

Name of Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

### Project Fund Application Evaluation Rubric

Components	4 – Outstanding	3 - Commendable	2 - Satisfactory	1 - Poor	Points
<b>Strength of proposed mentoring relationship</b>	Proposed mentoring relationship is clear; role of mentor clearly defined	Relatively clear proposal, but lacking some definition; role of mentor is vague	A number of weaknesses but scope of work is articulated; evidence of some mentoring provided	Proposal is vague and scope of work is poorly identified; no clear mentor role	
<b>Potential for Learning and Student Development (academic, career, personal development)</b>	Project will significantly enhance all three student development aspects	Project will enhance at least two student development aspects	Project may enhance one student development aspect	Enhancement of any student development aspect is less than clear or not likely	
<b>Demonstrated significance of the project and merit of the work</b>	Clearly assesses the role of the proposed project in the field	Provides some evidence of significance	Claims significance but lacks substance	No sense of how the proposed project contributes to the field	
<b>Overall quality of the proposal</b>	Evidences clear understanding of methodology/creative focus	Methodology/creative focus is defined, but not clearly	Lacks some understanding of methodology or creative focus	No evidence of methodology/creative focus	
<b>Application received on time</b>		Received on time		Received late	
<b>Mentor status: full time or part-time employee</b>	Full time		Part-time		
<b>Faculty Status: Tenured or non-tenured</b>	Non-tenured	Tenured			
<b>Budget</b>	Well defined budget and realistic detailed timeline	Budget and/or timeline realistic but missing some detail	Budget and/or timeline not realistic or clearly defined	Budget and/or timeline unrealistic or missing	