

Each committee member will assign a score to each proposal based on the following rubric.

Category

Point Break Down

Interest/Anticipated Attendance (26.32%)

SCORE

Number of Attendees: Potential to cost effective a reaching a large audience based on ULF requested funds only <i>(Determined by dividing the ULF request by the estimated number of attendees, for example a proposed event for 100 people wherein the organizers ask for the full \$3000 from ULF results in a ratio of \$30:1) ** (expectations of attendance are adjusted for speakers at Roundrock campus)</i>	Missing Content / Too Costly: Not enough details or cost ratio exceeds \$500:1 SCORE: 0	Low Potential: High cost to audience ratio (no more than \$500:1) SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Cost to audience ratio (up to \$100:1) <i>Adjusted for Roundrock: up to \$200:1</i> SCORE: 2	High Potential: Cost to audience ratio (up to \$15:1) <i>Adjusted for Roundrock: up to \$25:1</i> SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: Cost to audience ratio (\$5:1 or better) <i>Adjusted for Roundrock: up to \$10:1</i> SCORE: 4	
Relevancy of Topic: The proposal describes how the topic/speaker will create a relevant, timely event of interest to the TXST community.	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Relevancy: Topic is relevant to select participants who share a specialized interest SCORE: 1	Relevant: Topic is relevant to a subset of the TXST community SCORE: 2	Strong Relevancy: Topic is relevant to the TXST community at large SCORE: 3	Exceptional Relevancy: Timely topic that is critically relevant to the TXST community at large SCORE: 4	
Broad Interest: Potential that Speaker/Topic will Attract a Varied Audience <i>(e.g., multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary across departments/colleges)</i>	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Draw: Expectation to draw in audience from only a single program / class / content area SCORE: 1	Moderate Draw: Expectation to draw in audience from multiple courses within a single department / discipline SCORE: 2	Strong Draw: Expectation to draw in audience from multiple departments / disciplines SCORE: 3	Exceptional Draw: <u>Explicit</u> expectation to draw in audience from multiple <u>disciplines / colleges</u> SCORE: 4	
Scope of Attendees: Potential that Speaker/Topic will attract a variety of student groups <i>(e.g., undergrad, grad, first-gen, veterans, other)</i>	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Likely to only engage a single course or single type of student group SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Likely to engage a subset of similar courses and/or student groups SCORE: 2	High Potential: Expectation to attract students from a subset of disciplines or levels SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: Likely to attract multiple types of students across disciplines and levels SCORE: 4	
External Reach: Potential to Reach a Community/External Audience	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: No explicit intention to interest or engage with community members outside of TXST SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Topic/Event may be of interest to select community members outside of TXST SCORE: 2	High Potential: Implied connections between the event and the community beyond TXST SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Explicit</u> connections between event and community beyond TXST SCORE: 4	

Topic/Speaker Involvement (26.32%)

Active Scholarly Dialog: Direct involvement of TXST community in scholarly dialogue before/during the program <i>(e.g., activities including students/faculty/staff)</i>	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Incomplete plans include optional dialog among TXST attendees related to event SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Plans include include scholarly dialog involvement with select subset of TXST attendees SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Generalized plans for how TXST attendees will be engaged in related scholarly dialog SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Explicit</u> plans detailing how <u>all</u> TXST attendees will be engaged in related scholarly dialog SCORE: 4	
---	--	--	--	---	---	--

Speaker Involvement Beyond Lecture: Direct speaker involvement with scholarly interactions before/during/after program (e.g., activities including the speaker)	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Speaker will provide content that may be used for dialog, but will not directly participate SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Speaker will interact with only a subset of the full audience (e.g., Q&A restricted to select participants, interactions with one class post lecture) SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Speaker will be actively involved in dialog with most of the audience members present (e.g., publicly open Q&A) SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: Provided plans explicitly articulate that the Speaker will be <u>actively involved</u> in dialog with all audience members present in some manner SCORE: 4	
Continued Reflection: Plans for Dialogue/Reflection among TXST community beyond/after the Presentation/Q&A (e.g., could involve classes, student organizations, faculty meetings, etc., in which the topic is further considered beyond the main lecture)	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Vague or no clear plan for additional scholarly activities beyond the primary lecture SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Limited or generic plans for additional scholarly reflection activities beyond the primary lecture SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Plans provided for additional scholarly reflection through follow-up activities beyond lecture SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Explicit</u> plans detailing how additional activities related to lecture will be integrated beyond the proposed experience for continued reflection SCORE: 4	
University Mission and Shared Values: Clear connection are made on how the event will advance TXST's mission and shared values	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Limited Connection: One connection on how event will advance mission / values SCORE: 1	Moderate Connections: Two connections on how the event will advance mission / values SCORE: 2	Strong Connections: Three clear connections on how the event will advance mission / values SCORE: 3	Exceptional Connections: <u>More than Three, explicit</u> connections SCORE: 4	
Speaker Biography: The speaker is well suited to present on the topic and has National / International recognition	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Adequate Speaker: Speaker is new to the field, may not be well known, and/or most accomplishments are local/regional SCORE: 1	Good Speaker: Speaker is established within the topic field with limited national recognition SCORE: 2	Strong Speaker: Speaker is respected in the topic field and recognized for national accomplishments (limited international recognition) SCORE: 3	Exceptional Speaker: Speaker is well respected in the topic field and recognized for multiple international accomplishments SCORE: 4	

Event Logistics (26.32%)

Event Planning: Details describe the specifics of event details and planning to ensure the feasibility of success.	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Vague description of how the event is being planned and what will take place during SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Generalized description of how the event is being planned and what will take place before/during/after SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Description of all event details being planned, agenda, and including scholarly activities before/during/after SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: High quality and <u>thorough details</u> provided to ensure <u>feasibility</u> of event as intended SCORE: 4	
Established Contact with Speaker	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Contact details available, but not yet contacted SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Set an appointment to meet with speaker, but not yet connected SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Already contacted publicist, but not speaker directly SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Active</u> communication lines established with speaker SCORE: 4	

<u>Tentative Commitment by Speaker</u>	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Speaker has not yet committed to the events, but has expressed an interest SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Speaker has tentatively committed to the event SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Speaker has committed to the event (dates pending) SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: Speaker has <u>committed</u> to the event (and set dates) SCORE: 4	
<u>Marketing Plan:</u> The organizers have crafted a multifaceted marketing plan to reach their intended audience	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Marketing plan has issues that may cause potential problems with plan feasibility SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Limited or single strategy marketing plan SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Generalized but broad marketing plan SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Multifaceted</u> and detailed plan to offer marketing to intended audience through multiple means SCORE: 4	
<u>Detailed Recruitment Plan:</u> The organizers have considered a purposeful approach to reach their intended audience in a timely manner to promote event participation	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Potential: Generalized plan on a tight timeline SCORE: 1	Moderate Potential: Generalized plan that will reach a large group in a timely manner SCORE: 2	Strong Potential: Purposeful plan to reach intended audience in a timely manner SCORE: 3	Exceptional Potential: <u>Explicit</u> purposeful plan to reach intended audience in an effective and timely manner to facilitate maximum participation SCORE: 4	

Collaboration/Budget (21.04%)

<u>Budget Justification:</u> The justification for the budget is complete and appropriate for the event to lend toward a successful event	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Justification: General justification provided, but missing elements SCORE: 1	Moderate Justification: General justification provided for all needed funds SCORE: 2	Strong Justification: Justification provided for all needed funds to have a successful event SCORE: 3	Exceptional Justification: <u>Detailed</u> and clearly articulated budget justification to support <u>all needed expenses</u> SCORE: 4	
<u>Collaboration:</u> The organizers have secured collaborations across university units/outside of TXST to support the event. <i>(e.g., funding, nonmonetary activities such as, but not limited to: involvement of classes, in kind services, marketing/recruitment, planning)</i>	No Collaboration SCORE: 0	Low Collaboration: Lecture-related activities shared within a single program / department / organization SCORE: 1	Moderate Collaboration: Lecture-related activities shared across at least two programs / organizations <i>(may be within same department)</i> SCORE: 2	Strong Collaboration: Lecture-related activities shared across at least two separate departments / organizations SCORE: 3	Exceptional Collaboration: Lecture-related activities shared across at least two colleges SCORE: 4	
<u>Co-Sponsor(s):</u> The organizers have obtained outside of University Lecturers Funds	No Co-Sponsors: No commitment beyond University Lecturers Funds (ULF) (0) SCORE: 0	Low Co-Sponsorship: One sponsor beyond ULF SCORE: 1	Moderate Co-Sponsorship: Two sponsors beyond ULF SCORE: 2	Strong Co-Sponsorship: Three sponsors beyond ULF SCORE: 3	Exceptional Co-Sponsorship: <u>Four or more</u> sponsors beyond ULF SCORE: 4	

Committed Funding: Additional funds have been committed outside of the ULFs to successfully host the event	Missing Content / Not Enough Details to Determine SCORE: 0	Low Commitment: Shared funding covers 1-15% of total budget SCORE: 1	Moderate Commitment: Shared funding covers 16-30% of total budget SCORE: 2	Strong Commitment: Shared funding covers 31-50% of total budget SCORE: 3	Exceptional Commitment: Shared funding covers <u>51% or more</u> of total budget SCORE: 4	
---	--	---	---	---	--	--

Earned Score 0 (x 1.31578948 weight)

Total Score	0.00
--------------------	-------------

*Rubric score totals will be listed in ranked order. The committee will recommend as many proposals judged to merit funding as the budget allows, starting with the top-ranked proposal and progressing through the ranked list. Proposals must follow articulated guidelines on formatting and length as well as earn a minimum average of **70 points weighted score** per reviewer to be considered for funding.*