

Explorance Faculty Grant Scoring Rubric – Bluenotes Global 2020

	Exceptional 7	6	Very Good 5	4	Average 3	2	Needs Improvement 1	Score
I. Project Description Weight: _____ (x 1)	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand; provides sufficient supporting evidence and data; contains original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	Description is understandable; provides some supporting evidence and data; contains some original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	Description does not explain project concisely, or it does not give a general picture of the proposed initiative; provides very little supporting evidence or data; contains no or few original, innovative, or creative aspect(s).	Description is hard to understand; does not provide supporting evidence or data; it is not clear that the project is creative or innovative.				
II. Goals and Timeline Weight: _____ (x 2)	The goals of the project are clearly stated; an appropriate/reasonable timeline provided; full explanation of analytic plan.	The goals of the project are clearly stated; an appropriate/reasonable timeline is provided; partial explanation of the analytic plan.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated; timeline provided is not appropriate/reasonable; no analytic plan.	The goals of the project are not clearly stated; no timeline provided.				
III. Contributions to Curricular Change/Student Learning/Student Success Weight: _____ (x 2)	Clearly articulates an assessment project (e.g. survey, use of formative or summative course evaluation data) that will directly contribute to the substantial improvement of institutional effectiveness and/or multiple identified student learning/student success issues; improvements are indicated by degree of impact or by change in identified key measures.	Clearly articulates an assessment project (e.g. survey, use of formative or summative course evaluation data) that will directly contribute to the improvement of institutional effectiveness and/or at least one identified student learning/student success issue; improvement is indicated by degree of impact or by change in identified key measure(s).	Articulates an assessment project (e.g. survey, use of formative or summative course evaluation data) that may contribute to the improvement of institutional effectiveness and/or an identified student learning/student success issue; may have minimal impact on identified key measures.	Does not articulate an assessment project (e.g. survey, constructive use of course evaluation data) that directly relates to institutional effectiveness and/or a student learning/student success issue; expected impact is low or hard to quantify. Does not identified key measures.				
IV. Budget Weight: _____ (x 1)	Budget is clearly explained, provides suitable granularity, and is appropriate for the proposed project.	Budget is not clearly explained but is appropriate for the proposed initiatives.	Budget is clearly explained but is not appropriate for the proposed project.	Budget is not clearly explained and is not appropriate for the proposed project.				
V. Measurability Weight: _____ (x 1)	Proposal has a clear, data-driven plan to appropriately measure success of project; includes set targets and defines success criteria.	Proposal has a data-driven plan to appropriately measure success of project; includes set targets.	Proposal has a plan to measure success of project, but is not data-driven or is not appropriately accurate; does not include set targets.	Proposal does not have a plan to measure success of project.				

TOTAL SCORE: Project Descriptions _____ + Goals and Timeline _____ + (Contributions to retention/student success X 2 _____) + (Budget and Sustainability X 2 _____) + Measurability _____ = _____.

