

Name of Applicant:

Name of Reviewer:

<b>ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH MERIT (25 total points in this category)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>5 = comprehensive explanation of the topic 3-4 = partial or somewhat reasonable; informative 1-2 = incomplete, confusing, or implausible 0 = ineffective or absent</i>		
a) Communication of the research purpose (5)		
b) Significance and Background (5)		
c) Hypothesis or Specific Aims (5)		
d) Methods or Techniques (5)		
e) Potential Problems and Results (5)		
<b>BUDGET &amp; PROJECT TIMELINE (10 points)</b>		
<i>8-10 = well-planned, appropriate, manageable 5-7 = acceptable, some minor issues or concerns 1-5 = unrealistic, inappropriate, and/or vague 0 = not described</i>		
<b>APPLICANT ABILITY (10 total points)</b>		
<i>5 = strong background, training, and/or experience appropriate to the level of the applicant or organization 3-4 = some background, and/or experience 1-2 = little background and/or experience 0 = lacks background and/or experience (unlikely to complete successful, timely research)</i>		
a) Resumé or CV (5)		
b) Letters of recommendation (5)		
<b>TRAINING AND MENTORING (10 points)</b>		
<i>9-10 = project is independently designed by a student or avocational archaeologist working with a professional (academic or CRM) mentor 6-8 = the project is designed by an organization or professional to train community member(s), intern(s), or student archaeologist(s) 2-5 = training and mentoring are not clearly described or are a minimal part of the project 0-1 = very vague or not explicitly addressed</i>		
<b>WISCONSIN ARCHEOLOGY FOCUS (5 points)</b>		
<i>5 = significant and innovative focus on WI arch 3-4 = average, less innovative focus on WI arch 1-2 = unconvincing or general focus on WI arch 0 = not explicitly addressed</i>		
<b>TOTAL (60)</b>		

Final Qualitative Assessment: (Choose One). Based on all of the above criteria, I rate this project as:

Outstanding

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Non-fundable