RUBRICS FOR 2019 PROGRAM INNOVATION FUND PROPOSALS

Workforce Needs (25 Points)	**Poor (0 – 6 points)**	**Good (7– 12 points)**	**Very Good (13 – 19 points)**	**Excellent (20 – 25 points)**	**Score**
	Proposed program demonstrates **weak** links to workforce development, training, and internships, etc.	Proposed program demonstrates **appropriate** links to workforce development, training, and internships, etc.	Proposed program demonstrates **robust** links to workforce development, training, and internships, etc.	Proposed program demonstrates **strong** links to workforce development, training, and internships, etc.	
Enrollment Growth (25 Points)	**Poor (0 – 6 points)**	**Good (7 – 12 points)**	**Very Good (13 – 19 points)**	**Excellent (20 – 25 points)**	
	Shows **little** potential for enhancing enrollment growth through the plan outlined in the proposal	Shows **reasonable** potential for enhancing enrollment growth through the **sound** plan outlined in the proposal	Shows **strong** potential for enhancing enrollment growth through the **solid** plan outlined in the proposal	Shows **exceptional** potential for enhancing enrollment growth through the **superior** plan outlined in the proposal	
Adult Attainment (15 Points)	**Poor (0 – 3 points)**	**Good (4 – 7 points)**	**Very Good (8 – 11 points)**	**Excellent (12 – 15 points)**	
	Proposed program **does not** exemplify a **coherent** and **suitable** adult attainment plan	Proposed program exemplifies a **coherent** and **suitable** adult attainment plan	Proposed program exemplifies a **strong** and **well thought out** adult attainment plan	Proposed program exemplifies a **superior** adult attainment plan	
Feasibility and Expediency (15 Points)	**Poor (0 – 3 points)**	**Good (4 – 7 points)**	**Very Good (8 – 11 points)**	**Excellent (12 – 15 points)**	
	Feasibility of 6 to 12 month implementation of a high-quality program is **very low**, based on the outlined strategies and approaches; **highly likely** that the project **will not** meet its objectives	Feasibility of 6 to 12 month implementation of a high-quality program is **reasonable**, based on the outlined strategies and approaches; the project may meet its objectives	Feasibility of 6 to 12 month implementation of a high-quality program is **strong**, based on the outlined strategies and approaches; **likely** that the project will meet its objectives	Feasibility of 6 to 12 month implementation of a high-quality program is **excellent**, based on the outlined strategies and approaches; **highly likely** that the project will meet its objectives	
Statewide Impact and Collaboration (10 Points)	**Poor (0 – 1 points)**	**Good (2 – 4 points)**	**Very Good (5 – 7 points)**	**Excellent (8 – 10 points)**	
	Will not enhance statewide impact and collaboration among UMS institutions and entities appropriate for the project proposed	**Could** enhance statewide impact and collaboration among UMS institutions and entities appropriate for the project proposed	Will enhance statewide impact and collaboration among UMS institutions and entities appropriate for the project proposed	Will **greatly** enhance statewide impact and collaboration among UMS institutions and entities appropriate for the project proposed	
Credentials of Value (10 Points)	**Poor (0 – 1 points)**	**Good (2 – 4 points)**	**Very Good (5 – 7 points)**	**Excellent (8 – 10 points)**	
	Does not provide **basic** competencies for credentials of value	Provides **basic** competencies for credentials of value	Provides **very good** skills for credentials of value	Provides **outstanding** skills for credentials of value	
TOTAL					