

Organizer: \_\_\_\_\_ Title & Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Excellent (5)</b>	<b>Good (3)</b>	<b>Not Competitive (1)</b>
<b>Event Significance</b> _____	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.
<b>Use of Funds</b> _____	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.

<b>Funding Recommended</b> _____	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not Competitive</b>
-------------------------------------	------------------	-------------	------------------------

(Comments on Reverse)