

Big Idea Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Absent	Developing	Strong	Excellent	Score
Collaborative	The proposal does not address necessary partnerships or collaborations needed to implement or maintain Big Idea.	<p>The potential may exist for collaboration, but the proposal does not describe the roles and responsibilities of partnerships.</p> <p>The idea involves minimal interdisciplinary/interdivisional collaboration in both the implementation and the maintenance of the idea.</p> <p>Any collaboration is between faculty, staff, or students, but only includes one of the three.</p>	<p>The proposal describes how the idea requires or leverages new or existing interdisciplinary/interdivisional collaboration, but the proposal may lack details about the roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Collaboration largely occurs during implementation or maintenance, but not both.</p> <p>Collaboration occurs among faculty, staff, and students, but the predominant work is accomplished by one or two of the groups.</p>	<p>Proposal clearly identifies how proposed idea requires or leverages new or existing interdisciplinary/interdivisional collaboration, detailing the positions involved and their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Collaboration occurs during BOTH the implementation and maintenance of the idea.</p> <p>Collaboration occurs equally among faculty, staff, and students.</p>	

Big Idea Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Absent	Developing	Strong	Excellent	Score
<p data-bbox="201 240 415 427">Focuses on Strengths – Leveraging existing strengths</p> <p data-bbox="201 475 415 735"><i>A proposal may not address this area if the idea focuses on creating new pathways for opportunities.</i></p> <p data-bbox="201 784 415 1011"><i>Still provide a score for this area based on the rubric. The overall score will be adjusted.</i></p>	<p data-bbox="441 240 722 703">Proposal does not identify any strengths of JMU and/or natural assets of the surrounding area nor does it provide information of how the idea would benefit JMU or surrounding area by leveraging strengths/assets</p>	<p data-bbox="743 240 1083 427">The proposal attempts to identify strengths or assets, but the rationale is limited and not supported by fact.</p> <p data-bbox="743 475 1083 703">Limited details provided of how strength/asset will be enhanced. The proposal does not describe how distinctive the strengths are to JMU.</p>	<p data-bbox="1104 240 1434 427">Proposal describes how the idea will leverage existing strengths or assets during implementation.</p> <p data-bbox="1104 475 1434 898">However, proposal may not fully describe ways that strength/asset will be enhanced after implementation or proposal’s description of how the strengths are distinctive (or will make JMU distinctive) is limited and not supported by data.</p>	<p data-bbox="1455 240 1785 394">Proposal describes how the idea will leverage strengths or assets during implementation.</p> <p data-bbox="1455 443 1785 776">Rationale for inclusion of strengths or assets is provided and ways in which strengths/assets will be enhanced and measured after implementation are laid out and supported by data.</p> <p data-bbox="1455 824 1785 1052">The proposal describes how the strengths/assets are distinctive to JMU or will make JMU distinctive once implemented.</p>	

Big Idea Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Absent	Developing	Strong	Excellent	Score
<p>Focuses on Strengths – New Pathways</p> <p><i>A proposal may not address this area if the idea focuses on leveraging strengths.</i></p> <p><i>Still provide a score for this area based on the rubric. The overall score will be adjusted.</i></p>	<p>The proposal does not explain how the idea reveals or creates pathways to NEW strengths for JMU. Or, described pathways are clearly irrelevant or inappropriate for JMU.</p>	<p>The proposal suggests how the idea will reveal or create pathways to new strengths, but rationale is limited. Details are lacking. Proposal is not fully developed.</p> <p>Pathways may be appropriate for JMU, but the relevance is not addressed in the proposal.</p>	<p>The proposal describes how pathways to new strengths are created and rationale is clear.</p> <p>Pathways appear appropriate for JMU and relevant to JMU, but the proposal lacks supporting evidence.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly articulates how the idea will lead to new strengths or reveal previously unused pathways.</p> <p>Pathways are appropriate and relevant to JMU, and key details are described in detail within the proposal, supported by data.</p>	

Big Idea Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Absent	Developing	Strong	Excellent	Score
<p>Makes a Positive Impact</p>	<p>Proposal does not address how the idea has the potential to improve society at local, regional, national or global level</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Proposal does not address how the idea will enhance the student/learner experience or the rationale is limited or not based on relevant information</p>	<p>The proposal states that the idea has potential to improve society at local, regional, national or global level, but no details are provided as to how the idea accomplishes this.</p> <p>The proposal addresses how the idea will enhance the student/learner experience, but the impact is minimal. No metrics are included AND it is unclear what evidence could be used to demonstrate the impact.</p>	<p>The proposal provides details about how the idea has the potential to improve society at local, regional, national, or global level..</p> <p>The proposal identifies the benefit to the student/learner experience, but no metrics are identified to measure the magnitude of the impact.</p>	<p>Proposal articulates how the idea will improve society at either the local, regional, national or global level. Metrics are identified to evaluate the impact.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Once implemented, the idea will demonstrate with evidence how the the student/learner experience will be enhanced. Proposal articulates specific metrics to measure the benefit.</p> <p>And</p>	
Criteria	Absent	Developing	Strong	Excellent	Score

Big Idea Evaluation Rubric

<p>Differentiates the University</p>	<p>The proposal does not identify any comparison group, field, or concept (e.g., Research universities, all higher education, other non-profits) against which the idea will elevate the university. It is unclear how the idea will lead to JMU differentiating itself against its peers.</p>	<p>The proposal provides some details on how the idea might elevate the university, but the proposal does not provide data to support the argument and simply refers to the differentiation in general terms. (e.g., JMU will become the best in the nation). Or the proposal does not provide details on how the idea will differentiate JMU against an identified comparison group, field, or concept (e.g., Research universities, higher education, other non-profits).</p>	<p>The Proposal details how the idea will distinguish JMU from a well-defined comparison group, field, or concept (e.g., Research universities, higher education, other non-profits) with details on how the idea will elevate JMU's standing among these peers. However, the proposal does not provide data to support the argument and simply refers to the differentiation in general terms.</p>	<p>The proposal details how the idea will elevate JMU from a well-defined comparison group, field, or concept (e.g., Research universities, higher education, other non-profits) with details on how the idea will elevate JMU's standing among these peers. Data are provided about where JMU currently stands among comparison groups and the potential change/improvement that could occur because of the idea.</p>	
--------------------------------------	--	---	---	--	--