

Champions for a Healthy Campus Challenge – Evaluation Rubric

Project Name: _____ Reviewer Name: _____

Instructions: Use this rubric to facilitate scoring of projects. For each criteria item, please choose a score between 5 and 1 (5 – Excellent; 4 – Very Good; 3 – Good; 2 – Fair; and 1 – Poor). The rubric serves as a guide; please use your own discretion when assigning scores.

	Ranking Criteria 5 - Excellent	Ranking Criteria 1 - Poor	Reviewer Ranking
Makes a valuable contribution to supporting the Campus Mental Health Strategy	Builds a strong case linking project idea to improving student wellness; aligns with vision for a caring campus community	Poor explanation of project idea or focus areas; weak rationale provided to connect project idea to the Campus Mental Health Strategy	
Builds partnerships and collaborations	In-depth knowledge of on/off campus stakeholders; relevant and strategic partners identified; contact with partners initiated	Poor understanding of campus/external stakeholders; key partners overlooked or missed	
Addresses a gap or strengthens an existing asset on campus	In-depth knowledge of existing supports on campus; project demonstrates need to fill a gap or to strengthen (add value to) existing services	Poor knowledge of supports and resources on campus; unnecessary duplication of campus activities	

Creates opportunities for staff and student engagement	Staff/student engagement is integrated throughout planning and implementation processes.	Little or no involvement from staff and student community in project planning and/or implementation	
Demonstrates potential to meet outcomes and have an impact	Clearly identifies project’s short and long term outcomes for intended audience; project activities have a high chance to meaningfully impact this population	Poor job of articulating project’s short and long-term outcomes for intended audience; activities described have little chance of meaningfully impacting this population	
Considers the sustainability of the project beyond funding	Viable demonstration of long term continuity; consideration given to sustained awareness, sustained project activities, and/or sustained partnerships	No consideration or lack of effective examples provided to ensure long term continuity	
Overall impression	Complete, clear, organized. Project is well thought out and logical. Practical timeframe, available resources, and community buy-in.	Incomplete; project is poorly explained, impractical timeframe, lack of resource availability, or community buy-in.	

Total score out of 35 (reviewer): _____

Average score (committee): _____