

INDICATORS OF STRONG JPC PROJECTS:

- Build on group members' previous research, previous projects, previous experience
- Discuss courses taken (or that will be taken) and clearly state the skills and knowledge each group member acquired as a result
- Propose projects that have a reasonable scope for the team, the community partner and the budget. Think seriously about what can you really get done in a summer, a month or in one day a week.
- Address language skills and cultural fluency of all group members if project will be conducted abroad. State language skills of team members, previous travel experience in country
- Address frankly what cultural barriers exist and how they will be addressed sensitively and appropriately. This applies to all projects, not just projects conducted in a foreign country.
- Have a research question that is relevant and located with an distinct academic context.
- Demonstrate ongoing engagement with the faculty advisor—multiple meetings, emails, conversations, classes—and with the community partner—multiple meetings, emails, phone calls, visits
- Have group members with the skills necessary for their tasks (if someone is doing statistical analysis, they have received a decent grade in statistics, e.g.)
- Have group members who clearly describe their role, tasks, and contributions to the project
- Have a Work Plan that is detailed, has phases/stages to the project over many weeks, and assignments of titled roles to specific team members
- Includes a faculty advisor letter that discusses specific knowledge, experience or skills of each group member and provides broader academic and/or social context for the engagement. The letter might also discuss connections to his/her own research and teaching.
- Provides a Community partner letter that discusses prior contact with team members and/or faculty advisor, understands project scope and plan, states clearly what organization is and is not providing the team, welcomes the outcome of the project and sees potential benefit for organization's overall operations
- Are self aware, meaning the group understands the limits and boundaries of the service project and the research and explicitly states them in the project narrative.
- Has prior experience or knowledge about IRB
- Clearly state plans for safety, health and medical emergencies, and communication strategies (cell phones, internet access, etc.). This applies to all projects, not just projects in foreign countries.
- Cite sources and research to support statements about conditions, problem or situation in a location
- Have prior experience in developing community partnerships where there is a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge, resources, and experience between student(s) and community

INDICATORS OF JPC WEAK PROJECTS:

- Lack faculty input or guidance about research background and/or methodology or faculty advisor's work is not related in any way to the JPC project
- Work plans and steps to completion are too vague, brief or general
- Group members repeat the same thing about their role in the project and there is no specificity to their tasks
- Budget has no detail, is too general or too large for the project proposed
- Lack of critical analysis or understanding of population served/engaged
- Project scope is too broad, too over-reaching, tries to do too much in too short amount of time: Tries "save the village" in two weeks
- Is unaware of limits to research or to service, tries to do it all and does not address sustainability of project or service provided
- Group members only discuss how the project will benefit them personally and do not demonstrate awareness of impact on community
- Project does not have a demonstrable positive impact on community
- Research lacks a control group or a way to test findings
- Research methodology includes surveys, interviews and focus groups but team members do not have any experience in using these tools in an academic setting
- Project narrative makes generalizations about the state of affairs in a country, city, or community without citing credible academic sources
- Focus only on unidirectional outreach and do not seek a mutually beneficial engagement with community partner
- Community partner letter is vague and unclear about its role and/or the support it will provide to the student
- Letters from faculty and community partner reveal little to no communication prior to JPC deadline. There has been very little interaction or discussion of project and its mutual benefits to the community, the students, and the faculty advisor.