

	<b>Excellent (5 points)</b>	<b>Good (4 points)</b>	<b>Average (3 points)</b>	<b>Fair (2 points)</b>	<b>Poor (1 point)</b>
<b>Background/Rationale: Does the background sufficiently articulate the motivation for the objectives of the study and avoid the use of jargon? Is it clear what research gap the author is addressing with their work? (5 points possible)</b>	<p>*Sufficient background provided for the study objectives/hypotheses.</p> <p>*Clearly and evidently articulates an important research gap.</p> <p>*Information follows a logical flow from broader context to specific question.</p> <p>*Jargon avoided or explained.</p>	<p>*Critical background details to motivate hypotheses/objectives present. May include a few extraneous details.</p> <p>*Reader can infer an important research gap from prior knowledge, but it is not evidently stated by the author.</p> <p>*Information follows a logical flow from broader context to specific question.</p> <p>*Contains some undefined jargon, but jargon does not prevent reader comprehension.</p>	<p>*Some critical details necessary to understand the objectives/hypotheses are missing, although most of the information presented is relevant.</p> <p>*Research gap is not clearly evident from the details provided or is evident but the importance is not articulated.</p> <p>*Some broader context of the research presented but this context is not clearly linked to the specific research question.</p> <p>*Jargon prevents complete comprehension, although major points are still clear.</p>	<p>*Many critical details missing.</p> <p>*Important research gap is not evident from the details provided.</p> <p>*Broader context presented is insufficient or irrelevant. Information does not follow a logical presentation from broader context to specific question.</p> <p>*Use of jargon makes comprehension difficult.</p>	<p>*Background information is irrelevant or insufficient for the study objectives.</p> <p>*Important research gap is not evident from the details provided.</p> <p>*Broader context of the work is entirely missing. Information does not follow a logical flow.</p> <p>*Use of jargon prevents reader comprehension.</p>
<b>Objective AND Hypotheses: Are the objectives/hypotheses clearly articulated, follow from the information given in the background, and scientifically sound? (5 points possible)</b>	<p>*Objectives/hypotheses clearly follow from the background/rationale and are appropriate, feasible, and clear.</p> <p>*Objectives/hypotheses are specific and concise.</p>	<p>*Objectives/hypotheses flow logically from the background/rationale and are appropriate, feasible and clear.</p> <p>*Objectives could be edited to improve specificity and conciseness.</p>	<p>*Objectives and hypotheses mostly make sense in the context of the background/rationale, although some elements do not flow logically from the information provided. Most, but not all, elements of the objectives and hypotheses are appropriate and feasible.</p> <p>*Objectives and hypotheses could have benefitted from a thorough editing to improve specificity and conciseness.</p>	<p>*Objectives/hypotheses do not flow logically from the background/rationale and are not entirely appropriate or feasible.</p> <p>*Objectives and hypotheses section are neither specific nor concise, preventing reader comprehension.</p>	<p>*Objectives/hypotheses are not stated clearly enough to evaluate whether they sufficiently address the background/rationale and/or not appropriate or feasible.</p> <p>*Alternatively, objectives/hypotheses are absent from the proposal entirely.</p>

<p><b>Methods: Are the research methods well-conceived and organized? Are the methods appropriate for the student's objective/hypotheses? (5 points possible)</b></p>	<p>*Methods are described in sufficient detail to evaluate their appropriateness for the objectives/hypotheses.</p> <p>*Methods are concise and organized.</p>	<p>*Methods include most critical details necessary to evaluate their appropriateness for the objectives/hypotheses. Some details are missing/extraneous information is added, but this does not take away from the overall presentation of the methods.</p> <p>*Methods need some work on conciseness and organization.</p>	<p>*Methods are missing several critical details OR include several extraneous details but can still be evaluated for their overall appropriateness to the objectives/hypotheses.</p> <p>*Methods need significant work on conciseness and organization and would have benefitted from a thorough proofreading.</p>	<p>*Methods are missing so many critical details OR include so much extraneous information that it is difficult to evaluate whether they are appropriate/sufficient for the study at hand.</p> <p>*Methods are neither concise nor organized, preventing reader comprehension.</p>	<p>*Methods are not appropriate or do not make sense in the context of the study at hand.</p> <p>*Alternatively, methods section is absent from the proposal entirely.</p>
<p><b>Results OR Expected Results: Are the results concise, clear, and accurate? (5 points possible)</b></p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>*Results are connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*If relevant, quantitative results with appropriate summary statistics are reported.</p> <p>*All hypotheses/objectives addressed.</p> <p><u>Expected Results</u></p> <p>*Expected results are connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*Expected results are specific and scientifically sound.</p> <p>*All hypotheses/objectives addressed.</p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>*Results are connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*Quantitative results are reported but focus on statistical significance rather than directional responses.</p> <p>*All hypotheses/objectives addressed.</p> <p><u>Expected Results</u></p> <p>*Expected results are connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*Expected results are scientifically sound but some lack specificity.</p> <p>*All hypotheses/objectives addressed.</p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>*Results are not fully connected to the hypotheses and study objectives.</p> <p>*Results are discussed quantitatively but important summary statistics are not reported.</p> <p>*A majority of hypotheses/objectives addressed, but not all.</p> <p><u>Expected Results</u></p> <p>*Expected results are connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*Expected results are either too general or are not scientifically justifiable given the presented information.</p> <p>*A majority of hypotheses/objectives addressed, but not all.</p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>*Results are not clearly connected to the hypotheses and study objectives.</p> <p>*Results are not discussed quantitatively and appropriate summary statistics are not presented.</p> <p>*Several objectives/hypotheses are not addressed.</p> <p><u>Expected Results</u></p> <p>*Expected results are not clearly connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives.</p> <p>*Expected results are too general and are not scientifically justifiable.</p> <p>*Several objectives/hypotheses are not addressed.</p>	<p><u>Results</u></p> <p>*Results are not connected to the hypotheses and study objectives or are not discussed at all.</p> <p>*Results are not discussed quantitatively and appropriate summary statistics are not presented.</p> <p>*No hypotheses/objectives are addressed.</p> <p><u>Expected Results</u></p> <p>*Expected results are not connected to the hypotheses and the study objectives or are not discussed at all.</p> <p>*Expected results are too general and are not scientifically justifiable.</p> <p>*No hypotheses/objectives addressed.</p>

<b>Broader Significance: Does the student articulate the significance of their contribution to broader topics/issues in freshwater science? (5 points possible)</b>	<p>*Broader significance is specific to the study.</p> <p>*Broader significance is logical given the context provided throughout the proposal.</p>	<p>*Broader significance isn't sufficiently specific to the study.</p> <p>*Broader significance is logical given the context provided throughout the proposal.</p>	<p>*Broader significance isn't specific to the study.</p> <p>*Broader significance requires the reader to infer the relevance to the provided context.</p>	<p>*Broader significance is too generic.</p> <p>*The relevance of the broader significance cannot be inferred from the provided context.</p>	<p>*Broader significance is absent or contains incorrect information.</p>
<b>Style/Formatting/Grammar: Is the proposal formatted correctly and free of grammatical errors? Is redundancy avoided? Is the writing clear and easy to understand? (5 points possible)</b>	<p>*Zero formatting and grammatical issues.</p> <p>*The author makes good use of the space allotted and there is no redundancy.</p> <p>*The writing is clear and easy to understand.</p>	<p>*Only a few formatting/grammatical issues.</p> <p>*The author makes good use of the space allotted. Minimal redundancy.</p> <p>*Most of the writing is clear and easy to understand.</p>	<p>*More than a few formatting or grammatical issues.</p> <p>*The author could have more effectively used the space allotted (e.g., to better explain some concepts or to provide more important details). There is some redundancy.</p> <p>*The writing is understandable but could be significantly edited to improve clarity.</p>	<p>*Formatting and grammatical issues are abundant throughout the proposal.</p> <p>*The author did not make good use of the space allotted. Redundancies present throughout.</p> <p>*The writing is difficult to understand and lacks clarity.</p>	<p>*So many formatting and grammatical issues that the proposal is hard to read.</p> <p>*The author did not make good use of the space allotted. Redundancies present throughout.</p> <p>*The writing is not understandable or clear.</p>
<b>References: Are relevant citations included and formatted correctly within literature cited and in-text citations? (5 points possible)</b>	<p>*Two to three relevant citations included with proper <i>Freshwater Science</i> formatting.</p>	<p>*Two to three citations included that are almost free of formatting errors.</p>	<p>*Only one or greater than three citations. Limited issues identified with citation formatting.</p>	<p>*Only one or greater than three citations. Major issues identified with citation formatting.</p>	<p>*No citations are provided.</p>