

**SERVICE-LEARNING COURSE DEVELOPMENT
SUMMER FACULTY FELLOWSHIP
Application Evaluation Rubric**

| | UNSATISFACTORY (0-3 pts) | SATISFACTORY (4-7 pts) | GOOD (8-10 pts) |
|--|---|--|---|
| Description of course development project | The description of the course to be developed is vague and unclear. There is not enough evidence to conclude that the faculty member can successfully implement the course. | The description of the course to be developed is relatively clear but is lacking sufficient detail to demonstrate that the faculty member can complete the course development process and successfully implement the course. | The description of the course to be developed is clear and sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the faculty member can complete the development process and successfully implement the course. |
| Linkage of service activities & learning objectives | There is not enough evidence to conclude that the service activities will support and reinforce student learning objectives. | The service activities appear to be well-suited to the course learning objectives, but it is not completely clear how the service activities relate to the student learning objectives. | The service activities identified (specific or general) are well-suited to the course learning objectives, and the application clearly explains how service activities will support and reinforce student learning objectives. |
| Impact on students | There is not enough evidence to conclude that the service activities will have a significant impact on students. | The specified service activities will benefit students in relation to the course being developed. | The potential benefits of the specified service activities are far-reaching, having the capability of enhancing student learning in the course being developed and in the field as a whole. It also has the potential to positively impact students' college experience in general. |

| | UNSATISFACTORY (0-3 pts) | SATISFACTORY (4-7 pts) | GOOD (8-10 pts) |
|--|--|--|---|
| Academic Rigor | The application does not include an adequate explanation of the evaluation plan or reflective activities, and does not give enough evidence to conclude that the course will be academically rigorous. | The application documents a plan for evaluation and the inclusion of reflective activities, but it is not clear how the faculty member will ensure an academically rigorous course. | The application documents an appropriate and realistic plan for maintaining high academic standards, including the incorporation of appropriate reflective activities and the development of an effective evaluation strategy. |
| Knowledge, experience, interest in service-learning | The application does not address faculty member's interest in, knowledge of, or experience with service-learning. | The application does not fully explain the faculty members' interest in, knowledge of, or experience with service-learning, making it somewhat unclear why the faculty member is choosing to include a service-learning component in the course. | The application documents faculty member's interest in and reason for including a service-learning component in the course being developed. The applicant has explained any service-learning related experience, and the origin and extent of his/her service-learning related knowledge. |
| Writing quality & completeness | The application does not address all of the required components. | The application thoroughly and completely addresses all of the required components specified in the narrative section of the application directions, but is lacking organization and structure, making it difficult to understand. | The application thoroughly and completely addresses all of the required components specified in the narrative section of the application directions. The document is well-written and easy to understand. |