Rubric: Faculty Senate Engagement Mini-Grants

CRITERIA	OUTSTANDING (3)	SUFFICIENT (2)	INSUFFICIENT (1)
Project engagement -- engaged learning -- civic engagement -- community engagement	– One or more types of engagement is clearly and accurately identified as a project outcome. – Engagement is an essential focus of the project. – Project shows potential for sustained engagement over time. – Project clearly advances JMU's engagement efforts.	– One or more types of engagement is identified as a project outcome. – Engagement is a focus of the project. – Project shows limited potential for sustained engagement over time. – Project is situated in JMU's engagement efforts.	– One or more types of engagement is addressed. – Engagement focus of the project is unclear. – Project's potential for sustained engagement over time is unclear. – Project is tangentially connected to JMU's engagement efforts.
Project description -- 500 words	– Description of the project is understandable and well-evidenced (e.g., references) to those without specialized knowledge. – Description is clearly aligned to proposed outcomes. – Description addresses meaningful involvement of/benefits to the community (e.g., JMU students, local, regional, or global).	– Description of the project is accessible to those without specialized knowledge. – Description is connected to proposed outcomes. – Description addresses involvement of/benefits to the community (e.g., JMU students, local, regional, or global).	– Description of the project is unclear to those without specialized knowledge. – Description is tangentially connected to proposed outcomes. – Description tangentially addresses involvement of/benefits to the community (e.g., JMU students, local, regional, or global).
Faculty expertise -- 250 words	– Explanation clearly identifies faculty expertise that is relevant to and necessary for the project. – Explanation clearly situates faculty expertise for the project within specific subject matter, scholarship, and/or engagement.	– Explanation provides faculty expertise that is relevant to and necessary for the project. – Explanation situates faculty expertise for the project within subject matter, scholarship, and/or engagement.	– Explanation offers faculty expertise that is not clearly relevant to and necessary for the project. – Explanation does not clearly situate faculty expertise for the project within specific subject matter, scholarship, and/or engagement.

Project timeline -- 150 words	– Timeline is clearly explained and reasonable for completion of the project. – Timeline allows for expenditure of funds within the allotted time period.	– Timeline is provided and reasonable for completion of the project. – Timeline allows for expenditure of funds within the allotted time period.	– Expenditure of funds within the allotted time period is unclear.
Project budget -- maximum $5,000 -- 150 words	– Budget itemizes and explains expenditures requested for project outcomes. – Budget's expenses are allowed by JMU Funded Grant Considerations (see document) – If applicable: Budget discloses other funding or grant applications relevant to the project and clearly positions mini-grant funds in relation to the larger funding scope.	– Budget itemizes expenditures requested for project outcomes. – Budget's expenses are allowed by JMU Funded Grant Considerations (see document) – If applicable: Budget discloses other funding or grant applications relevant to the project and positions mini-grant funds in relation to the larger funding scope.	– Budget includes unallowable expenses as noted in the JMU Funded Grant Considerations (see document)
Proposal overall	– Proposal includes all required information and meets given guidelines. – Proposal language is clear and accessible.	– Proposal includes all required information and meets given guidelines. – Proposal language is accessible.	– Proposal does not include required information or meet given guidelines.

* created by Research & Scholarship Committee (April 2024)