**Schweitzer Fellowship Application Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Problem** | | | | |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **Problem comprehension and proximity** | Unable to define the problem they are trying to address and demonstrate that it is a problem to the community described. Does not articulate why they are addressing this problem. | Defines the problem but does not identify its root causes and somewhat demonstrates that this is a problem to the community. Assertions are supported with limited data and evidence. Conveys interest in addressing the problem but has not spent time with the affected community or engaged in related work and/or research. | Defines the problem and its ecosystem and potential root causes and demonstrates that it is a problem to the community described. Assertions are supported by compelling data and evidence. Presents a strong reason for addressing the problem and has a relationship with the community and/or has participated in related work and/or research. | Precisely defines a problem and root causes, demonstrating that this is a problem of significance to the community described. Assertions are enhanced by use of significant data and evidence. Presents a compelling reason for addressing the problem and/or has a long-standing relationship with the community and conveys how these relationships advance their work. |
| **Learning orientation** | Does not demonstrate commitment to learning. | Demonstrates some commitment to learning and improvement by proactively seeking input that informs their approach in addressing the problem. | Demonstrates commitment to learning and improvement by seeking input and applying insights to improve effectiveness in addressing the problem. | Demonstrates commitment to continuous learning and improvement by proactively evaluating one’s efforts, seeking input, and applying insights to improve effectiveness. |
| **Positioning and feasibility** | Has no skills or experiences needed to address the problem; does not demonstrate assessment of operational capacity for the implementation of their work. | Has very few of the skills and experiences needed to address the problem and/or a limited track record of taking action to advance progress on this problem. Demonstrates an insufficient assessment of operational capacity for implementation and does not acknowledge potential obstacles. Ability to launch and/or lead the proposed effort is unclear. | Has several of the skills and experiences needed to address the problem and a track record of action. Demonstrates a realistic assessment of operational for implementation, including attention to potential challenges and proposed mitigation strategies. Demonstrates ability to launch and/or lead the proposed effort. | Has many of the skills and experiences needed to address the problem and an extensive track record of action. Demonstrates a comprehensive assessment of operational capacity for implementation, including clarity about additional resources necessary, potential challenges, and mitigation strategies. Compellingly demonstrates ability to launch and lead the proposed effort. |
| **Plan for impact and action** | Unable to articulate how the proposed effort will address the problem, and or/ identify key goals for the year and planned actions. Any plans mentioned are unclear and/or illogical. | Somewhat articulates how the proposed effort will address the problem, key goals for the year, and planned activities. There is little logic in how the key activities will drive social impact or evidence to support claims. | Clearly articulates how the proposed effort will address the problem and result in change. Clearly defines goals for the year and planned activities. There is logic in how key activities will drive impact and evidence to support claims. | Compellingly articulates how the proposed effort will address the problem and result in measurable change. Clearly defines key goals, planned activities, and anticipated. There is strong logic in how key activities will drive impact and evidence to support claims. |
| **Measurement and evaluation** | Does not explain how they will measure and evaluate the intended outcomes and social impact. | Provides minimal explanation on how they will measure and evaluate the intended outcomes and social impact. | Provides an explanation on how they will measure and evaluate the intended outcomes and social impact, including some relevant metrics. | Provides a clear explanation on how they will measure and evaluate each intended outcome and the overall social impact, along with detailed associated metrics. |
| **Innovation** | Demonstrates no understanding of existing efforts. The proposed project does not appear to be innovative or add/expand services at the community site. | Demonstrates some understanding of existing efforts (past and/or present). Does not explain how their intervention is innovative within their implementing context (i.e., differentiated from and/or complementary to other efforts). | Demonstrates understanding of efforts (past and/or present). Articulates how their intervention is innovative within their implementing context (i.e., differentiated from and/or complements other efforts), using data and evidence. | Demonstrates extensive understanding of efforts (past and present) to address the problem. Clearly articulates how their effort is innovative within their implementing context (i.e., differentiated from and complements other efforts) using compelling data and evidence from primary and/or secondary sources. |

*\*Adapted from the Cheng Evaluation Rubric, developed by the Social Innovation Change Initiative at Harvard University*