

# Anchor University RSN Civic & Community Engagement Grant Scoring Rubric

	Criteria	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
1	<b>The proposal clearly details how the project advances and/or promotes civic engagement and/or participation through civic education programming, community organizing and advocacy, voter engagement and mobilization, and/or civic innovation and technology.</b>	The proposal does not provide any information regarding how the project advances civic engagement.	Provides little details about how the project advances civic education and does not demonstrate clearly how the project promotes civic participation.	The proposal communicates adequate details about how the project advance civic education; and provides some details about how the Sac State partner and the community organization are trying to promote civic participation.	The proposal clearly defines the details about how the project's advance civic education, advocacy; and demonstrates a clear understanding about how the Sac State partner and the community organization will collaborate together to promote civic participation.	The proposal is well-written and communicates precisely how the project's advance civic education and advocacy; the details about the collaboration that promotes civic participation is clearly understood; discusses the importance of implementing these particular activities.
2	<b>The proposal effectively demonstrates how the proposed activities establish or maintain a mutually beneficial partnership with the community organization.</b>	The proposal does not provide any information regarding the relationship between the Sac State partners and the community organization.	The proposal is poorly written; and does not communicate a clear understanding about how the Sac State partner and the community organization will work together.	The proposal communicates an adequate vision of how the Sac State partner and community partner will work together; and provides some details about their current relationship.	The proposal communicates a clear vision of how the Sac State partner and community partner will work together; details of the partnership are clearly understood and provide examples of how the existing relationship works well.	The proposal is well-written and communicates a precise vision regarding how the Sac State partner and the community organization will work together; details of the partnership are clearly understood; provides examples of how the existing relationship works well; and discusses how they can sustain their collaboration beyond the grant cycle.

3	<b>The proposal clearly describes how the proposed activities correlate to student success (e.g. connecting to a course, learning outcomes, or encouraging student engagement):</b>	Provides a poorly written description and does not make any connections to how the proposed activities correlate to student success; does not state how students are involved.	Provides little details regarding how the proposed activities correlate to student success; needs to be clearer about how it connects to a course, its outcomes, or student engagement; unclear how students are involved.	Provides some details regarding how the proposed activities correlate to student success; somewhat clear about how it connects to a course, its outcomes, or student engagement; student involvement is limited.	Provides many details about how the proposed activities correlate to student success; makes connections to a course, states outcomes, and/or encourages student engagement; clearly states how students are involved.	Provides a well-written description of how the proposed activities correlate to student success; clearly understands how it's connected to a course, clear learning outcomes, and meaningful student engagement; students are highly involved in the project.
4	<b>The proposal effectively outlines the key roles of the project participants.</b>	The proposal does not clearly outline the key participants and the involvement between the participants and the community partner.	The proposal provides some details but still needs to outline the key participants more clearly; allows limited involvement between the participants (faculty/staff & other departments) and the community partner.	The proposal provides a clear outline of the key participants; and allows for involvement between the participants and the community partner.	The proposal provides a detailed outline of the key participants; and allows participants (faculty/staff & other departments) and the community partner to be equally engaged.	The proposal provides a well-written and understandable outline of the key participants; and allows participants (faculty/staff & other departments) and the community partner to be equally engaged.
5	<b>The proposal clearly demonstrates how the proposed activities can serve to advance equity, antiracism, and social justice.</b>	Poorly written and needs to provide more apparent details regarding how the proposed activities can advance equity, antiracism, and social justice.	Provides some details but still needs to clearly describe how the proposed activities can advance equity, antiracism, and social justice; unable to communicate the inequities within the project.	Provides some detail that gives a clearer understanding of how the proposed activities can advance equity, antiracism, and social justice; briefly discusses the inequities within the project.	Provides clear details addressing how the proposed activities can advance equity, antiracism, and social justice; identifies the inequities within the project.	Provides a well-written description that thoroughly explains how the proposed activities could advance equity, antiracism, and social justice; discusses the inequities within the project and how the project can make an impact.

6	<b>The proposed timeline effectively reflects how the schedule of tasks/activities will be conducted from the planning stages through the final reporting.</b>	The proposed timeline does not provide any details that effectively reflect a schedule of tasks/activities.	The proposed timeline provides details that need to be more effectively reflected in a schedule of tasks/activities; not clear of the timeline of the project.	The proposed timeline communicates an adequate schedule of tasks/activities; and provides a timeline that reflects how the planning stages through final reporting could be carried out.	The proposed timeline communicates a detailed schedule of tasks/activities; clearly reflects how the planning stages through final reporting will be carried out.	The proposed timeline provides precise details that effectively reflect the schedule of tasks/activities; and provides a complete timeline with specific dates from the planning stages through final reporting.
7	<b>The budget section and template clearly detail how the funding will be used and how the project expense will be allocated.</b>	The proposed budget does not provide any details regarding how the funding will be used/allocated; the budget sheet is not attached.	The proposed budget provides little details regarding how the funding will be used/allocated; the budget sheet attached; is unclear on permissible and non-permissible expenses.	The proposed budget provides somewhat accurate details regarding how the funding will be used/allocated; the budget sheet is attached; unclear on permissible and non-permissible expenses.	The proposed budget provides clear details regarding how the funding will be used/allocated; the budget sheet is attached; all line items are permissible expenses.	The proposed budget provides precise and accurate details regarding how the funding will be used/allocated; the budget sheet is attached; all line items are permissible expenses.
8	<b>The proposal clearly outlines the outcomes of the project and effectively describes the indicators that will be used to measure the efficacy of this project.</b>	The proposal does not outline the outcomes; and does not provide indicators to measure the project's efficacy.	The proposal needs to more clearly outline the outcomes; unclear if outcomes can be realized with the grant cycle; the indicators listed need to provide more evidence on measuring the project's efficacy.	The proposal outlines satisfactory outcomes with some feasibility to be realized; the indicators to measure the efficacy can be more clearly defined.	The proposal clearly defines the project's outcomes and feasibility to be established; the indicators to measure the efficacy are clearly defined and easily understood.	The project's outcomes are well-defined and will be readily established within the grant cycle; the indicators to measure the efficacy are precisely defined and easily understood.
9	<b>The proposal details a clear plan for the sustainability of</b>	The proposal needs to provide details of a plan; no clear	The proposal provides limited details of a plan; and	The proposal provides details that give some	The proposal provides details that give some understanding of a plan	The proposal provides details that give some understanding of a plan

	<b>the project beyond the grant cycle.</b>	understanding of the project's sustainability beyond the grant cycle.	needs more clarification of the project's sustainability beyond the grant cycle.	understanding of a plan for sustainability beyond the grant cycle; the plan is to continue on the momentum built during the grant cycle;	for sustainability beyond the grant cycle; the plan is to continue on the momentum built during the grant cycle; and discusses a plan to look for additional funding.	for sustainability beyond the grant cycle; the plan is to continue on the momentum built during the grant cycle; additional funding is in place for the project to continue.
--	--	---	--	--	---	--