2025 SSC: ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

The evaluation of proposals and final presentations for the 2025 SSC will be based on the following criteria. Proposals will be scored on a scale of 1–5 for each category, with 1 being "Needs Improvement" and 5 being "Excellent." The total possible score for written proposals is 35. For presentations, an additional category for Quality of Presentation will be included, making the total possible score 40.

PARTICIPANT/TEAM_____

Criteria	Rubric	Score
1. Innovation & Novelty of Solution (0–5 Points) Does the proposal introduce a new or innovative sustainability solution? How does the solution differ from or improve upon existing solutions on campus?	1-2: The solution lacks originality and is similar to past initiatives or commonly known strategies. 3-4: The solution is somewhat innovative, offering improvements or new twists on existing concepts. 5: The solution is highly original, introducing a novel and creative approach to sustainability that hasn't been attempted on campus.	_____/5
2. Sustainability Impact (0–5 Points) How well does the proposed solution address sustainability across all three pillars: environmental, economic, and social?	1-2: The solution addresses only one or two sustainability pillars, or lacks significant depth in analysis. 3-4: The solution addresses all three pillars with a reasonable level of impact but may not fully explore or balance them. 5: The solution addresses and effectively integrates all three sustainability pillars, demonstrating clear and substantial impact.	_____/5
3. Clarity & Organization (0–5 Points) Is the proposal well-structured and easy to follow? Does it clearly outline the key components, such as the problem, solution, stakeholders, and resources needed?	1-2: The proposal is unclear or poorly structured, making it difficult to follow the key points. 3-4: The proposal is generally well-structured, but some sections may lack clarity or detail. 5: The proposal is logically organized, clear, and concise, making it easy to understand the concept and its benefits.	_____/5

4. Feasibility & Resources (0–5 Points) Does the proposal demonstrate a clear understanding of the resources required for implementation (e.g., cost, time, materials, staff)? Is the proposed solution feasible within the context of the university?	1-2: The proposal lacks a realistic understanding of the resources required or feasibility of implementation. 3-4: The proposal provides a reasonable estimation of required resources but may overlook some practical aspects. 5: The proposal is highly feasible, demonstrating a clear and well-thought-out plan for securing resources and implementing the solution.	____/5
5. Stakeholder Engagement (0–5 Points) Has the proposal identified the relevant stakeholders, and how does the solution benefit them? Is there evidence of preliminary engagement or feedback from relevant campus offices or departments?	1-2: The proposal does not identify key stakeholders or provide evidence of engagement. 3-4: The proposal identifies stakeholders and provides some evidence of engagement, but this may be limited or informal. 5: The proposal clearly identifies and engages key stakeholders, demonstrating a collaborative approach and potential for buy-in.	____/5
6. Expected Benefits (0–5 Points) Are the expected benefits of the proposed solution clearly articulated? Do the benefits align with the goals of the SSC and the university's sustainability priorities?	1-2: The expected benefits are vague or unclear, or the proposal does not connect them to the goals of the SSC or university. 3-4: The expected benefits are clear and mostly aligned with sustainability goals, but some aspects may need more development. 5: The expected benefits are well-defined, aligned with sustainability priorities, and clearly demonstrate the positive impact on the university and broader community.	____/5
7. Alignment with SSC Theme ("Beyond Green: Solutions for a Better Campus") (0–5 Points) How well does the proposal align with the 2025 SSC theme? Does it contribute to a broader vision of creating a sustainable, better campus community?	1-2: The proposal is loosely aligned with the theme, with limited connection to creating a better campus. 3-4: The proposal aligns with the theme and offers a relevant contribution to campus sustainability, though some aspects may require further development. 5: The proposal is a strong fit with the SSC theme, offering a compelling contribution to improving campus sustainability and fostering a better community.	____/5

| 8. Quality of Presentation (0–5 Points) [THIS IS ONLY APPLICABLE FOR PRESENTATIONS] How effectively is the proposal communicated? Does it use clear language, compelling arguments, and visual elements (if included in appendices) to strengthen the proposal? | 1-2: The presentation is unclear or lacks professionalism, making it difficult to engage with or understand the proposal. 3-4: The presentation is clear and professional, but it may lack persuasive arguments or engaging elements. 5: The presentation is highly effective, using clear, professional language, compelling arguments, and thoughtful elements (e.g., visuals or charts) to enhance understanding and engagement. | |