Application Review Rubric

NASPA Sustainability at Scale Project
Applications will be reviewed using the criteria below. Reviewers will score each area on a 1-3 scale,using the descriptors provided to assess overall alignment, strength, and readiness for participation.

Scoring Scale
1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Meets Expectations
3 – Strong/Exemplary

Review Area	What Reviewers Are Looking For	1 (Does Not Meet Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Strong/Exemplary)
Alignment with Project Purpose	Extent to which the application describes a system-led, holistic advising or pathways redesign aligned with the goals of this study.	Redesign is unclear, fragmented, or primarily institution-level, with limited evidence of system leadership or coordination.	Clear system-level redesign with identifiable, holistic, or cross-cutting elements and a defined system role.	Compelling, cohesive, and clearly system-driven redesign that serves as a strong example for the field.
Sustainability & Evolution Over Time	Evidence that the redesign has been sustained, adapted, and embedded beyond initial implementation	Limited evidence that the work continued beyond initial funding, leadership, or pilot phases	The work has clearly continued over time, with some adaptation to changing conditions.	Strong evidence of long-term sustainability, institutionalization, and thoughtful evolution
Holistic Scope of Redesign Activities	Breadth and depth of redesign activities, demonstrating a holistic approach to student success.	The redesign focused on a limited set of activities or a single intervention area.	The redesign addressed multiple redesign activity areas, reflecting a broadly holistic approach.	The redesign engaged many interconnected activity areas, demonstrating a comprehensive and integrated approach to student success.
Fiscal Responsibility, Staffing, and Policy	Clarity and depth of discussion across the project's three core topics	One or more topics are missing or addressed superficially	All three topics are addressed with reasonable depth and clarity	Integrated discussion showing how fiscal, staffing, and policy decisions reinforced sustainability
Evidence of Impact & Data Readiness	Strength of available evidence demonstrating student success outcomes and readiness to share data	Limited evidence or unclear data availability	Clear description of outcomes tracked and evidence used to assess advising impact	Strong outcome evidence, analytic capacity, and clear readiness to share relevant data and documentation
Readiness & Capacity to Participate	Organizational readiness, capacity, and motivation to engage fully in the project.	Participation plans are unclear or underdeveloped, with limited clarity about system-level coordination or capacity.	Demonstrated readiness to participate, including identification of appropriate system and institutional leads and a reasonable engagement plan.	Strong readiness, clear motivation, and thoughtful plans for system- and institution-level engagement, including effective use of the award and learning opportunities.
Leadership Commitment & Feasibility	Strength and clarity of senior leadership support and feasibility of participation	Leadership support is minimal, procedural, or lacks evidence of feasibility or follow-through.	Leadership confirms awareness of the project, endorses participation, and affirms feasibility of system involvement.	Leadership demonstrates clear engagement, commitment to resourcing participation, and support for sustained follow-through.

Eligibility Requirements (Screened, Not Scored)
Applications must also meet the following eligibility requirements to advance to scoring:
- U.S.-based state higher education systems or statewide coordinating or governing entities that oversee multiple postsecondary institutions
- Advising or pathways redesign launched between 2015 and 2020
- Evidence of at least five years of sustained work
- Identification of 3 participating institutions
- Submission of a senior leadership letter of support
- Confirmation of ability to participate over the project period (March 2026–March 2027)

Overall Selection Approach
Final selections will be based on rubric scores and consideration of cohort balance across system types, institutional contexts, and advising models. The goal is to assemble a diverse and informative group of systems that can contribute meaningfully to shared learning.