

PRAC Grant Proposal Rubric

1. Aims, objectives, and measurable outcomes		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Objectives are absent or incomplete; are difficult to understand, unrealistic; or appear unmeasurable.	Provides most of the objectives. Some objectives may not be readily attainable or measurable, or are loosely linked to problem/needs.	Objectives clearly address problem/need; are measurable, realistic; clearly define steps to be taken to achieve project goals; provides success indicators; answers questions: who? what? by when? by how much? according to which instrument?
2. Description of the assessment methods that would be used in the project		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Methods are absent, incomplete; are difficult to understand how you will achieve desired results.	Includes methods but not entirely clear how you will achieve objectives.	Methods to be used, scope, and activities to achieve desired results are clearly stated; contains realistic timelines and tasks.
3. Uses to be made of findings for program improvement		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Fails to address how findings will help the grant giver; project will be difficult to replicate; or promises unrealistic benefits.	Provides information on how findings will benefit the grant giver and how project will serve as model.	Clearly establishes how findings will help the funding agency in addressing program priorities or agency mission; how it will serve as state or national model; benefits appear realistic and attainable.
4. Contributions to an assessment plan for enhancing student learning		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Missing contributions to an assessment plan for enhancing student learning.	Only identifies possible contributions to assessment plans but does not apply to student learning.	Identifies how findings of project contribute to an assessment plan that enhances student learning (identifies PULs).
5. Appropriateness of proposed expenditures		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
No support given for funds requested for project.	Budget does not give careful attention to detail.	Budget connects well with project and is realistic given the size of the project.
6. Newness of the idea		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Addresses how program is offered but not leading edge or creative.	Applicant identifies how the program is creative in approach, content or delivery.	Engaging, creative, and new pathways to learning are well documented by the applicant.
7. Clarity		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Long, rambling, vague, uses jargon, passive voice, extraneous information; boring to read ;written in 1st or 2nd person; contains unsupportable statements or statistics; numerous exaggerations or untruths; key elements are embedded in straight text; complex sentence construction; pages unnumbered.	Writing is generally good, written in third person; generally clear although somewhat wordy, pages numbered, highlights key elements; proposal concept is appropriate but not particularly innovative.	Written in short, clear, crisp sentences in third person; factual; statistics and statements are documented; cites reference sources; key elements highlighted by headings, bullets, italics, etc.; written in active voice; innovative, interesting, exciting to read; simple sentence construction; pages numbered; uses concrete, specific language; pages numbered.
8. Overall		
Poor (1-3)	Adequate (4-6)	Excellent (7-10)
Proposal is unclear or missing key elements.	Reasonably clear proposal.	Clear and concise description of entire project.