale and significance of proposed research in the form of a well-structured argument.	☐ Presents rationale and significance of proposed research in the form of a well-structured, logical argument.	
	\square Does not use data and/or literature relevant to the proposed research.	☐ Uses limited number of sources of data and/or literature relevant to the proposed research.	☐Uses a broad range of data and/or literature relevant to the proposed research.	
	\square States vaguely worded and/or untestable research question(s).	☐ States one or more clearly worded research questions, but not all are testable.	□States specific, testable research question(s).	
	Needs Improvement (3 pts)	Adequate (6 pts)	Exemplary (10 pts)	Points Awarded
Methods	☐Methods do not address the research question as described.	☐ Methods address the research question as described.	☐Methods are novel and address the research question as described.	
	□Study context is not described (i.e., setting, relevant programmatic details, target group/subgroup, etc.).	□Study context is partially described (i.e., setting, relevant programmatic details, target group/subgroup, etc.).	☐ Study context is robustly described (i.e., setting, relevant programmatic details, target group/subgroup, etc.).	
	□Explanation of study implementation is not provided (e.g., basic study design, key variables, measurement instruments, statistical approaches).	☐ Explanation of study implementation is only partially provided (e.g., basic study design, key variables, measurement instruments, statistical approaches).	☐ Explanation of study implementation is fully provided and offers detail in support of replication by others (e.g., basic study design, key variables, measurement instruments, statistical approaches).	
	Needs Improvement (1 pt)	Adequate (2 pts)	Exemplary (3 pts)	Points Awarded
Significance	☐Potential implications for future research/practice are addressed poorly or not at all.	☐Potential implications for future research/practice are adequately addressed.	□Potential implications for future research/practice are robustly described in alignment with the study rationale.	
	☐The potential significance of the project and/or benefit to others does not justify the proposed budget.	☐The potential significance of the project and/or benefit to others justifies only a portion of the proposed budget.	☐The potential significance of the project and benefit to others fully justifies the proposed budget.	
	\square No evidence of plans to disseminate knowledge.	□Provides limited plans to disseminate knowledge.	□Provides clear plans to disseminate knowledge.	
	☐ Plans for project sustainability are not presented.	☐Limited plans for project sustainability are presented.	☐Fully elaborated plans for project sustainability are presented.	
	Total Points Awarded =			