GSUSA Gold Award Scholarship Rubric

*Note: Words in **red font** refer to terms listed on the "Key Evaluation Criteria" section of the GSUSA Gold Award Scholarship Reviewer Guide*

Category	*Description*	**0** Does Not Meet the Requirements	**1** Meets Requirements Marginally	**2** Meets Requirements Well (Indicates a Gold Award Project)	**3** Exceeds Expectations	**4** Far Exceeds Expectations (rare!)
National and/or Global Link [Evaluate in Response 3]	*The applicant explained how their project connects to an issue that is relevant beyond their own community, and ideally used research to inform the project itself.*	The applicant did not connect the project to a larger national and/or global issue. They did not convey research that helped to shape their project.	The applicant showed limited understanding of the connection between their project and a national and/or global issue. They demonstrated limited research on their issue.	The applicant specifically connected their project to a larger national and/or global issue. They used research to develop a solution that contributes to solving that issue.	The applicant specifically connected their project to a larger national and/or global issue. They have examined solutions to the same or similar issues in their communities or countries and used this research to inform their project.	The applicant connected their project to a larger national and/or global issue, used thorough research to inform their project, and has replicated or shared their project beyond their immediate community.
Measurability/Impact [Evaluate in Response 2]	*The applicant demonstrated their impact through data and their information. They used numbers to say, "Here's the change I planned to make, and here's how I know I made it."*	The project solution demonstrated little or no impact on the identified issue. The applicant may not have measured the impact, or the impact was not meaningful.	The project solution had limited impact on the identified issue; or the applicant made a clear effort to explain the issue, but the project solution does not match the issue well, or the impact is unclear.	The project solution **successfully addressed** the identified issue and the applicant explained how they measured their impact.	The project solution **successfully addressed** the identified issue for a **significant number** of individuals and/or to a significant degree. The applicant identified their success criteria and built them into their project planning.	The project **successfully addressed** the identified issue for a **significant number** of people to a significant degree. The applicant identified their success criteria and used data and analytics to demonstrate their project's impact over time.
Root Cause [Evaluate in Response 1]	*The applicant identified a **root cause** of their issue and addressed it through a well-constructed and researched project plan.*	The applicant did not identify a **root cause** of their issue. Their project addressed an immediate need with a short-term or one-off solution.	The applicant identified a **root cause** of their issue, but their project did not address it.	The applicant showed careful consideration of a **root cause** of the identified issue through a well-constructed approach.	The applicant presented a well-constructed and well-researched plan with careful attention to detail that described the issue, formed a well-reasoned solution that addressed a **root cause**, and executed on a plan to implement their solution.	The applicant presented a well-constructed and well-researched project plan that showed both careful attention to detail and creative thinking in addressing a **root cause** of their issue and the solution was especially innovative and/or the impact was profound. Their project may have addressed a new/underserved area.
Resources [Evaluate in Response 1]	*The applicant used the resources (technical, natural/environmental, financial, social, subject matter experts/human, infrastructure, local organizations, and more) available to them in a creative and effective way to increase their project's reach or expand its impact.*	The applicant did not describe the connection between their project and appropriate resources.	The applicant made limited use of available resources but there was some attempt to use available resources to enable or inform their work.	The applicant demonstrated a well-considered use of resources.	The applicant demonstrated a well-considered use of resources, and showed some innovation in finding or using resources in their project.	The applicant showed remarkable innovation or ingenuity in the use of their resources – making great use of existing resources, or overcoming a significant lack of resources available to them.
Sustainability [Evaluate in Response 2]	*The applicant's project has continued to have an impact after they have completed their part.*	No plan was put in place to continue the project and the solution cannot be maintained following this project.	There may be some impact beyond their involvement, but it's not very significant or solid. There may be a vague **sustainability** plan, but there is little evidence to back it up.	The project included a clear, thoughtful plan for **sustainability**.	The project has had a significant and lasting impact beyond their involvement.	The project has had a significant and lasting impact beyond their involvement, and that impact is strong and self-sustaining.

GSUSA Gold Award Scholarship Rubric

Category	*Description*	**0** Does Not Meet the Requirements	**1** Meets Requirements Marginally	**2** Meets Requirements Well (Indicates a Gold Award Project)	**3** Exceeds Expectations	**4** Far Exceeds Expectations (rare!)
Community Engagement [Evaluate in Response 1]	*The applicant exercised leadership by involving appropriate members of the community they served in their project.*	The applicant did the project *for* their **target audience**. They did not engage appropriate members of the community in the solution, before, during, or after the project.	The applicant may have attempted to work with appropriate members of the community for their project, but it was not a core element of their project's work. This project may have conveyed some benefit to the **target audience** but it was not a partnership.	The applicant engaged appropriate members of the community before, during, and after the project and they have demonstrated that their **target audience** is benefiting from their project.	The applicant engaged their community before, during, and after the project. There are demonstrated ways that appropriate community members are benefiting from and participating in their project. The community is helping sustain their work after the project's completion.	The applicant engaged their community before, during, and after the project. There are demonstrated ways that appropriate community members are benefiting from and participating in their project. The community has taken their idea and replicated it, or established it as an ongoing service.
Team Leadership **[**Evaluate in Response 1]	*The applicant led a team to accomplish their goals. They explain how they attracted people to help with their project, delegated the work, and managed their team.*	The applicant did not lead a team or engage others to help with their project - the applicant did it by themselves or this project appears driven by an adult (parent, mentor, or existing organization that the applicant served).	The applicant did not convey significant effort to engage a wider team from the community or the applicant led their project team with outsized support or direction (excessive help from an adult). Teamwork might have been limited to people from their immediate network performing only peripheral tasks but it was not a functioning team.	The applicant recruited and led a team to complete their project. There is evidence that the team performed their assigned roles.	The applicant effectively led a team that included at least one expert, along with a diverse representation of skill sets. They sparked action within their larger community.	The applicant thoughtfully assembled and engaged a team with diverse skill sets and areas of expertise. They showed extraordinary effort in inspiring others outside of their immediate network to take action on their chosen issue.
Personal Growth and Development [Evaluate in Response 4]	*The applicant described the new skills they gained, qualities they learned about themselves, and how these discoveries will help them in the future.*	The applicant did not describe or exhibit meaningful personal growth as a result of completing their project.	The applicant gave general/non-compelling examples of personal growth.	The applicant described how their project changed their experience or outlook, and there is some evidence that this development will continue.	The applicant was able to articulate the impact completing the Gold Award had on them, including skills gained, how the project helped them learn about themselves, and how these discoveries connect with their future plans.	The applicant expressed concrete examples of how they will apply lessons from their Gold Award in future endeavors. They have demonstrated ongoing civic engagement that is tied to, or inspired by their project.