

Criterion	Weight	1	2	3	4	5	FYI Column
Clarity of Purpose	20%	There is not an identifiable central purpose, research question or central premise to the proposal		Central purpose fairly clear, research question or central premise is not clear or specific enough		Clearly stated central purpose, research question or central premise is clear and readily apparent to the audience	Clarity is related to the degree to which the way they've written their intro and the info they've chosen to include leads you to perceive their purpose (research aims/goals) as a logical 'next step'.
Appropriateness of methodology (*or alternate mode of inquiry/rigor of approach, keeping in mind the requirements of a particular field)	20%	The methodology and/or design did not support the central purpose, hypothesis or research question. Methodology was not clear or was lacking altogether.		Methodology and/or design were discussed, but there was some difficulty understanding them; methodology lacked some detail; did not clearly support the central purpose of the research.		Methodology and/or design for exploring the central purpose clearly stated; presented logical steps and/or appropriate information that clearly addresses the central purpose of the research with adequate detail provided.	
Interpretation of Results (Criteria do not imply that the project must be data-driven; creative and nonempirical projects may earn high scores. For empirical projects: no data 1 point, preliminary data/data collection in progress 2-3 points, data collection and interpretation 4-5 points.)	20%	Very limited to no interpretation of results and a vague link to the central purpose, hypothesis, or research question.		Appropriate information or data were collected, described and linked to the purpose of the research; more in-depth analysis was needed to provide the audience with deeper or more complex insights.		Appropriate information or data were collected, clearly described, and interpreted with a demonstrable understanding and clear link to the purpose of the research; shows a thoughtful, in-depth analysis that provides the audience with insights.	
Value of the Research or Creative Activity	20%	There is no discussion or very limited discussion of the value of the research. Research is not original nor significant inside or outside the discipline.		Value of the research is mentioned; insufficient discussion of the background and scope to be able to determine the value of this research. Research lacks originality or significance inside or outside the discipline.		Value of the research is persuasively argued within the established background and limitations of the research topic, or another persuasive way. The results are original and have significant contribution inside or outside the discipline.	Value refers to how well they've justified their purpose (research aims/goals) as 'necessary' or important to their topic/area of study. Also a reminder that the summaries should allow for a person not from the exact discipline (but a related one) to get the general idea of the student's project. For example, a KIN submission should be written so that someone in health sciences or public health could follow along (so not overly jargony writing, or jargon needs to be defined).
Ability of the Presenter to articulate the research or creative activity and organization of the presented materials	20%	Had difficulty communicating about the research project, proposal lacked organizational structure, was well outside of page limits.		Demonstrated ability to communicate about the research, but not always clearly, discussed some aspects of the research more cogently than others; somewhat organized.		Demonstrated ability to make complex ideas understandable using appropriate language and examples for readers both in and outside the discipline. Well-organized, clear, interesting and easy to follow.	