S.E.R.V.E. Award Application Review Rubric

Total Possible Points: 100

Each section of the application will be evaluated using the criteria below. Applications should aim for **clear, specific, well-researched, and well-organized responses**.

1. **Team Information & Mentor Support (10 points)**

Criteria	Excellent (10–9)	Good (8–7)	Fair (6–5)	Needs Improvement (4-0)
Team composition, student leadership, and mentor involvement	Team has 3+ diverse members, clear leadership roles, and strong mentor support	Meets minimum requirements with mentor identified	Team structure unclear; mentor support limited	Missing members or mentor; unclear leadership

2. **Community Need Statement (25 points)**

Criteria	Excellent (25–22)	Good (21–18)	Fair (17–14)	Needs Improvement (13-0)
Definition of problem	Clear, compelling, and well-defined issue with strong scope and urgency	Problem identified with some clarity; scope partially addressed	Problem stated vaguely; scope unclear	Issue not well defined
Evidence of need	At least 3 credible, relevant sources integrated effectively	Sources present but limited or not well-integrated	Weak evidence; fewer than 3 sources	No credible evidence provided

3. Project Description (25 points)

Criteria	Excellent (25–22)	Good (21–18)	Fair (17–14)	Needs Improvement (13-0)
Objectives & outcomes	Clear, measurable, realistic goals	Goals are somewhat clear but not fully measurable	Goals vague or overly ambitious	No clear objectives
Activities & timeline	Detailed, logical steps; realistic semester timeline	Steps generally clear; timeline mostly feasible	Limited details; timeline unrealistic	Activities not described
Roles & responsibilities	Clear roles for each team member; equitable involvement	Roles described but uneven or unclear	Few roles described; team involvement vague	Roles missing or entirely unclear
Alignment with LMU mission	Strong, explicit connection to LMU values of service, education	General connection made	Weak or unclear link	No connection described

4. Budget & Justification (20 Points)

Criteria	Excellent (20–18)	Good (17–15)	Fair (14–12)	Needs Improvement (11–0)
Budget completeness	Detailed, accurate, adds up to $1,000 or less	Mostly complete; minor calculation gaps	Incomplete or unclear categories	Missing or unrealistic
Budget justification	Clear, thoughtful explanations for why each item is needed and reasonable	Some explanations provided but limited detail	Explanations vague; weak link to project objectives	No justification; expenses unreasonable

5. **Sustainability & Growth (Optional) (10 points)**
   (Note: This section is optional, but strong responses can give applications a competitive edge.)

Criteria	Excellent (10–9)	Good (8–7)	Fair (6–5)	Needs Improvement (4-0)
Vision for long-term impact	Strong, creative ideas for continuation or expansion	Some ideas for sustainability	Minimal mention of continuation	Not addressed

6. **Writing Quality & Professionalism (10 points)**

Criteria	Excellent (10–9)	Good (8–7)	Fair (6–5)	Needs Improvement (4-0)
Organization, clarity, mechanics	Clear, professional, well-organized, free of major errors	Generally well-written; minor errors	Writing somewhat unclear; organization weak	Difficult to read; many errors

Scoring Summary

- Team & Mentor: 10 points
- Community Need: 25 points
- Project Description: 25 points
- Budget & Justification: 20 points
- Sustainability & Growth: 10 points (optional but encouraged)
- Writing Quality: 10 points

Total: 100 points possible

Recommended Funding Threshold: Applications scoring **80+ points** are considered strong and fundable.