

Faculty Development Grant Application Scoring Rubric

| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Qualifications | Applicant is a full-time undergraduate faculty. | Applicant is a full-time graduate faculty. | Applicant is a part-time undergraduate faculty. | Applicant is a part-time graduate faculty. | Applicant does not meet the qualifications and application is null and void. |
| Significance of Project | The proposed project is directly aligned to faculty development and growth. The proposal has a clear purpose, measurable outcomes, and detailed timeline of milestones and deliverables. The significance of the proposal is present throughout the proposal and is directly aligned with the impact and the budget. | The proposed project is mostly aligned to faculty development and growth. The proposal has purpose, measurable outcomes, and a timeline of milestones and deliverables. The significance of the proposal is mostly present throughout the proposal and is mostly aligned with the impact and the budget. | The proposed project mentions faculty development and growth, but direct alignment is not present. The proposal's purpose is somewhat unclear. The outcomes or objectives are not fully explained and measurability of outcomes is unclear. A timeline of milestones and deliverables is present but lacks in detail and gaps are present within the | The proposed project attempts to encompass faculty development and growth, but project is either too vague or not appropriate for the funding. The proposal's purpose is unclear. The outcomes or objectives are not fully explained and there is a lack of measurability. A timeline of milestones and deliverables is either missing or the timeline has large gaps and inconsistencies. The significance of the proposal is unclear and is not aligned with the budget and impact. | The proposed project is not appropriate, as it is outside the areas of faculty development and growth. The purpose is missing or inappropriate. The outcomes or objectives are missing or inappropriate. There is no timeline or the timeline is not consistent. The significance of the proposal is not aligned with the budget and impact or it is not appropriate. |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | timeline. The significance of the proposal is mentioned, but direct alignment with the impact and the budget is unclear and vague. | | |
| Impact | Faculty describes how activity helps with faculty development. Includes benefits beyond activity. | Faculty describes how activity helps with faculty development. | A description of how activity aids in development. | An attempt is made to describe how activity develops faculty. | The impact is unclear and it is not stated or vague how activity benefits the faculty. |
| Mission Alignment | Project clearly aligns with Campbell's mission and faculty's current position. | | Project partially aligns with Campbell's mission and faculty's current position. | | Project does not align with or discuss its link to the mission statement. |
| Budget | Budget is clear, aligns with proposed activities and all funds are used thoughtfully. Justification describes individual allocation of funds well. | Budget is mostly clear with funds allocated appropriately. Justification is line specific, and could be clearer in use of funds. | Budget is reasonably clear but may be missing one or two critical items. Justification is not line specific, with broad, overarching | Budget is somewhat clear but does not account for all necessary expenses for proposed activity. Justification is not line specific, aligns weakly with what is stated in the budget, and has | Budget is unclear with vague descriptions of how funds will be used. No or weak justification is provided. |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | statements given. | generalized uses for funds. | |
| Expectations | Funded activities of grant align with length of grant. Proposal is clearly written for the non-specialist. Proposal clearly outlines an idea for plans to disseminate information in a public forum. | Funded activities of grant align with length of grant. A few places in the proposal are unclear to the non-specialist. Proposal has a plan for public dissemination of information that is loosely stated. | Funded activities of grant mostly align with scope of grant. Places in the grant have non-technical jargon that is unclear to the non-specialist. Proposal has an unclear plan for public dissemination that is implied. | Funded activities of the grant do not align with the scope of the grant. Proposal has discipline-specific jargon that is unclear and unneeded to the non-specialist. Proposal does not have a plan for public dissemination. | Funded activities fall outside timeline of grant. The proposal is full of discipline-specific jargon that is foreign to the non-specialist. Proposal does not have a plan for public dissemination. |