

SEIFC AWARDS RUBRIC

Updated: 10-01-2013

Criteria	Exemplary 6	Strong 4	Emerging 2	Limited/Absent 0	Score	Comments
Planning (Weight = 1)	Highly detailed planning occurred in advance of the event. Program is connected strategically to IFC and/or University mission, goals, or strategic plan. Relevant stakeholders articulated and communications with stakeholders established	Planning occurred well in advance of the event. Program is clearly? connected to the goals of the IFC or its officers. Relevant stakeholders identified; limited evidence of communication with stakeholders.	Some planning occurred prior to the event. Some connection to goals or a planning process is evident. Relevant stakeholders implied; no evidence of communication with stakeholders.	Little to no planning for the event; Connections to goals or a planning process not evident Relevant stakeholders not identified; no communication with stakeholders.		
Delivery (Weight = 1)	Program is described extensively to additionally include roles/responsibilities Evidence of budget linkage reflective of IFC mission/planning/values. Marketing consisting of multiple media Evidence of collaboration exists with campus offices, inter/national headquarters, and/or other campus (non-Greek) organizations	Sufficient description with program that includes dates, locations, and attendance. Program budget and marketing efforts sufficiently described. Limited evidence of collaboration with campus offices, inter/national headquarters, and/or other campus (non-Greek organizations)	Limited description of the program Some marketing exists. Limited evidence of budget consideration is limited. Collaboration with campus offices, inter/national headquarters, and/or other campus (non-Greek organizations) implied	Little to no description of the program is provided. Little/no marketing exists; No evidence of budget considerations No evidence of collaboration with campus offices, inter/national headquarters, and/or other campus (non-Greek organizations)		
Evaluation (Weight = 1)	Program goals and learning outcomes for the participants exist and are described sufficiently. Multiple methods of multiple types of (qualitative & quantitative)	Program goals exist, limited evidence of specific learning outcomes for the participants. Multiple methods of the same type of assessment (qualitative or quantitative)	Program goals and specific learning outcomes for the participants are implied, Single method of assessment (qualitative or quantitative)	Program goals do not exist, no indication of specific learning outcomes for the participants exists. No indication of evaluation/assessment.		
Innovation or Improvement (Weight = 1)	<i>Significant evidence – For example:</i> <u>Innovative:</u> Full articulation of where the idea developed. High-quality data reported to support the merit of idea before it was considered (Evidence or Theory-based data) <u>Improvement:</u> the program was a significant improvement over what was done previously. Data reported from previous informed improvement effort documents improvement	<i>Modest evidence -- For example:</i> <u>Innovative:</u> Full articulation of where the idea developed. Some data reported to support the merit of idea before it was considered (Evidence might be weak). <u>Improvement:</u> the program was a noticeable improvement over what was done previously. Data reported from previous informed improvement effort.	<i>Some evidence -- For example:</i> <u>Innovative:</u> Description of where idea came from exists (Supporting evidence may be anecdotal). <u>Improvement:</u> the program was a small or minor improvement over what was done previously. Weak assessment evidence to document improvement.	<i>No evidence -- For example:</i> <u>Innovation:</u> the program was not new. <u>Improvement:</u> unclear that the program improved over what had been done previously. No assessment-based evidence to document improvement.		
Total Score						

Evaluator: _____

University Evaluated: _____