

Chapman & Innovation Grant Scoring Rubric

	Feasibility	Partnership	Community Impact	Objectives and Goals	Project Plan	Innovation	Learning Objectives	Budget
Relevant documents	Whole application package	Whole application package (particularly Q's 7 - 10 and partner letter of support)	Whole application package and partner letter of support	Objectives and goals (Q 4)	Project description, timeline and milestones (Q's 1-5)	Project innovations statement (Q 6)	Learning summary (Q 11)	Budget
Weight	5%	20%	20%	10%	15%	5%	15%	10%
Score of 1	Resources, timelines and goals are unfeasible and unrealistic.	Relationship does not appear to be balanced. CP role is unclear. Proposal lacks consideration for meaningful and respectful interaction with community.	Project does not consider community needs. Short-term vision for project with no sustainable benefits.	Objectives are vague and disconnected from the goal(s) identified.	Vague timeline with incomplete picture of project milestones, tasks and activities. Description does not answer the 5 W's.	Does not demonstrate unique approach. Project duplicates existing initiatives/ programs without new approach.	Statements expressed are not true learning objectives. Applicant does not demonstrate understanding of the grant as a learning opportunity.	Costs/Expenses contains multiple errors, lacks detail or lacks thoughtful consideration of project needs. Budget is highly unfeasible and unrealistic.
Score of 2	Resources, timelines and goals require adjustments.	CP relationship is vague. Roles and responsibilities for each partner/actor are unclear/undefined.	Community voice present although further consultation is needed.	Objectives are outlined but not well scoped. Connection between goal/vision and objectives is unclear/vague.	Timeline requires a few clarifications to milestones, tasks and activities. Description answers a few of the 5 W's.	Project is a slight variation on existing initiatives/ programs.	Learning objectives are unclear or unrealistic, not connected to project objectives.	Costs/Expenses are improperly estimated, vague or unnecessary. 1-2 areas are unrealistic and require improvement.
Score of 3	Project feasibility outlined although may require small adjustments.	Proposal outlines partnership clearly with roles and responsibilities outlined. Mutual benefit requires minor elaboration or clarity.	Community voice is present. Community benefit is clear and sustainable, but requires further clarity.	Proposal articulates clear goals and project objectives, but needs to outline with greater clarity a plan for accomplishing these goals.	Timeline requires small adjustments. Project milestones, tasks and activities are clear. Description answers the 5 W's.	Project addresses an issue in a unique way. Project expands on existing models or programs.	Realistic learning objectives. Some clarity needed to connect them to project objectives.	Budget is accurate and comprehensive. Small/ minor adjustments required. Budget connected to project objectives.
Score of 4	Project is achievable and resilient.	Mutual and balanced relationship articulated. Clearly outlines key activities performed by each actor. Clearly outlines community partner collaboration.	Community voice is entrenched in the project. Significant and measurable impact is achievable. Impact is sustainable beyond the grant end date.	Project objectives are SMART (well-scoped). Project deliverables contribute to goal achievement. Clear how project connects to broader social context/issue.	Timelines are comprehensive. Milestones align with goals and timeline. Thorough outline of tasks and activities. Description answers the 5 W's & how.	Project addresses an issue in a unique way. Project stands out in comparison to others.	Robust and realistic learning objectives. Demonstrated understanding and commitment to grant as a learning opportunity.	Budget is precise and comprehensive. References other resources that will be leveraged. Budget aligns with and maps resource input to achieve project objectives.