University of Iowa
Graduate and Professional Student Government
2017-18 Service Grant Evaluation Rubric

GPSG recognizes that graduate and professional student education is advanced through service projects. Therefore, GPSG strives to support high quality graduate and professional student service projects that contribute toward the applicant's personal and professional development and have an impact on the campus and broader community. The maximum that can be awarded for Service Grant Funding is $1500 per project to be used within the academic year. All applications are evaluated based on the following criteria:

Total points possible: 50 points
1. **Previous Funding:** 5 points
2. **Project Overview:** 10 points
3. **Project Plan & Impact:** 20 points
4. **Itemized Budget:** 5 points
5. **Quality of Writing:** 5 points
6. **Funding Recommendation:** 5 points

Category 1: Previous GPSG Funding

Has the applicant previously received a GPSG Grant? (*Applicants' names will be checked against a database of previously funded students in order to verify accuracy of responses.*)

Description	Rating
No, the applicant has not previously received a GPSG.	5
Yes, the applicant has previously received a GPSG grant.	0

Category 2: Project Overview

ABSTRACT
How clearly is the abstract written? (Do you understand the objective and think the work is significant, regardless of your discipline?)

Description	Rating
Extremely clear - Abstract accurately, completely, and concisely summarized the proposed service project.	5
Neither clear nor unclear – Abstract reasonably summarized the proposed service project	3
Extremely unclear – Abstract either contains excessive jargon (requiring an expert in the field to understand), or is severely lacking in clarity or completeness.	1
No abstract provided.	0

SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Does the proposed service project have a strong support infrastructure? (i.e. established non-profit, annual trip with history of success, external grant funding, etc.)

Description	Rating
Strongly agree	5
Somewhat agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Somewhat disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

Category 3: Project Plan & Impact

BACKGROUND & SIGNIFICANCE

Does the service proposal include a thorough literature review and address the importance or merit of the project?

Description	Rating
Strongly agree - Exhaustive review of relevant literature that strongly supports the significance and methodological approach of the proposed project. The proposal clearly indicates the importance of undertaking this service project to address the problem or phenomenon of interest (the project has merit).	5
Neither agree nor disagree - The review of literature is presented in general terms, and somewhat supports the significance and methodological approach of the proposed project.	3
Strongly disagree - The review of literature and description of significance is either unclear, underdeveloped, or unrelated to the proposed project.	1
No review of literature or description of significance was provided.	0

PROJECT PLAN & TIMELINE

Does the proposal clearly describe the location, participants, and community served? Is the timeline feasible, manageable, and appropriate for the proposed service project?

Description	Rating
Strongly agree	5
Somewhat agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Somewhat disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

PERSONAL & PROFESSIONAL IMPACT

Does the service proposal clearly explain how it relates to the applicant's graduate work, career path/development, thesis work, and personal development?

Description	Rating
Strongly agree	5
Somewhat agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Somewhat disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

CAMPUS & COMMUNITY IMPACT

Does the applicant clearly explain the potential impact of the service project on the graduate and professional students at the University of Iowa? (How well the service project topic educates, enhances, or enriches UI graduate and/or professional students, and the broader community.)

Description	Rating
Strongly agree - The service proposal can educate, enhance, or enrich UI graduate and/or professional students, and the university community as a whole.	5
Somewhat agree	4
Neither agree nor disagree - The service proposal may have a positive impact on, or relate to the development of, a select group of students	3
Somewhat disagree	2
Strongly disagree – The service proposal is unlikely to have any impact on those who are not immediately involved in the project.	1

Category 4: Itemized Budget

Is the budget organized, reasonable and follow all funding guidelines? Guidelines found at https://gpsg.uiowa.edu/grants-for-students/

Description	Rating
The budget is clear, reasonable, follows the GPSG guidelines, provides detailed explanations for the amount requested, and reflects efforts to minimize costs.	5
The budget is clear, reasonable, follows GPSG guidelines, and provides explanations for the amount requested.	4
The budget is reasonable and follows GPSG guidelines, but lacks clarity or explanations for the amount requested.	3
The budget is either incomplete or significantly lacking in the area of organization, descriptions, or amount requested.	2
The budget is not organized, is not reasonable, and does not specify the items to be covered through the grant.	1
The applicant does not provide a budget.	0

Category 5: Quality of Writing

Is the writing clear and free of spelling or grammatical errors?

Description	Rating
Writing is professional in presentation and free from errors of spelling, grammar and punctuation.	5
Some errors in spelling, grammar or punctuation; however, they do not significantly affect comprehensibility.	3
Application consistently contains errors in spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation that negatively affect comprehensibility.	1

Category 6: Funding Recommendation

Do you recommend funding this application?

Description	Rating
Definitely yes.	5
Probably yes.	4
Might or might not.	3
Probably not.	2
Definitely not.	1