|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent (5)** | **Good (3)** | **Not Competitive (1)** |
| **Event Significance****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | Event enhances the intellectual and/or creative life of the department, either by contributing to existing efforts or suggesting new avenues of inquiry/artistic expression. Proposal clearly explains how the event will connect SIP to university and public audiences (if appropriate). | The proposal is fundable and articulates a contribution to intellectual/creative life of the department and/or university. The rationale is not fully explained and does not meet the highest standards of significance. | Event reflects the organizer’s own research/creative agenda and does not support broader efforts in research or teaching. There is no indication that revising and resubmitting will change the nature of the event. |
| **Use of Funds****\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | Clear rationale for the amount requested. Organizer has a concrete plan to proceed with the event without the full amount requested from SIP. | The proposal explains a clear need for funds, but it is unclear how they would be spent. Ambiguous representation of external support or backup plan. | No sense of why funding is necessary, how funds will be spent, or how the organizer will proceed without support from SIP. No indication that revising and resubmitting will change this. |