



SMCCCD Innovation Fund Proposal Review Rubric (Cañada)

Project Title:

Proposals will be evaluated based on the rubric below. They must receive a minimum score of **15** in order to be forwarded to the district for consideration

<p>District Strategic Goals Addressed (check all that apply). If no district strategic goals are addressed in the proposal, the proposal will not be forwarded to the district for consideration</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Develop and strengthen educational offerings, interventions, and support programs that increase student access and success</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Establish and expand relationships with school districts, 4-year college partners, and community-based organizations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase program delivery options, including the expanded use of instructional technology</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ensure necessary resources are available to implement strategic plan through sound fiscal planning and management of allocations</p>

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (0 - 1)	Satisfactory (2 - 3)	Exemplary (4 - 5)
Innovation	The project replicates existing campus efforts (lacks innovation). The project has little to no opportunity for institutionalization or additional student impact.	The project demonstrates some innovative practices that address an institutional need.	The project clearly demonstrates innovative practices that address an institutional need. Innovative practices are based on proven methods (could include ‘scaling up’ existing proven practices)
Rationale	The project rationale uses little to no data, or the data used has been manipulated. There is not a clear need for the project demonstrated.	The reasons for the project are established with clear data. The project reflects planning based on program review and/or previous successes from other institutions. The data and explanation may need some clarification.	The reasons for the project are substantiated with accurate data. The project is grounded in previous successes from other institutions, or scaling up of existing efforts. Program review results were vital to the project development
Sustainability	The project requires additional facilities and in order to begin and sustain the project that are not feasible. The project includes little to no opportunities for connections outside the department developing the project.	The project will need minimal facilities updates and new resources to implement and sustain the project. Some of the project’s resources are reusable.	Existing facilities will allow for the project to be implemented and sustained. Many of the project’s resources are reusable. Opportunities exist for connections to the community outside the college.
Financial Resources	The budget is incomplete, excessive or unrelated to proposed project. Overall, the budget is not cost-effective with a limited or no rationale for each item.	The budget includes necessary items and explains the relevance of those items as important to the project. These may need some clarification. The budget demonstrates cost-effective use of funds with a logical rationale for each item; however, the explanations may need some clarification.	The budget includes reasonable and necessary items. Clear explanations describe how budget items benefit students and align with the project goals. The budget demonstrates cost-effective use of funds with a logical rationale for each item.
Outcomes and Impacts	Little to no outcomes or metrics are identified. The project has limited or no focus on students, or does not indicate how the project relates to students directly or indirectly.	There are a few outcomes and metrics identified, but may need further clarification. Metrics somewhat align with district strategic goals. The project demonstrates some impacts or benefits to students (direct or indirect).	There are multiple outcomes and metrics identified that tie to district strategic goals. The project has identified significant student impacts.

Total Score: