

PACES Tier 3 and 4 Grant Proposal Scoring Rubric

Scoring Key

	0	1	2	3	4
Criterion/ category is...	<i>...missing, not addressed.</i>	<i>...partially addressed or underdeveloped.</i>	<i>...adequately addressed in a plausible manner.</i>	<i>...well thought out in a fairly thorough manner.</i>	<i>...extensive and addressed in a very compelling manner.</i>

Alignment with Campus Definition of Outreach and Engagement (Section weight: 40 points)

	0	1	2	3	4
Rooted in scholarship, creative work and teaching Engagement activities connect to and advance faculty-led research, creative work, and/or teaching.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Public need(s) Evidence of the public need as well as the rationale for CU Boulder involvement has been informed by relevant research, partner consultation and/or a direct request. Engages with communities with less access to university resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Quality of Community Partnership(s) External partners and participants have appropriate, meaningful opportunities to contribute to project process. Identifies how any relevant relationships will be fostered and sustained.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Mutual Benefit Benefits to external and university partners are clearly articulated.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Project Design and Proposal Elements (Section weight: 30 points)

	0	1	2	3	4
Project overall goals/objectives Goals/objectives are well-defined and clearly connected to the problem or issue being addressed.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Project plan and timeline Outlines plan to achieve goals and provides detailed and realistic timeline.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Participant engagement and inclusion Provides details that demonstrate how the program is inclusive and accessible for all participants.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Student Involvement Details of student involvement in the project and how students will be supported, trained and/or mentored is well defined.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Or Justification for why student involvement is not feasible or appropriate is clearly articulated.					

Evaluation and Budget (Section weight: 10 points)

	0	1	2	3	4
Evaluation Detailed and feasible evaluation plan that includes appropriate measures and approaches used to assess quality of the community partnership (e.g., trust, communication, mutual benefit).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Budget narrative Clearly explains how the budget will support the activities and people described in proposal. Justifies why funds are needed in addition to other funding and/or how grant funding will be leveraged to obtain other funding (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Additional Considerations - For Faculty Group/Interdisciplinary Proposals (Section weight: 10 points)

	0	1	2	3	4
Collaboration Interdisciplinary/interdepartmental collaboration is clearly defined, and participating faculty work is synthesized under a single theme or topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Additional Considerations - For Continuing Project Proposals (Section weight: 10 points)

	0	1	2	3	4
Continuing Projects Project's impact to date and rationale for continued funding is clear and compelling.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Total Scores

Tier 3 (Individual Faculty) Proposal - New
Proposal Score (Total/Overall): _____ /80

Tier 4 (Faculty Group) Proposal - New
Proposal Score (Total/Overall): _____ /90

Tier 3 (Individual Faculty) Proposal - Continuing
Proposal Score (Total/Overall): _____ /90

Tier 4 (Faculty Group) Proposal - Continuing
Proposal Score (Total/Overall): _____ /100

