Assessment Grant Proposal Review Rubric

PROJECT TITLE: _____

RUBRIC COMPLETED BY: _____   **DATE:** _____

Reviewers will complete the rubric to evaluate the quality of eligible proposals and their alignment with the goals of the assessment grant program.

Criteria	Strong	Satisfactory	Developing
Alignment with assessment grant program goals: The project identifies an area for development or improvement in the program's learning outcomes (or student services programs' goals), assessment practices, or instruments.	The area for development or improvement will significantly improve the program's assessment practices or instruments and focuses on program-level student learning outcomes or student services programs' goals.	The area for development or improvement will somewhat improve the program's assessment practices or instruments and focuses on program-level student learning outcomes or student services programs' goals.	The area for development or improvement is unlikely to affect the program's assessment practices or instruments, or does not focus on program-level student learning outcomes or student services programs' goals.
Logical plan: The project proposes logical actions for addressing the area needing development or improvement.	The planned actions directly respond to and will improve the most important aspect(s) of the area for development or improvement.	The planned actions directly respond to and will develop or improve an aspect of the area for improvement. Additional aspects or a more important aspect could be improved but are not.	The planned actions do not directly respond to and are unlikely to develop or improve the target area.
Budget: The planned expenditures logically support and are necessary for the planned actions, and do not exceed $3000.00.	The planned expenditures logically support and are necessary for the planned actions. The budget request does not exceed $3000.00.	The planned expenditures might support the planned actions, but require more detail or justification. The budget request does not exceed $3000.00.	The planned expenditures do not logically support or are not necessary for the planned actions, or they exceed $3000.00.

Criterion	Strong	Satisfactory	Developing
Collaboration: Multiple stakeholders in the program have an active role in carrying out the proposed project.	Multiple stakeholders in the program have an active role in carrying out the proposed project, thereby increasing its impact.	Multiple stakeholders in the program have agreed to participate but have a limited role in carrying out the proposed project, thereby limiting its impact.	A single stakeholder will carry out the proposed project with limited participation from or impact on other stakeholders in the program.
Scope: The project's scope is manageable given the number of participating individuals, their experience with assessment, and the proposed budget.	There are sufficient individuals with appropriate assessment experience or requests for expert support to complete the project with the proposed budget.	There are sufficient individuals but with limited assessment experience or inadequate requests for expert support, OR too few individuals, but with appropriate experience to complete the project with the proposed budget.	There are too few individuals and limited assessment experience or insufficient/misaligned requests for expert support; it is unlikely they will be able to complete the project with the proposed budget.
Timeline: The project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	The project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	It will be challenging to complete the project within the grant year's timeline without additional help, expertise in assessment, or funds.	It is unlikely that the project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.
Support: The relevant supervisor/chair/unit head understands the demands of the project and the requirements of grant recipients.	The relevant supervisor/chair/unit head enthusiastically supports the proposers' participation in the project and expresses confidence in their ability to complete the project.	The relevant supervisor/chair/unit head agrees to the proposers' participation in the project.	The relevant supervisor/chair/unit head expresses concern about the proposers' participation in the project or the project itself.
Program's assessment grant history: Proposals from programs that have not previously received a grant will have priority.	The program has not received an assessment grant before.	The program has previously received an assessment grant and successfully completed the project. The current proposal is clearly a separate or extension project, not a request for continuing funds.	The program has previously received an assessment grant but did not successfully complete the project, or the current proposal is a request for continuing funds rather than a clearly separate or extension project.

2023 WSU Program Assessment Grant: Proposal Review Rubric

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation for funding: Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for promoting best practices in assessment within the grant period.	Fund this proposal: Most elements received a "Strong" rating; any elements with a "Satisfactory" rating can be easily improved. (Add feedback below.)	Consider this proposal: Some elements were rated "Strong," but others were rated "Satisfactory," indicating some areas that need further development. With feedback, the proposers could improve the project plan. (Add feedback below.)	Do not fund this proposal in its current form: The proposal does not align with the assessment grant program's goals, or several of the elements above were rated as "Developing." (This rating allows the proposers to revise their project plan for consideration in future grant cycles.) (Add feedback below.)

Feedback to proposers:

_____

_____

_____

_____

　　　　　　　　2023 WSU Program Assessment Grant: Proposal Review Rubric