

Mini-Grant Proposal

56 points total		4 = Excellent	3 = Satisfactory	2 = Marginal	1 = Unacceptable
Max. Content					
4	Summary and pitch	Clear one-sentence pitch, 1-2 paragraph summary that meets requirements	Adequate summary and one-sentence pitch	Partial or vague summary of policy issue	No summary and pitch
6	Motivation	Need for intervention motivated clearly using outside sources	Some discussion of motivation with limited use of sources	Limited discussion of motivation	No discussion of motivation
6	Innovation and impact	Paper convincingly argues intervention is innovative and impactful, using evidence from outside sources	Paper argues intervention is innovative and impactful, some evidence from sources	Innovation and impact argued to limited degree, minimal use of outside sources	No use of outside evidence, no discussion of innovation/impact
12	Measuring success and lessons learned	Includes description of reasonable RCT to evaluate impact, with all required components	Adequate plan randomized impact evaluation, but some elements missing	Limited plan for randomized impact evaluation - missing most elements or with extremely sparse detail	No discussion of randomized impact evaluation
2	Potential to scale	Argues clearly and logically that proposed intervention can be scaled	Argues that proposed intervention can be scaled, but limited critical thinking and/or evidence	Minimal discussion of potential to scale, or broadly unsupported claims	No discussion of potential to scale
8	Critical thinking and synthesis	Presentation of ideas - whether new or extensions - demonstrate independent thought, critical thinking, and deep understanding of course concepts	Ideas and discussion demonstrate some independent thought and critical thinking	Ideas and discussion demonstrate limited independent thought and critical thinking	Ideas and discussion demonstrate no independent thought or critical thinking
6	References	At least 3 references from peer-reviewed academic journals, at least 2 from non-assigned readings, cited appropriately and consistently in-text and in references list	1-2 peer reviewed references, at least 1 from peer-reviewed academic journals, or references cited inconsistently within text or references section	Minimal use of citations when needed, incomplete reference section	No outside sources referenced

56 points total		4 = Excellent	3 = Satisfactory	2 = Marginal	1 = Unacceptable
Appearance and style					
4	Organization	Well organized, easy to understand, within page limit	Good organization, some parts out of place, over page limits	Unclear organization	Disorganized, impedes understanding
8	Aesthetics, style and grammar	Clear and easy to read; few grammatical errors / attractive slides with clear narration	Awkward or wordy writing, clear planning. Some errors, do not impede understanding. / Slides overly crowded or with minor errors, can follow narration, but some discussion unclear	Readable but difficult to follow text / slides poorly formatted, numerous typos, narration sometimes rambling or unclear	Writing difficult to understand / Slide deck and narration make points difficult to understand