

Finance and Funding Committee
**Professional Development Request Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Outline for Budgeted Items** | Missing items Irrelevant informationUnclear and/or poorly planned | Inconsistent outline for specific line items and amountsUnsatisfactory estimates for attendance/turnout | Estimates for attendance/turnoutMaximization of requested fundingSpecific line items and amounts |  |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Relevance to CU Denver Student Organization** | No clear objective or relevance to CU Denver Student Organization | Objectives and relevance to Student Organization included, but not clearly explainedIndirect relation to the goals of the organization | Explicitly states benefit to the CU Denver Student OrganizationRelates to organization goalsInclusive of CU Denver Student Organization Members |  |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Presentation** | Errors cause incoherenceTeam collaboration is not apparentQuality of event is poorly described | Major grammatical, mathematical, and/or spelling errors, but proposal is coherentTeam is present, but little to no collaborationQuality of event is somewhat described | Few to no grammatical, mathematical, and/or spelling errorsAttempts to show teamwork within leadership committeeQuality of event is thoroughly described |  |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Accessibility** | No attempt/plans for making development accessible to members | Vague plans for making development accessible to members | Cohesive plan for making development accessible to members (zoom link, meeting location, confirmed attendees, etc.) |  |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Measure of Impact** | No plans to measure the development success | Vague idea and/or approach to measure the development success | Clear idea and approach to measure development successHas a plan to summarize the development success to Student Government (I.e. evaluation and surveys)If applicable, outreach and collaboration with other organizations |  |
|  | 0 Points | 1 Point | 2 Points | Rating |
| **Procurement** | Does not follow university procurement policies | Follows some university procurement policiesAttempts to adhere to the [Green Procurement Policy](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ucdenver.edu%2Fdocs%2Flibrariesprovider129%2Fchris-r-test%2Fsga-green-procurement-policy-1.docx%3Fsfvrsn%3De1946db4_1&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) | All procurement abides by university procurement policies (I.e. purchasing, contracts, risk management, [Green Procurement Policy](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ucdenver.edu%2Fdocs%2Flibrariesprovider129%2Fchris-r-test%2Fsga-green-procurement-policy-1.docx%3Fsfvrsn%3De1946db4_1&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK) etc.) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0-4 Points** | **5-8** | **9-12** |
| Request is denied | Request may require resubmission | Request is approved (may require adjustments to request) |