

AACDC MINI-GRANT APPLICATION EVALUATION RUBRIC

Total Possible	Score
45 points	

This rubric provides evaluative criteria for mini-grant proposals in five areas:

- The proposal clearly addresses the purpose of the mini-grant.
- The proposal clearly states its objective, including how the proposed activity addresses an ongoing need
- The proposal clearly demonstrates the applicant’s ability, or opportunity to develop ability, to accomplish proposed activity.
- The proposal clearly describes how its anticipated impact will be measured.
- The proposal clearly details its anticipated budget in terms of accuracy, reasonability, good use, and sustainability.

Objective clearly stated and addresses an ongoing need – 10 pts.

Component	Excellent – 5 pts	Good – 4 pts	Average – 3 pts	Poor – 0 pts
Intended impact of the proposed activity for division staff is clearly stated.	The proposal clearly states what the proposed activity is intended to accomplish for division staff, with descriptive examples.	The proposal gives some detail about what the proposed activity is intended to accomplish for division staff, but lacks examples.	The proposal makes some mention of what the proposed activity is intended to accomplish for division staff, but does not give detail.	The proposal does not mention what the proposed activity is intended to accomplish for division staff.
Proposed activity addresses an ongoing need.	The proposal clearly identifies an ongoing need that will be addressed by the proposed activity, with descriptive examples.	The proposal gives some detail about an ongoing need that will be addressed by the proposed activity, but lacks examples.	The proposal makes some mention of an ongoing need that will be addressed by the proposed activity, but does not give detail.	The proposal does not mention an ongoing need that will be addressed by the proposed activity.

Demonstrates the applicant’s ability, or opportunity to develop ability, to accomplish proposed activity – : 20 pts

Component	Excellent – 5 pts	Good – 4 pts	Average – 3 pts	Poor – 0 pts
Applicant’s experience related to the proposed activity clearly described.	Applicant’s experience, or opportunity to build experience, is clearly described with descriptive examples.	Applicant’s experience, or opportunity to build experience, is sufficiently described, but lacks concrete examples.	Applicant’s experience, or opportunity to build experience, is mentioned but without necessary detail.	Applicant’s experience related to the proposed activity is not addressed.
Existing efforts related to the proposed activity are clearly identified.	Clear evidence of research into existing efforts; Detailed description of how proposed activity will relate to existing efforts.	Awareness of existing efforts is evident; some effort made to link proposed activity to existing efforts.	Some awareness of existing efforts is evident, but without detail.	No awareness of or evidence of research into existing efforts related to the proposed activity.

Component	Excellent – 10 pts	Good – 8 pts	Average – 6 pts	Poor – 0 pts
Individual: Applicant clearly states how the proposed activity will impact her/his ongoing job responsibilities.	Detailed description of how proposed activity fits job description, including descriptive examples.	Detailed description of how proposed activity fits into job responsibilities, but lacks concrete examples.	Some description of how the proposed activity will fit into job responsibilities, but lacks detail.	No description or evidence that the applicant has considered how the proposed activity will fit into job responsibilities.
Program: Proposal clearly describes how the proposed activity outcomes will be shared across their department and/or division.	Detailed description of how outcomes will be shared, including descriptive examples.	Detailed description of how outcomes will be shared, but lacks concrete examples.	Some description of how the outcomes of the proposed activity will be shared, but lacks detail.	No description of how outcomes will be shared.

Describes how impact of the proposed activity will be measured – 5 pts.

Component	Excellent – 5 pts	Good – 4 pts	Average – 3 pts	Poor – 0 pts
The impact of the proposed activity on division staff measurable.	The proposal details the expected impact in measurable terms and provides a plan for measuring lasting impact for division staff.	The proposal details the expected impact for division staff in measurable terms such as number of persons impacted, breadth of influence, or span of time.	There is some evidence that the expected impact for division staff is measurable, but lacks detail.	The expected impact is not measurable.

Budget sufficiently detailed – 10 pts.

Component	Excellent – 5 pts	Good – 4 pts	Average – 3 pts	Poor – 0 pts
The proposed budget is reasonable, accurate and detailed.	The proposed budget is accurate, detailed, and shows evidence of research into costs.	The proposed budget is both accurate and reasonable, and gives some detail to how funds will be spent.	The proposed budget is arithmetically accurate, but does not reflect actual costs.	There proposed budget is unreasonable or arithmetically inaccurate. The proposed budget over- or underestimates cost; no evidence of research of costs.
The proposal addresses sustainability of the proposed activity in terms of funding.	The proposal details how the proposed activity will be sustained, including commitment from other sources.	The proposal details how the proposed activity will be sustained after mini-grant funding is spent.	The proposal mentions sustaining the proposed activity after the mini-grant funding is spent, but does not provide detail.	The proposal does not address how the proposed activity will be sustained after mini-grant funding is spent.