

# Faculty Innovation Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

---

## Evaluation Criteria

There are six evaluation criteria and a technical compliance measure by which to assess the STEP 1 proposal. STEP 2 proposals are evaluated according to the same rubric but with added emphasis on viability and sustainability. Please review each category carefully and provide a numerical score according to the rubric scale for each of the six criteria. Weightings for each of the criteria are indicated below and used to provide a summative score for the proposal. Category and summative scores are provided to the proposer along with substantive comments provided by reviewers.

## Category 0 Technical Compliance

Assessed before distribution to review panel.

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Proposal Score
Page/word count	Does not comply with word/page count			Slightly over the page/word count.	Complies with word/page count	
Project Team	Project Team does not meet guidelines				Project team meets guidelines	
Format	Proposal format ignores template form	Proposal missing templated sections or is otherwise incomplete			Proposal format follows template	
<b>Category Score</b>						

Category 0 Weight: 0.05

## Category 1 Scope and Fit

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Proposal Score
Innovation vs. Research or other activity	Other activity	Has elements of innovation but is primarily research	Seems to mix scholarship or other activity with innovation	Mostly scoped to innovation and near-term implementation	Clearly scoped to innovation and near-term implementation	
Project Team	Project Team does not meet guidelines	Project is either inadequately defined or does not have clearly scoped roles	Project team is clearly defined but roles are not well defined.	Project team is appropriate, and roles are somewhat defined	Project team meets guidelines	
Sustainability	No indication of forward plan past FIG funding	Poorly defined forward plan	Sustainability addressed but not fully defined.	Proposal suggests path toward sustainable implementation / use of innovation	Proposal demonstrates clear path toward sustainable implementation / use of innovation	
<b>Category Score</b>						

Category 1 Weight: 0.25

## Category 2 Benefit to Community

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Element Score
Community is well-defined and significant	No effort to clearly define target community	Community is ambiguously defined	Target community is defined but is too broad to be impacted by proposed work	Target community is defined, and relationship to proposed work is somewhat defined	Target community is defined, and relationship to proposed work is clear	
Benefit	The benefit of the proposed work to the target community is not clear	The benefit of the proposed work to the target community lacks sufficient evidence	The benefit of the proposed work to the target community is backed by limited evidence	The benefit of the proposed work to the target community is clear and evidence provided.	The benefit of the proposed work to the target community is clear, evidence is provided, and the proposed work is novel.	
Significance and Scale	The impact of the proposed work is limited in both scale and significance	The impact of the proposed work is limited in either scale or significance	Significance and scale are addressed but lack specificity or evidence.	The impact of the proposed work is scalable and has potential relevance to the target community.	The impact of the proposed work is scalable and has potential high relevance to the target community.	
Category Score						

Category 2 Weight: 0.2

## Category 3 Innovative Use of existing or new technologies

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Element Score
Technology	No effort to implement a new or existing technology	Cursory effort to leverage technology	Technology solution proposed but lacking in implementation specificity or motivation	Strong effort to leverage new or existing technology, implementation plant adequate.	Strong effort to leverage new or existing technology, implementation plant excellent	

Category 3 Weight: 0.1

## Category 4 Outcomes & Assessment

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Element Score
Outcomes	Outcomes poorly defined or ambiguous	Project outcomes defined but do not follow from project activities	Project outcomes defined and some connection to project activities	Project activities well defined and path between activities and outcomes indicated	Project activities well defined and path between activities and outcomes clear and realistic	
Assessment	No effort to provide assessment plan	Outcomes assessment defined but lacking specificity	Outcomes assessment defined but relationship to project objectives not clear	Outcomes assessment defined and related to project objectives	Outcomes assessment well-defined, related to project objectives, and likely to yield project-level insights	
<b>Category Score</b>						

Category 4 Weight: 0.1

## Category 5 Viability

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Element Score
Viability	Project outcomes do not appear to be viable with the resources or team	Project outcomes may be viable but not in the timeframe for STEP 1	Project outcomes likely viable but STEP 1 objectives need clarification.	STEP 1 Project outcomes likely viable	STEP 1 Project outcomes viable; Overall project Objectives also viable.	

Category 5 Weight: 0.2

## Category 6 Budget

Review Element	0	1	2	3	4	Element Score
Budget	Budget is not defined, is out of scope, or does not directly relate to outcomes.	Budget is in scope but relationship to project outcomes unclear or missing.	Budget is in scope, has some relation to project outcomes.	Budget is in scope, is related to project outcomes	Budget is in scope, has clear connections to project outcomes.	

Category 6 Weight: 0.1