



Criteria	0-1	2-3	4-5	Score
I. Research Project Description & Significance	Description of research is missing or too unclear for an interdisciplinary audience. Contribution to research or scholarship in the field is missing (0) or negligible.	Description of research is adequate for an interdisciplinary audience. Contribution to research or scholarship to the field appears strong and project is described clearly.	Description of research is very clearly stated for an interdisciplinary audience, and significance in the field appears exceptional.	
II. Significance of Travel to Scholarly Development	Proposal lacks (0) or makes a poor academic justification for travel (i.e., for our purposes, experiencing new places is not a strong justification). Research is not being disseminated or no discussion of data being gathered; project or product is not (minimally) enhanced by travel.	Proposal makes an academic justification for travel; Research is being disseminated but no students are anticipated to travel on the trip. Data is being gathered for later student use, but no students are travelling. Opportunity for scholarly development needs improved organization or clarity, or needs elaboration.	Proposal provides excellent academic justification for travel; Students are presenting research, gathering data or are fully immersed in the research purposes, with or without faculty mentors present. Opportunity for scholarly development is exceptionally clear and travel provides significant contribution to reaching research aims.	
III. Clarity of Mentee & Mentor Roles	Roles of student and mentor are lacking (0) or poorly defined. Potential for student growth is unclear.	Roles during research and during travel are discussed. Integration of student into scholarly process is clear, mentor responsibilities are identified, thoughtful, and allow for intellectual and professional growth of student.	Roles during research and during travel are clearly defined. Potential for intellectual and professional growth of student is exceptional; Mentor responsibilities are thoughtful, and allow for significant mutual benefit. Vertical or multiple levels of mentorship are involved.	
IV. Budget Justification	Budget is missing or incomplete (0); Budget shows inefficient or minimally efficient use of funds.	Budget is complete, stated clearly, and request is reasonable for project.	Budget is complete, stated clearly, and request is reasonable for project. Budget shows attempts to maximize the use of funds.	
Overall Quality of Application	Application is incomplete, unprofessional (e.g., spelling, grammar, formatting errors), or did not follow requested format. Research described appears inadequate for university scholarship or shows little value to students or faculty mentors.	Application is organized, written for an interdisciplinary audience, and follows the requested format. Description justifies how the travel supports faculty and students.	Application is highly organized, written for an interdisciplinary audience, and follows the requested format. Description goes beyond justification to show how the travel supports, faculty, students and or university mission.	
Total Score				
Reviewer Comments :				