

<b>Criteria-Scholarship</b>	3. Exceeds standard	2. Meets standard	1. Does not meet standard
<b>A. Clarity of purpose of scholarship</b>	3: Project clearly addresses questions/needs of more than one of the following: scholar, community partner, institution	2: Project addresses questions/needs of only one of the following: Scholar, community partner, institution	1: Project's purpose hard to discern and its impacts are vague
<b>B. Effective presentation of proposal</b>	3: Proposal is well-organized. Absence of jargon and confusing verbiage - ideas clearly expressed.	2: Proposal is either organized or ideas are not clearly expressed. Reviewers experience difficulty quickly grasping central ideas.	1: Proposal lacks organization; central ideas are not readily grasped.
<b>C. Adequate prep &amp; appropriate methods</b>	3: Researcher understands prior, related work; uses appropriate methods and describes them clearly	2: Researcher makes passing reference to prior work OR specifies appropriate methods	1: Researcher does not clearly specify either prior, relevant work OR methods employed in project
<b>D. Helpful/informative inferences drawn</b>	3: The project presents helpful/informative/specific inferences or conclusions for <b>the community partner, scholar and/or institution</b>	2: Inferences or conclusions are presented; less specific than those in D3; and/or presented only for one of the following: community partner, scholar, or institution	1: Inferences/conclusions vague or missing; reviewer has to work to figure out if they are present
<b>E. Results specified; work refines or extends scholar's knowledge base</b>	3: Clear indication of results AND how scholar's/community partner's/institution's knowledge base was refined or extended by project.	2: Results OR knowledge improvement noted, but in ways that are less explicit than E3	1: No reference to research benefit of project, or reference in only the vaguest terms - e.g. 'my understanding of x was enhanced'

<p><b>F.</b>  <b>Work contributes in measurable ways to community partner</b></p>	<p>3: Projects demonstrates clear, measurable benefit(s) to community partner</p>	<p>2: Project indicates benefit to community partner but does not provide sufficient evidence to support benefit (e.g. 'staff felt more empowered')</p>	<p>1: The project does not indicate any benefit to community partner</p>
<p><b>G.</b>  <b>Scholar's project fits with goals of community project</b></p>	<p>3: The project clearly demonstrates a contribution to community partner mission or goals</p>	<p>2: The project refers to community Partner mission/goals, but in a manner less explicit than in G3</p>	<p>1: There is no reference to community partner's mission/goals</p>
<p><b>H.</b>  <b>Work contains reflection on process, lessons learned, and/or benefit to agency</b></p>	<p>3: The project makes clear reflection on process/lessons learned, as well as benefit to agency</p>	<p>2: The project makes some reference, but in a manner less explicit than in H3</p>	<p>1: The project presents no apparent reflection</p>