**Faculty-Led Classrooms Abroad Program Proposal Rubric – out of 30 points**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Exemplary****(3 Points)** | **Adequate****(2 points)** | **Needs Improvement****(1 point)** | **Missing****(o points)** | **Score**  | **Comments** |
| **Faculty experience and/or knowledge of location** | The faculty should have direct knowledge and/or experience in the chosen location. | Faculty have direct experience and knowledge of the location, which clearly enhances the content of the course. | Faculty does not have direct experience in the location however the program collaborates with on-site experts. | This is the first time the faculty have been to this location and on-site experts are only for logistical and translation assistance. | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided. |  |  |
| **Prior faculty involvement in projects leading students; demonstrated leadership with students** | The lead faculty should have some demonstrated experience leading student projects at home or abroad. | Faculty have direct experience leading student projects.  | Faculty does not have direct experience leading student projects; however, faculty has identified other areas of demonstrated leading young people.  | Faculty does not have direct experience leading students from DC or elsewhere. | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided. |  |  |
| **Link to program/course learning outcomes** | Location enhances overall theme and learning objectives.  | Clear association between the overall theme and learning objectives and the location of the program. | Moderate association between the overall theme and learning objectives and the location of the program. | The location does not adequately enrich the overall theme and learning objectives.  | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided.  |  |  |
| **On-site cultural and immersive experiences & activities** | Design the program with structured onsite immersive and cultural experiences and activities.  | Clearly structured to include immersive and cultural experiences with locals and/or time for self-exploration. | Program structure includes adequate levels of immersive and cultural experiences or independent exploration.  | Program structure includes limited levels of immersive and cultural experiences or independent exploration.  | Program structure does not include immersive and cultural experiences.  |  |  |
| **Link to Essential Employability Skills Outcomes****(EESO)** | Proposal describes the link between the FLCA and specific EES outcomes  | Clear association between EESO and the identified learning outcomes  | Moderate association between EESO and the identified learning outcomes | Vague association between EESO and the identified learning outcomes | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided. |  |  |
| **Collaboration with partner institutions** | Proposal demonstrates how the partner will enhance academic learning for students and add value to the local cultural experience. | Clear link between partner and learning activities; evidence of partner’s involvement in local culture experiences  | Moderate link between partner and learning activities; some evidence of partner’s involvement in local culture experiences  | Vague link between partner and learning activities; little evidence of partner’s involvement in local culture experiences | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided.  |  |  |
| **Post-travel sharing of FLCA experience** | Proposal describes how faculty will ensure the FLCA is shared with the wider campus community  | Clearly indicates how the FLCA experience will be shared to benefit other students/faculty | Moderately indicates how the FLCA experience will be shared to benefit other students/faculty | No indication indicates of how the FLCA experience will be shared to benefit other students/faculty | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided.  |  |  |
| **Risk Management** | Risks and mitigation strategies should be defined.  | Risks and mitigation strategies are clearly articulated | Risks and mitigationstrategies are somewhat articulated.  | Risk and mitigation strategies are not clear.  | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided.  |  |  |
| **Itinerary**  | Detailed itinerary is provided that details specific daily activities of students while abroad | Itinerary is detailed and provides specific detail about daily activities  | Itinerary provides moderate detail about daily activities | Itinerary provides vague detail about daily activities | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided. |  |  |
| **Budget**  | Lower costs equals more access but value for location and time matters as well.  | Budget is realistic and cost sensitive.  | Budget is realistic but costs are high.  | Budget is not reflective of realistic costs.  | Not adequate or unable to gauge by information provided.  |  |  |
| **Grand total – out of 30 points**  |  |  |