SCORING RUBRIC FOR NEAIR AMBASSADOR GRANTS

	Outstanding 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1 or 0	Explanation for Score:
Rationale for conference attendance	Proposal provides specific details/ examples of how conference and new knowledge/ skills to be gained are relevant to IR/NEAIR.	Proposal includes a good but general description of how IR/NEAIR will benefit from their attendance.	Proposal includes a vague description of how IR/NEAIR will benefit from their attendance.	Proposal does not provide evidence of how this conference benefits themselves and/or IR/NEAIR.	
Participation	Proposal provides a specific plan of participation in the full array of activities and opportunities provided by the Ambassador's conference.	Proposal describes plans to participate in some of the Ambassador's conference activities.	Proposal includes a vague description of participation in the Ambassador's conference activities.	Proposal lacks a discussion of the applicant's level of participation.	
Benefit to NEAIR via dissemination	Proposal provides clear, concrete, and thoughtful plan for disseminating relevant information at the following NEAIR.	Proposal includes a good but general description of plan for dissemination.	Proposal includes a vague plan for dissemination.	Proposal does not provide a plan for dissemination.	
Scope of Potential Audience	Sharing experience of attending conference has direct relevance to all sectors.	Sharing experience of attending conference has direct relevance for either 2 or 4 year+ institutions.	Proposal has relevance for a large group within a sector, e.g. tuition discount rate for non-profits.	Proposal has limited relevance, e.g. to Division 1 schools only.	
Funding	Proposal clearly defines expenses and why alternative funding is not available or not likely to be obtained.	Proposal includes a good but general description of need for funding and non-availability of alternate sources of funding.	Proposal includes a vague description of need for funding and non-availability of alternate sources of funding.	Proposal lacks clear argument for needing funding from NEAIR or has alternate funding available.	

Note: It is unlikely that a proposal would have a perfect score of 20; the rubric is meant to provide consistency and suggest multiple ways that proposals can qualify. Reviewers are asked to explain their rationale for assigning a score of 0 to 4 for each rating.

Preference Criteria:

Non-IR Conference	Yes ☐	No ☐
Intention to present at Ambassador's Conference	Yes ☐	No ☐
Same conference was not funded in the previous year	Yes ☐	No ☐
Applicant has not received a NEAIR grant within the past 5 years	Yes ☐	No ☐
Applicant has access to matching funding	Yes ☐	No ☐
Applicant commits to attend NEAIR the following year	Yes ☐	No ☐

Additional Comments: