

College of Human Ecology
Harold and Letha Reser Family and Community Innovation Award Rubric

Name of Faculty: _____

Faculty Rank: _____

Department/School: _____

Is the project related to one of the priority areas identified in the application? ____No ____Yes
 (If yes, what area? _____)

Does the project involve applied research and/or the translation of research-based knowledge into practice or programs?
 ____No ____Yes (If yes, explain. _____)

Is the PI partnering with Outreach and/or Extension? ____No ____Yes

Annual Budget: _____

of Years: _____

	Exceptional 5	Good 4	Average 3	Needs Improvement 2	Poor 1
Abstract	The abstract clearly summarizes the project AND includes a statement regarding the amount of money requested and the length of the project.		The summary is adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent.		It is unclear what is being proposed, the amount of money being requested, or the length of the project.

Project Description	The description, including the methodology, is clear, concise, and easy to understand. The proposed project involves applied research and/or the translation of research into practice or programs.		The description, including the methodology, is adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent. The potential for application and/or the translation of research into practice or programs needs to be clearer.		It is unclear what is being proposed. The proposed project is not applied or does not involve the translation of research into practice or programs.
Interdisciplinary in Nature	The applicant clearly described the interdisciplinary nature of the project as well as the explicit roles of each person involved in the project.		The description of the interdisciplinary nature of the project as well as the explicit roles of each person involved in the project is adequate, but could be clearer.		The project is not interdisciplinary.
Importance to the Field	The applicant clearly describes the importance to the field. The scholarly impact is significant.		A link is made between the proposed project and the broader creative or research field. The impact is modest.		It is not clear how the proposed project will further the field or how the scholarly community will benefit from the project.
Anticipated Benefits/ Outcomes	The anticipated benefits to youth, families, and/or the community are clearly stated. The anticipated outcomes youth, families, and/or the community are significant.		The description of the anticipated benefits to youth, families, and/or the community is adequate, but could be clearer. The anticipated outcomes youth, families, and/or the community are modest.		It is not clear how the proposed project will benefit youth, families, or the community. Anticipated outcomes youth, families, and/or the community were omitted.

Engagement	The applicant clearly describes how the proposed project aligns with K-State's definition of engagement.		The description of how the proposed project is adequate, but could be clearer.		It is not clear how the proposed project aligns with K-State's definition of engagement.
Budget	Budget is comprehensive, clearly explained, and appropriate for the activities proposed. All costs are justified.		Budget and justification are adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent.		Budget and justification are either omitted or vaguely described.
Timeline	Timeline is clearly presented and clearly outlines when major activities will be conducted and anticipated outcomes will be completed.		Timeline is adequate though the need for greater clarity is apparent.		Timeline is either omitted or vaguely described.

Total Score: _____

Does the proposed project include undergraduate students?* _____ **No** _____ **Yes**

Comments: _____

*Although not required, bonus points will be awarded for including undergraduate students in your proposed project.