PRAC Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Poor | Adequate | Excellent |
| Aims, objectives, and measurable outcomes | Objectives are absent or incomplete; are difficult to understand, unrealistic; or appear unmeasurable. | Provides most of the objectives. Some objectives may not be attainable during project period or measurable or are loosely linked to problem/needs. Relevant citations are included in the references. | Objectives clearly address problem/need; are measurable, realistic; clearly define steps to be taken to achieve project goals; provides success indicators; answers questions: who? what? by when? by how much? according to which instrument? Relevant citations are included in the references |
| Description of assessment methods | Methods are absent or incomplete; it is difficult to understand how the project directors will determine if objectives are achieved. Citations and references are missing. . | Includes methods but not entirely clear how they will help determine if objectives are achieved. Relevant citations are included in the references. | Methods to be used, scope, and activities to achieve objectives are clearly stated; contains realistic timelines and tasks. Relevant citations are included in the references |
| Intended uses of finding for program improvement | Fails to address how findings will benefit the program and IU broadly; project will be difficult to replicate; or promises unrealistic benefits. | Provides information on how findings will benefit the program and IU broadly and how project will serve as model. | Clearly establishes how findings will help the program and IU broadly addressing program priorities; how it will serve as state or national model; benefits appear realistic and attainable. |
| Contributions to an assessment plan to enhance student learning | Missing contributions to an assessment plan for enhancing student learning. | Only identifies possible contributions to general assessment plans but does not necessarily apply to student learning. | Identifies how findings of project contribute to an assessment plan that enhances student learning, particularly related to the Profiles of Learning and/or inclusive and equitable student learning experiences. |
| Considerations of equity and inclusion\* | The project description does not consider equity and inclusion with respect to student learning experiences, or the stakeholders involved in the project (other faculty, staff, etc.). | The project description is developed considering the assets or/and barriers related to specific populations of students and stakeholders in the project. Multiple forms of evidence (assessment data) are considered (including student feedback if applicable).  | The project description is developed considering the assets and/or barriers related to specific populations of students and stakeholders in the project. Multiple forms of evidence (assessment data) are considered. Actionable findings serve as an opportunity to advance equity. |
| Appropriateness of budget and justification | No justification provided for the funds requested for the project. | Budget and/or justification does/do not give careful attention to detail. | Budget connects well with the project, justification is appropriate, and is realistic given the size of the project. |
| Newness of idea | Applicant addresses how the program is offered but it is not leading edge or creative. | Applicant identifies how the program is creative in approach, content or delivery. | Engaging, creative, and new pathways to learning and assessment are well documented by the applicant. |
| Clarity of proposal | Long, rambling, vague, uses jargon, passive voice, extraneous information; not engaging reader; written in 1st or 2nd person; contains unsupportable statements or statistics; numerous exaggerations or untruths; key elements are embedded in straight text; complex sentence construction; pages unnumbered. | Writing is generally good, written in third person; generally clear although somewhat wordy, pages numbered, highlights key elements; proposal concept is appropriate but not particularly innovative. | Written in short, clear, crisp sentences in third person; factual; statistics and statements are documented; cites reference sources; key elements highlighted by headings, bullets, italics, etc.; written in active voice; innovative, interesting, exciting to read; simple sentence construction; pages numbered; uses concrete, specific language; pages numbered. |
| Overall recommendation | Do not fund: Proposal is unclear or missing key elements. | Fund if monies are available: Reasonably clear proposal. | Definitely fund: Clear and concise description of the entire project. |

\*These criteria has been developed using guidance from the James Madison University’s [Assessment Improvement Rubric](https://oercommons.org/courseware/related-resource/108484/download) (document will download upon clicking link) which includes criteria for Equity-Centeredness for each step in the assessment process.