Student Engagement Fund Evaluation Rubric										
Criteria	Excellent (5 points)	Good (4 points)	Average (3 points)	Fair (2 points)	Poor/Does not meet (1 point)	Total				
Project Aims	The project is very well explained and meets a significant/multiple need(s) that is not currently met by existing programming.	The project is well explained and meets a clear need for students.	The project is adequately explained. There is a need for the project however it would benefit from further justification .	Project is not well explained . The rational/need for the project is unclear, vague, or too broad .	The project lacks meaningful description . There is no rational or need expressed. The aims of the project are undefined .	/5				
Comments										
Relevance	Project clearly advances both goals of the fund : promotes community <u>and</u> provides an opportunity for professional development.	The connection to the aims of the fund is evident. Project relates to at least one goal of the fund : a) project will promote community building or b) P.D. training.	Project has some connection to the goals of the fund: e.g. students will likely gain some skills or knowledge from participating in this project or may expand their social network .	Project has a weak connection to the goals of the fund. Project provides academic opportunities for students but does not enhance their professional skills. Allows for networking within already established circles.	Project has little to no connection to the goals of the fund . Does not provide training opportunities or networking for the McGill graduate community	/5				
Comments										
Audience	The project is interdisciplinary (two or more departments/fields) and appeals to a wide and diverse audience or large number of students.	The project benefits at least two communities at McGill; reaches moderate number of students.	The project benefits a single department or group at McGill; will reach a fair number of students.	Project benefits a limited number of students; only appeals to few students.	Project does not benefit the McGill community; very few students will be impacted by this project. Project is not accessible to minoritized students.	/5				

Comments							
Timeline and execution	The timeline and execution of the project is detailed and very well explained , and the project can be easily achieved within the time frame specified.	The timeline and execution of the project are well and clearly explained . The project can likely be achieved in the time frame.	The timeline and execution of the project are sufficiently described. Seems generally achievable with minor changes or a more detailed plan.	TImeline and execution of the project are vague or lacking important details . Project needs considerable revision to be realized in the time frame specified.	Timeline and execution of the project are missing from the proposal or incoherent . The project design is not achievable / the project does not seem feasible within the time frame.	/5	
Comments							
Budget	There is a clear rational for the use of funds and the budget is well detailed ; allocation of funds is optimal for best delivery of the project.	The use of funds makes sense, and the budget is sufficiently detailed; funds are appropriately allocated.	The budget needs some work; use of funds is not optimal but makes general sense. Budget lacks detailed breakdown.	Use of funds is inappropriate; budget needs to be revised. Not clear how the funds will be spent.	Budget is unrealistic and use of funds is unjustified /budget is missing from the proposal.	/5	
Comments							
Total score							