



**SRI FOUNDATION – DISSERTATION RESEARCH GRANT
PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM, 2014**

Project Title	
Applicant's Name	
Academic Institution	
Review Date	
Reviewer Name	

Applicant must meet eligibility criteria: graduate student, related cultural resource program, and must be ABD.	Yes	No
Is the applicant eligible?		

Which class of award is the applicant applying for? Be sure to rate correct category.	Check
A. Expand Scholarly Impact of Preservation Project(s)	
B. Advance Historic Preservation Practice	

Selection Criteria

Please check the appropriate rating for each element. Points are associated with each response.

1=low, minimal, poor 2=somewhat below average 3=somewhat above average 4=high, excellent

Research Design:	1	2	3	4
Rate the statement of the research problem.				
Rate the clarity of the project goals.				
Rate the logic and methods that connect the source data or information to the stated research objectives (does the plan match the research statement and goals?) In other words, has the applicant thought through the research from data to conclusion?				
Rate the likelihood that the applicant will successfully complete the project. Is it doable?				
Provide an overall rating for Research Design and its potential for advancing academic knowledge. (Sections 1 and 3)				

Research Impact:	1	2	3	4
Rate how well applicant incorporates data from completed historic preservation projects?				
For A proposals, rate how well applicant's research will expand on the scholarly impact of previous works.				
For B proposals, rate how well applicant's research will significantly advance historic preservation practice.				
Provide an overall rating for the potential impact of the project to one or more fields related to historic preservation if it were to succeed. (Section 2)				



Name of Student _____

Proposed Public Products: What is the likelihood that the proposed outreach products will result in a <i>significant</i> increase in understanding and appreciation for historic preservation?	Yes	No
Are the proposed products appropriate means to share research results?		
Are the proposed products creative or innovative?		
Are they intended for a national audience?		
Are they intended for a vital local audience?		
	1	2
	3	4
Provide an overall rating of the likelihood that these public products would effectively increase public understanding of an aspect of historic preservation (Section 4)		

Qualifications: Does the applicant have the promise to achieve significant scholarly achievement, as presented in application?	Yes	No
Does the applicant have a strong academic record?		
Has the applicant received awards?		
Has the applicant's work been published?		
Has the applicant presented research at conferences, workshops, or other venues?		
	1	2
	3	4
Provide an overall rating for applicant's qualifications (Section 5)		

Anticipated Costs: Is the budget is clear and appropriate to the project activity?	1	2	3	4
Rate how clearly the allocation/use of SRIF funds is identified in the application.				
Rate the overall project budget and whether it is realistic.				
Rate how appropriate is the use of SRI funds.				
Provide an overall rating for the appropriateness of the budget (Section 6)				

Note: The total score for each proposal will be summed from the overall ratings given in each Section above. Possible range: 5–20. This score, plus overall assessment, will be used to identify proposals in the top half of all rankings. Committee discussions will focus on proposals in the top half of all scores.

Overall Assessment. What is your overall assessment of the project? For example, is the proposed research innovative and insightful, uninspired and mechanical, or something in between?

Feedback to Applicant. What would you suggest to the student to improve his/her proposal? Should we ask the applicant to resubmit?