## "ADAPT" Scholarship Rubric

| Detailed Program Description/25 | Criteria  They program provides the following specific details:  who it is for how it will be set up provide as much logistical detail as possible. Discuss any new or ongoing programs that exist. Do they already have a program in place Describe the scope of the problem that will be addressed by the proposed project. | OUTSTANDING (25-21) Project description is clear with strong evidence of work plan, logistics and feasible project approach. | EXCELLENT (20-16) Project description is clear with strong evidence of careful planning, thought and research.                             | GOOD (15-11) Project description is general but is still a good project/idea that can be understood.                            | AVERAGE (10-6) Project description needs clarity and further planning. Still, it is possible to understand what the project/idea is. | POOR (5-1) Unclear project description or lacks planning and research.                           |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Measurable Goals/10             | <ul> <li>Criteria</li> <li>Includes specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased (SMART) objectives.</li> <li>Includes objectives that include baseline data and quantifiable time frames for achievement.</li> </ul>   | OUTSTANDING (10) Goals are clear with strong evidence of specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased.       | EXCELLENT (8) Goals are clear but miss 1 or more of the following qualities: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased. | GOOD  (6) Goals are missing 2 or more of the following qualities: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased. | FAIR (4) Goals are missing 3 or more of the following qualities: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased.       | POOR (2) Unclear goals that are not specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time phased |
| Measurable Objectives/10        | Criteria     Includes measurable outcomes that will result from the project and provides specific, quantified estimate of expected outcomes.  | OUTSTANDING (10) Outcomes are clear with strong evidence of specific, measurable, achievable,                                | EXCELLENT (8) Outcomes are clear but miss 1or more of the following qualities: specific, measurable,                                       | GOOD (6) Outcomes are missing 2 or more of the following qualities: specific,   | FAIR (4) Outcomes are missing 3 or more of the following qualities: specific, measurable, achievable,                                | POOR (2) Unclear outcomes that are not specific, measurable, achievable,                         |

| Application Number: | Rev | viewer: |
|---------------------|-----|---------|
|                     |     |         |

## "ADAPT" Scholarship Rubric

|                     | 1  |                      |                        |                                    |                     |                |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
|                     |  | realistic, and time  | achievable, realistic, | measurable,                        | realistic, and time | realistic, and |
|                     |  | phased.              | and time phased.       | achievable,                        | phased.             | time phased    |
|                     |  |                      |                        | realistic, and                     |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      |                        | time phased.                       |                     |                |
| Sustainability Plan | • Proof of the staff expertise or experi                 | ence to support the  | Excellent              | Good                               | Fair                | Poor           |
|                     | proposed project.  |                      | (15)                   | (10)                               | (5)                 | (0)            |
|                     | A clear and concise project timetable                    | e is provided.       | A clear and concise    | Application                        | A partial           | No project     |
|                     | • The schedule of activities is logical a                |                      | project timetable is   | includes staff                     | description of      | timetable is   |
|                     | relation to project goals, objectives,                   |                      | provided. The          | involved in                        | scheduled           | provided.      |
| /15                 | • Show that the project can be replicat                  |                      | schedule of            | the project.                       | activities is       | Reviewers are  |
|                     | additional communities.                                  | ica to beliefit      | activities is logical  | Proposal                           | provided. Project   | unable to      |
|                     | <ul> <li>Evidence of forward planning for the</li> </ul> | a project to be      | and feasible in        | convincing of                      | feasibility is      | ascertain      |
|                     | reoccurring.   | e project to be      | relation to project    | success in                         | uncertain.          | scheduled      |
|                     | reoccurring.   |                      | goals, objectives,     | future years.                      |                     | activities or  |
|                     |  |                      | and budget.            | ,                                  |                     | project        |
|                     |  |                      | Č                      |                                    |                     | feasibility.   |
| Detailed Budget &   | The proposed budget is accurate                          | c cost effective and | EXCELLENT              | GOOD                               | FAIR                | POOR           |
| Current Funding     | linked to activities and outcomes                        |                      | (10)                   | (8)                                | (4)                 | (0)            |
|                     | • The application details how the                        |                      | Key expenses are       | Some                               | Budget is defined   | Budget is      |
| / 10                | will be funded in the future.                            | proposed denvines    | fully described and    | expenses are                       | only in general     | missing or     |
|                     | <ul> <li>Details any current funding.</li> </ul>         |                      | justified. The         | described and                      | terms and is        | does not align |
|                     | Details any current runding.                             |                      | method for arriving    | justified. The                     | missing specific    | with proposed  |
|                     |  |                      | at budgeted expense    | method for                         | details.            | project.       |
|                     |  |                      | categories/amounts     | arriving at                        |                     | 1 3            |
|                     |  |                      | is clearly explained.  | budgeted                           |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | Budget is directly     | expense                            |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | connected to project   | categories/am                      |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | description, goals,    | ounts is                           |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | and timetable.         | unclear or                         |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | Application details    | requires                           |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | how it will be         | inference.                         |                     |                |
|                     |  |                      | funded in the future.  | 11110101100                        |                     |                |
| Letters of support  | Should include at minimum 2 letters of a                 | academic support     | EXCELLENT              | Į.                                 | AIR                 | POOR           |
| from academic       | of the concept of the proposed program a                 |                      | (10)                   | (5)                                |                     | (0)            |
| program.            | evidence of resources provided by the in                 |                      | (10)                   | Includes only 1 letter of academic |                     | Includes no    |
| hiogiam.            | success and sustainability of the program                |                      |                        | support.                           |                     | letters of     |
|                     | baccos and bastamacinity of the program                  |                      |                        | 54                                 | PP-10.              | 1011015 01     |

| Application Number: | Reviewer: |
|---------------------|-----------|
|---------------------|-----------|

## "ADAPT" Scholarship Rubric

| / 10             |  | Includes 2 or more                                      |                |                   | academic       |  |
|------------------|--|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--|
|                  |  | letters of academic                                     |                |                   | support.       |  |
|                  |  | support.  |                |                   |                |  |
| Timeline for     | The schedule of activities is logical and feasible in  | EXCELLENT   | GOOD           | FAIR              | POOR           |  |
| program          | relation to project goals, objectives, and budget.     | (10)  | (7)            | (3)               | (0)            |  |
| implementation   |  | A clear and concise                                     | A partial      | A partial         | No project     |  |
|                  | • Project outcomes and/or tangible deliverables (e.g., | project timetable is                                    | description of | description of    | timetable is   |  |
| / 10             | assessment tool, presentation of results to academic   | provided and a clear                                    | scheduled      | scheduled         | provided and   |  |
|                  | unit on campus, conference proposal, etc.) are         | strategy for  | activities is  | activities is     | clear strategy |  |
|                  | thoroughly described.                                  | dissemination is  | provided.      | provided but some | for            |  |
|                  |  | presented.  | Project        | elements are      | dissemination  |  |
|                  |  |   | feasibility is | ambiguous.        | is presented.  |  |
|                  |  |   | uncertain.     | Dissemination is  | Reviewers are  |  |
|                  |  |   | It is unclear  | not addressed.    | unable to      |  |
|                  |  |   | how outcomes   |                   | ascertain      |  |
|                  |  |   | and/or         |                   | scheduled      |  |
|                  |  |   | deliverables   |                   | activities or  |  |
|                  |  |   | will be        |                   | project        |  |
|                  |  |   | disseminated.  |                   | feasibility.   |  |
| Minority Affairs | Include the name of a faculty member who is a current  | Excellent   |                |                   | Poor           |  |
| Committee        | member or will become an active member of the Minority | (10)  |                | (0)               | · /            |  |
| Member           | Affairs Committee upon the receiving the funds.        | Clearly identify the name of an No process or repr      |                |                   |                |  |
|                  |  | individual as a current or future identified as a curre |                |                   |                |  |
| / 10             |  | committee member. member                                |                | er.               |                |  |
|                  |  |   |                |                   |                |  |

| Project<br>Description |       | Outcomes | Sustainability<br>Plan | Budget | Letters of Support | Timeline for implementation | MAC<br>Member | TOTAL |
|------------------------|-------|----------|------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------|
|                        | 25/10 | /10      | /15                    | /10    | /10                | /10                         | /10           | /100  |

| Application Number: | Reviewer: |
|---------------------|-----------|
|---------------------|-----------|