

## Staff Career Development Grant Application Rubric

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

Application Type:  Individual  Group 2-10  Group 11+

Amount Requested: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section 1:

Use the scale outlined below to award points for each category.

Category	Excellent 9-10 points	Good 7-8 points	Average 4-6 points	Below Average 1-3 points	Points Awarded
<b>Professional Development Activity</b>	The details of the proposal are thorough and clearly outlines how the learning activity supports the desired outcome.  The importance of the proposed learning activity to the individual or group is compelling.	The proposal is complete and provides adequate detail supporting the learning activity.  The importance of the learning activity to the individual or group is present.	The proposal is vague or lacks significant detail.  Meets only the minimum requirements for submission	Proposal is incomplete.  Supportive documentation is not included or not well organized.  The importance of the learning activity is missing.	_____
<b>Points awarded for Category 1: _____ x 4 (40 points possible)</b>					
<b>Benefits to Applicant(s), Unit, and University</b>	A detailed explanation and a compelling case describe a significant benefit to the applicant(s), the unit, and the university.	A benefits statement is included with descriptions for at least two of the three areas.	A benefits statement is present but vague for two of the three areas.	The benefits statement is vague in all three areas.	_____
<b>Points awarded for Category 2: _____ x 4 (40 points possible)</b>					
<b>Budget</b>	Budget section is fully complete and estimates for all expenses are provided.	Expenses are itemized.  Website links are provided to reference expenses in lieu of attachments.	Budget lacks detailed itemization or reference to sources.	Budget information is vague or nonexistent.	_____
<b>Points awarded for Category 3: _____ x 2 (20 points possible)</b>					
<b>Total Points Awarded (100 points possible)</b>					_____

### Section 2 (Optional):

Discretionary ("Heart") Points. Reviewer may award up to five "heart" points for extraordinary circumstances described in the proposal. Reviewer must provide a clear and compelling rationale for awarding discretionary points. Consensus among reviewer subgroups is required.

Discretionary Points Awarded (5 points possible): \_\_\_\_\_

Discretionary Points Rationale
--------------------------------