Criteria	Below Expectations (1)	Approaching Expectations (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Score (1-4)	Weighted Score
Strategic Purpose and Rationale	Project seems unaligned to a specific problem; no meaningful alignment with university goals.	Vague purpose; relies heavily on anecdotal or weak evidence; only superficial references to institutional frameworks.	Solid rationale informed by peer review or best practice; alignment with institutional priorities is clear	Purpose and need are clearly defined, based in robust evidence; advances institutional priorities related to teaching and learning.	0	/20
Impact and Sustainability	Project has little substance, lacking cohesion; fails to articulate how the student or faculty experience actually improves.	Impact is localized and likely fleeting; the "sustainability" section is weak or non-existent	Significant benefit to a specific student group or set of courses; impact is clear but may be limited in scope; some thought given to post-funding life.	High potential for systemic change or significant impact at the program level or beyond; clear plan for sustainability and/or scalability.	0	/30
Methodology & Assessment Logic	Activities are poorly defined or unrelated to goals; no discernible assessment methodology.	Activities are listed but lack detail; assessment is an afterthought (e.g., satisfaction survey only).	Methods, analyses, and assessments are clearly described and appropriate for the project's purpose.	Methods are clear and sophisticated; excellent alignment between activities and the assessment of outcomes.	0	/25
Feasibility and Team Capability	Significant doubt about the team's ability to execute; timeline is missing major milestones or is entirely unrealistic	Experience is relevant but lacks evidence of project management skills; timeline is sparse or overly optimistic.	Relevant experience is present; timeline is logical but lacks any "buffer room" for unexpected delays.	Applicants have a proven track record of managing similar grants and student staff; timeline is detailed, realistic, and accounts for potential bottlenecks.	0	/10
Budget	Budget is missing major items or rationale; personnel hours are not accounted for.	Budget is present but lacks detail; breakdown of hours for students/RAs is vague.	Each line item includes a reasonable rationale and a breakdown of hours for personnel.	Strong rationale for all costs; detailed breakdown of hours aligned perfectly with specific project activities.	0	/15