

**Scoring Rubric Form
CAES Dean’s Faculty Support Fund**

 Name of Applicant:

 Amount requested: $

 Title of project:

Please enter a score at right for each of the following 5 items using the 5 point scale below.

A consistently “excellent” proposal would thus have the higher score.

The average score for all members’ rating will be provided to the Dean
for determination of funding.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **5-4 Meets or exceeds expectations** | **3-2 Meets some, but not all expectations** | **1-0 Meets few expectations** | **scores** |
| **Application Packet** | Provided a complete proposal addressing 1. merit, 2. value, 3. quality and 4. feasibility/budget, including the abbreviated vita. | Proposal provided three of the four required elements, OR vita did not meet requirements. | Proposal provided less than three of the four elements AND/OR vita did not meet requirements. |       |
| **Merit and Value** | Clearly states the merits of the proposal and its value to the faculty member, the college, and the university with clear and direct connections to pedagogy. | Indicates merit and value to the faculty member, college, or university, but not all. Questions exist as to connections to pedagogy. | Fails to provide connections of merit and value or connect proposal to pedagogy. |       |
| **Quality** | Clear descriptions, terminology was defined and clarified. No questions as to meaning or purpose exist. Validity and significance clearly connects to merit, feasibility, and budget. | A question exists as to the terminology and/or purpose, or could only be determined by context. Validity and significance partially connects to merit, feasibility, and budget. | Terminology is unclear or not written for the college committee (only a person in the field would understand). Weak connections between validity and significance, and merit, feasibility, and budget. |       |
| **Feasibility** | Timeline is clearly articulated and provides evidence the task can be accomplished. Indicates specific elements of project related to grant, if a multi-stage project. | Timeline is vague or does not indicate task can be accomplished in the timeline provided. | Lacks a timeline and evidence for feasibility. |  |
| **Budget** | Provides an itemized budget that observes university regulations. Addresses other sources of funding as stated in the criteria (other than N/A), with specifics about how those sources will be used. | Budget appears to lack items, or does not completely observe university regulations. Other sources of funding are partially addressed. | Does not provide an itemized budget nor shows evidence of, or observance to, university regulations OR does not provide information about other sources of funding. |       |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **TOTAL SCORE:** |       |
|  |  |  |