

Evaluation Criteria

The table below shows the criteria PIT-UN uses when evaluating proposals. This rubric has two parts:

- The left column has the criteria the proposal reviewers will assess. A winning proposal will demonstrate that your project matches or exceeds all criteria.
- The right column has the total number of points (or eligibility status) a proposal can be awarded based on how completely it meets each criterion. PIT-UN will consider proposals with the most possible points.

Application Evaluation Rubric <i>Application must meet all RFP stated requirements for completion.</i>	Evaluation Points
<p>Partnerships The project has meaningful and equitable partnerships with one or more of the following entities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other PIT-UN member institutions. • Other educational institutions in their proposals, including those that are not part of the PIT-UN University Network, in particular minority-serving institutions, and two-year community colleges. • Other educational institutions, including those that are not part of the PIT-UN University Network, affinity groups, or organizations that focus on non-tech disciplines such as ethnic studies, disabilities studies, history, humanities, and social sciences. • Organizations that identify as part of disadvantaged/underrepresented communities. • Organizations including those that are nonprofits, private industry, government agencies, affinity groups, or organizations that focus on tech and non-tech disciplines (accrediting agencies, industry representatives, regulators, legislative bodies). • Community organizations that have a specific focus on workforce development and/or creating career pathways for populations currently underrepresented in public service or the science, technology, engineering, or math fields. • Affinity groups or organizations that support academic leadership among communities of color or that are part of the disadvantaged/underrepresented communities. <p>Meaningful and equitable partnerships should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memoranda of Understanding (MOU), Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) for internships, apprenticeships, fellowships, clinics, labs, and practica/practicums. • Articulation agreements. • Documentation of community listening sessions, focus groups, and training sessions. <p>Description of the partnership is clear as to why the involvement of partner(s) is essential to the project and how the partnership will operate, including division of work, role of principal investigators, and allocation of funds.</p>	<p>Up to 20 points</p>

<p>Project Plan</p> <p><i>Proposals for new projects:</i> The project has clearly defined objectives, a well-designed method, and a process and timeline to achieve its goals; provides an evaluation plan with measurable indicators of success; and is feasible and likely to succeed.</p> <p><i>Proposals for previously funded projects:</i> The project has clearly defined objectives, a well-defined method, and a process and timeline to achieve its goals. The project has an evaluation plan with measurable indicators of success and clarity on how it will build upon both accomplishments and lessons it has learned to date.</p>	<p>Up to 10 points</p>
<p>Impact</p> <p><i>Proposals for new projects:</i> The proposal clearly articulates the rationale for the project. That is, the proposal explains how the project will create meaningful educational offerings or strengthen the career placement pipeline for the field of public interest technology. It will be helpful to list the assumptions the project is making about its work, its prioritized activities, and its intended impact over time.</p> <p><i>Proposals for previously funded projects:</i> The proposal clearly articulates the rationale for continuing the project, what the project has accomplished to date, and how extending the project will generate a meaningful contribution to educational opportunities or career pipeline opportunities in the field of public interest technology. It will be helpful to list the assumptions the project is making about its work, its prioritized activities, and its intended impact in a potential second or third year of funding.</p>	<p>Up to 25 points</p>
<p>Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal clearly articulates major barriers to equity and access related to public interest technology and identifies gaps in the workforce pipeline that lead to the exclusion of the majority of people of color, women, and people with disabilities from the current tech workforce. • The project’s objectives and method include a plan to address the articulated barriers and gaps, ensuring that aspects of racial, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity and equity are reflected in the design and reach of the project (i.e., students served) as well as the staffing of the proposed project team. • The project team demonstrates the ability to serve ethnically, racially, socioeconomically diverse, and underrepresented populations, perhaps supported by an actionable plan informed by best practices to use this funding to engage and serve these populations. 	<p>Up to 35 points</p>
<p>Qualifications and Capacity</p> <p>The proposal clearly articulates that the project team and institution have deep knowledge of the field of public interest technology and/or other fields relevant for the proposed project. The proposal also articulates that the institution has the capacity and resources to support the project.</p>	<p>Up to 10 points</p>

<p>Budget and Institutional Support</p> <p><i>Proposals for new or previously funded projects requesting up to \$90,000 (Tranche 1):</i> The project has demonstrated buy-in from the applicant’s university to help sustain the project’s impact. For example, the host university can contribute funds, provide support from university leaders, or enable collaboration between departments, faculty, or other university groups.</p> <p><i>Proposals for new or previously funded projects requesting \$90,001 to \$145,000 (Tranche 2):</i> The project team has secured at least a 50% match for requested funding commitments from its university (or universities if part of a collaboration). Such commitments may be in the form of cash contributions (either the value of the effort that university-paid personnel are expending on the project or money from a university gift, endowment, and/or other unrestricted fund) and/or in-kind support (real property, equipment, supplies and other expendable property, or goods and services).</p> <p><i>Proposals for previously funded projects (Tranche 1 or Tranche 2):</i> The project’s institutional plan(s) and related commitments clearly demonstrate the institutionalization of public interest technology within their university.</p>	<p>Up to 10 points</p>
--	------------------------