**Nicolet Federated Library System**

**Library Improvement and Innovation Grant**

**Application Review Rubric**

Library: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Weak/Basic = 1 Point** | **Good/Average = 2 Points** | **Strong/Above Average = 3 Points** | **Score** |
| **Purpose – Relates to Workforce Development, Lifelong Learning, and/or Technology** | Not specifically related to purpose of the grant.  | Partially related to the purpose of the grant. | Relates directly to Workforce Development, Lifelong Learning or Technology. |  |
| **Innovation/What Distinguishes This Project?** | Project is redundant of other community efforts. | Project uniquely addresses specific challenges or needs in a way that yieldsmeasurable results. | Project represents the implementation of new insight or idea, with potential benefits of change made clear. |  |
| **Justification** | Weak presentation of institutional or community need, or tenuous argument for grant’s ability to address need. | Rationale or significanceof project tends towardthe too-specific or too general, but overall argument holds. | Strong rationale and significance of proposed work. Addresses specific need(s) common among peer institutions. |  |
| **Community Need** | Need/priority described using stories, anecdotes or simply describing a worthwhile cause only, no statistical foundation for services organization intends to provide. | Need/priority reflected through the findings compiled through organizational surveys, research, etc.  | Organization has effectively identified the issue and population to be served in an understandable way and is able to demonstrate need with verifiable facts, statistics and data. Project would be relative to overall community. |  |
| **Feasibility** | Project’s assembled personnel, timeline, or budget expose weaknesses in plan design. Outcomes unlikely to be achieved in project’s current form. | Deficiencies or overestimations exist in personnel, timeline, or budget within tolerable range, outcomes appear achievable despite gaps or leaps. | Personnel, project activities timeline, and budget expenditurescongruent with project description and outcomes. |  |
| **Assessment** | Success difficult toascertain, flawed byuntestable outcomes,inappropriate methods, or lack of useful datacollection. | Good understanding ofanticipated specificresults or success, butplan lacks some detailsabout data or methods. | Clear picture of how data will be collected and used to demonstrate degree to which outcomes are met. |  |
| **Sustainability** | No meaningful plans forfuture beyond fundingterm appears in proposal.  | Project is temporary,designed to end whengrant ends, or some effort to secure commitment beyond grant period is represented. | Evidence presented that project or its impact can be sustained locally beyond grant period, ifresults warrant. |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |