

**Council of Community Based Partnerships at UA**  
**Spring, 2017**  
**Scoring Rubric: Graduate Fellowship Funding (Low Scores Better, as per NIH)**

Criteria	Level of Achievement				Rating (1 to 4 points)
	Exemplary (1)	Proficient (2)	Marginal (3)	Unacceptable (4)	
<b>Overview Theory</b>	Purpose of project is clear, theory defined.	Purpose of project is clear/significant, but theory not defined.	Purpose of project is vague and theory is not defined.	Purpose of project and theory difficult to discern.	
<b>Overview Scientific Methods</b>	Purpose of project is clear, and methods logical.	Purpose of project is clear/significant, but methods vague.	Purpose of project is clear but the logic or significance is marginal.	Clarity, logic, and significance are difficult to discern.	
<b>Team (faculty PI and student)</b>	The interests of PI and the grad student are clearly represented.	The interests of the PI are clear but those of the grad student are vaguely represented.	The team seems hastily constructed and the interests of the PI and grad student are not clearly represented.	The interests of the PI are vague and those of the graduate student are absent.	
<b>Other Team Members (if applicable; n/a if not applicable)</b>	The team has been thoughtfully constructed.	The team has been thoughtfully constructed BUT the interests of all members are not clearly represented.	The team seems hastily constructed. The interests of all members of the team are not clearly represented.	The choice of all team members is not clearly explained.	
<b>Community/ Partnership Benefits</b>	Clearly identifies main themes in the partnership and how all community interests will be represented.	Identifies some themes in the partnership and mentions how community members' interests will be represented.	Identifies only limited themes in the partnership and is unclear how the community's interests will be represented.	Does not identify themes in the partnership or how a true partnership with the community will be created.	
<b>Use of CBPR Methods</b>	Clearly identifies well known CBPR methods and how they will be used.	Identifies CBPR methods but unclear on how they are incorporated or used.	Vaguely mentions CBPR and lacks clear explanation on how methods will be used.	Does not mention CBPR methods or express understanding of their need.	
<b>Potential for External Funding-Innovation and Original Thinking</b>	Strong evidence of original thinking.	Good evidence of original thinking.	Some evidence of original thinking.	Little evidence of original thinking.	
<b>Potential for External Funding-Conclusions and Implications</b>	Identifies conclusions, implications & funding potential.	Mostly identifies conclusions, implications & funding potential.	Identifies some conclusions, implications & funding potential.	Fails to identify conclusions, implications & funding potential.	

**Additional Comments:**