

Incentive Grants for Community Engaged Scholarship Evaluation Rubric

Name(s) of Project Proposer(s) _____ Proposal No. _____

Grant Project Title _____

Department _____ College _____ Dept Chair _____

Application and signed community partner agreement letter received by deadline ___yes ___no

| Program Criteria | Excellent (3 points) | Meets (2 points) | Poor/Incomplete/Missing (0 - 1 point) | Score |
|---|--|---|---|-------|
| 1. Project aligns with university CES definition | Clearly explains that there is a mutually beneficial collaboration between the researcher and a community partner outside of the university. It is also very clear that the partnership generates new knowledge beneficial to both parties. The partnership will meet the needs of a community partner, as identified by that partner. | Somewhat explains how the collaboration is mutually beneficial to the researcher and the community partner. Application seems to suggest that new knowledge will be generated that is beneficial to both parties. The partnership appears to meet the needs of a community partner. | It is not clear how the partnership benefits both the researcher and the community, or that new knowledge is being generated that will be beneficial to both parties. The partnership does not meet the needs of the community partner. | |
| 2. Proposer(s) states the purpose of the work per the campus definition of CES | Purpose clearly stated and clearly described, and is relevant to CES. | Purpose stated with some clarity and some description. | Purpose is unclear or missing. Description is vague or missing. Purpose is not related to CES. | |
| 3. Project contributes to the public good/community | The contribution is clearly described, measurable and represents a significant impact | The contribution is described with some clarity, partially measurable and represents some degree of impact | The contribution is minimally described, not measurable with any certainty and represents little impact. | |
| 4. Project aligns with university mission, as relevant to CES | Clearly explains how project aligns with and enhances the university mission through the creation, transfer or application of knowledge | Somewhat explains how project aligns with and enhances the university mission through the creation, transfer or application of knowledge | Does not explain how project aligns with and enhances the university mission through the creation, transfer or application of knowledge. Relation to CES is unclear. | |
| 5. Identifies benefits of project to the academic partner, per the campus definition of CES | Clearly identifies the benefits to the University, faculty and/or students per the campus definition of CES | Somewhat identifies the benefits to the University, faculty and/or students | Benefits to the University, faculty and/or students are unclear or missing. Relation to CES is unclear. | |
| 6. Identifies benefits of project to the community partner, per the campus definition of CES | Clearly identifies the benefits to the community partner | Somewhat identifies the benefits to the community partner | Benefits to the community partner are unclear or missing. Relation to CES is unclear. | |
| 7. Expected outcomes of project including timetable | Clear benchmarks are identified to monitor project; Outcomes connect to the goals of the project; Project milestones are clearly | Most outcomes connect to the goals of the project; Benchmarks are somewhat | Outcomes do not connect to the goals of the project; Benchmarks are unclear; Milestones are not identified; | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | identified within the Incentive Grant timeframe. | clear; Project timetable may fall outside of Incentive Grant timeframe. | Project falls outside of Incentive Grant timeframe. | |
| 8. Dissemination plan/sharing outcomes as appropriate for CES | Clearly outlines a plan to disseminate information/outcomes as appropriate for CES | Somewhat outlines a plan to disseminate information/outcomes | Plan to disseminate information/outcomes is unclear or not defined. Plan is not appropriate for CES | |
| 9. Budget Justification, as relevant to a CES project | Provides detailed budget with explanation; All budget items link to proposal and are specific to supporting documentation. Budget does not exceed \$5,000 | Most budget items link to proposal; Most budget items are specific to supporting documentation. Budget does not exceed \$5,000 | Provides an incomplete budget; or exceeds \$5,000. | |
| TOTAL SCORE (Max Score = 27) | | | | |

*** **Recommended** **Not Recommend**

*****Note:** If Item #1 received a score of 0 or 1, you must not recommend the project be funded.