**FDFAC Rubric 2025-2026**

**Previous funding**

Any received this academic year -3
 Any received last year AY -2
 Any received 2 years ago -1

**Previous unfunded applications**

Have you applied for FDF funding from this committee at any time in the past 3 academic years?
(yes/no)

If yes, were you denied all funding (ie: never received any award in 3 AYs)?
(yes/no)

**If Yes to both**  +1 point

**Tenure status**

Non-tenured faculty +1

**Goals:**

(0 points) Missing or does not meet minimum standard.

(minimum +1) Gives name of event or activity.It is clear that this proposal supports either teaching or research/scholarship/creative works or service/leadership

(satisfactory +2) Goals meet the minimum requirements **AND**:

Describes or lists one or more specific goals that they hope to accomplish (example: attend two sessions on Artificial Intelligence, or present a paper/talk/poster)

(exceptional +3) Goals meet the satisfactory requirements **AND**:

Gives sufficient detail to judge the value or importance of the event/activity and why the person should participate.

**Contribution to faculty member’s professional development**

(0 points) Missing or does not meet the minimum standard.

(min. +1) Briefly describes how information gained from this activity will further the candidate’s professional development in either teaching, research/scholarship/creative works, or service/leadership.

(satisfactory +2) Meets the minimum requirements **AND**
Describes with specificity how the stated goals expand their knowledge or skills in unique or novel ways

(exceptional +3) Goals meet the satisfactory requirements **AND**
Explains how the candidate will build on their goals of this event/activity in the future (i.e.: how it provides a platform for further growth & development).

Change: Links professional development contributions to the goals. Starts with basically stating the value of the activity, then how the goals tie to professional development, then how they will build on this.

Rationale: Tying outcomes to the earlier goals will help differentiate the two sections. Starting with just describing how the information will be used will account for people who don’t link outcomes to goals – for more points, they will have to link the two.

**Sharing of Learning.**

(0 points) Does not describe how the learning or activity product will be shared with colleagues (departmental or in the field).

(min. +1) Briefly tells how the research, information or activity product will be shared.

(satisfactory +2) Describes in detail how the research, information, or activity product will be shared, and with whom (colleagues in department or field, etc.).

(exceptional +3) Meets the standard for satisfactory, **AND**
the communication of research, learning, or activity product for the benefit of others is a major focus of, or reason for, the activity.

**Budget**

(0 points) Missing (simply gives total amount requested)

(min. +1) Budget is included, but cost estimates may be general in nature

(satisfactory +2) Budget includes specific sources of expected costs, demonstrating research into costs (ie: actual airfare or mileage calculation, actual housing costs, not approximates. Note that costs can change, but this should show that applicant has looked into specifics)