**Ohio Five Collaborative Grants Program**

**Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **3****Exemplary** | **2****Adequate** | **1****Needs Improvement** | **0****Insufficient Evidence** | **Comments/Notes** |
| **Innovation** | Project represents the implementation of new insight or idea, with potential benefits of change made clear | Project represents local implementation of emerging innovation or trend, with potential benefits specified. | Project represents practice(s) common place within field, or an adoption of a change with well-established benefits. | No innovation described or specific potential improvement defined. |  |
| **Justification** | Strong rationale and significance of proposed work. Addresses specific need(s) common among peer institutions. | Rationale or significance of project tends toward the too-specific or too-general, but overall the argument holds. | Weak presentation of institutional or community need, or tenuous argument for grant’s ability to address need. | Unconvincing or no evidence of need presented, or grant proposal does not address stated need. |  |
| **Alignment with Ohio Five overall mission and strategic area** | Project outcomes or activities align with the mission and strategic areas. | Project elements align with the OH5 mission or strategic area, but not both.  | Project is tangentially but not directly related to organizational mission and strategies. | No explicit relationship between the project and the agenda of the Ohio Five. |  |
| **Feasibility** | Personnel, project activities timeline, and budget expenditure are congruent with project description and outcomes | Deficiencies or overestimation exist in personnel, timeline, or budget within tolerable range, outcomes appear achievable despite gaps or leaps. | Project’s assembled personnel, timeline, or budge expose weakness in plan design. Outcomes unlikely to achieved in projects current form. | Insufficient information about personnel, project activities timeline, or budge expenditures to gauge feasibility. |  |
| **Efficiency of Approach** | Project plan leverages or contributes to existing infrastructure or precedents. Design appears scalable or replicable. | Project plan overlooks or fails to mention important connections to relevant work by others, but redeemable. Represents a worthy contribution. | Project isolated from related work and duplicates effort. Extension or replication in current form unadvisable. | Plan presented lacks sufficient detail to judge how it fits into industry or local contexts. |  |
| **Sustainability** | Evidence presented that project or its impact can be sustained locally beyond grant period, if results warrant. | Project is temporary, designed to end when grant ends, or some effort to secure commitment beyond grant period is represented. | Plans to future are stated as assumptions without supporting arguments or evidence. | No meaningful plans for future beyond funding term appear in proposal. |  |
| **Collaboration** | Project involves the maximum number member institutions in a meaningful and substantive manner. | Project involves fewer member institutions but is open to participation and/or attendance. | Project involves the minimally required level of involvement and or participation. | The project does not demonstrate the minimally required level of collaborative effort. |  |
| **Total Score** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Recommend Funding?** | Yes, fully fund. | Yes, partial fund \_\_\_\_. | Not at this time. |  |  |
| **Additional Comments** |  |