

Immersive Learning Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Use: Evaluate whether a proposed experience meets LP&S immersive learning expectations.

1. Significant Engagement (Sustained Time and Effort) — Minimum Requirement

NOTE: This criterion is a threshold requirement rather than a scored item. If a proposed experience does not meet the minimum standard below, it should not move forward for full scoring on the remaining criteria.

Meets Minimum Engagement Requirement? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If "No," the application should not move forward for full scoring.

For reviewer reference:

Level	Descriptor
Meets requirement	Experience requires consistent engagement across the full semester or term, demonstrating ongoing commitment and increasing depth over time. Clearly not brief, episodic or partial-term. - Fall/spring: sustained engagement across at least 12 of the 14 weeks (90% of the semester) - Summer: sustained engagement across at least 9 of the 10-week summer term (90% of the term) - Study abroad: Program syllabus and schedule is included with the application (<i>effective Spring 2027</i>); must reflect a full semester or full summer term consistent with the standards above; brief or partial-term programs do not qualify.
Does not meet requirement	Engagement is intermittent, limited in duration, or resembles a short-term/episodic experience (e.g., a two-week program) rather than sustained engagement across the term.

2. Intentionality (Student Agency and Purpose)

Level	Descriptor
4 - Fully meets and clearly exceeds expectations	Proposal articulates a clear, compelling purpose connected to personal, professional, academic, and/or civic growth, with enough specificity that a reviewer understands why the experience matters to the student. Demonstrates strong student ownership, often including complex or open-ended challenges, with thoughtful alignment between purpose, activities, and anticipated outcomes.
3 — Meets expectations	Proposal includes a clear purpose. Shows student agency and a reasonable connection between purpose and planned activities.
2 — Partially meets expectations	Purpose is present but vague or broad. Limited evidence of student agency or weak alignment between purpose and activities.
1 — Does not meet expectations	Purpose is unclear or missing. Little to no evidence of student ownership or connection between the experience and the student's purpose.

3. High Expectations (Challenge and Academic/Professional/Civic Impact)

(Evaluated beginning Spring 2027)

Level	Descriptor
4 - Fully meets and clearly exceeds expectations	Experience is meaningful, impactful, and appropriately challenging, with clear opportunities for growth. Student identifies stretch goals and meaningful activities tied to academic, professional, or civic outcomes.
3 — Meets expectations	Experience reflects clear expectations and a moderate degree of challenge. Activities are defined, appropriate, and connected to academic, professional, or civic development.
2 — Partially meets expectations	Expectations are unclear, uneven, or insufficiently challenging. Activities are loosely defined or disconnected from meaningful outcomes.
1 — Does not meet expectations	Experience offers little challenge and minimal academic, professional, or civic development. Activities appear largely social or personal in nature, with limited developmental value.

4. Meaningful Interactions (Mentorship, Peers, and Diverse Perspectives)

NOTE: This criterion evaluates the student's intent and plan for meaningful interaction, recognizing that experiences such as internships, co-ops, and independent research or technical projects may not have a predetermined mentor or team at the time of application.

Level	Descriptor
4 - Fully meets and clearly exceeds expectations	Proposal articulates a clear intent and specific plan for engaging with mentors, peers, and/or others who bring diverse perspectives, appropriate to the nature of the experience. Student identifies concrete opportunities they plan to pursue and describes how they will seek them out, even within experiences that can otherwise appear independent or solitary (e.g., coding, research, technical project work).
3 — Meets expectations	Proposal describes an intent to engage with mentors or peers and identifies some likely opportunities for interaction, though the plan may be less specific.
2 — Partially meets expectations	Intent to engage with others is vague, limited, or an afterthought. Little discussion of how the student plans to pursue interaction opportunities.
1 — Does not meet expectations	No meaningful plan or intent to engage with mentors, peers, or others. Experience is described as entirely independent or isolated, with no consideration of interaction opportunities.

Overall Determination

NOTE: If an overall determination differs from the guidance below, please provide an explanation.

Approved: Proposal meets the Significant Engagement requirement and receives mostly 3s and 4s across the other criteria.

Conditional Approval: Proposal meets the Significant Engagement requirement and receives a mix of 2s and 3s in scored categories; requires revision (if revision is needed, please specify in your notes on your scoring spreadsheet).

Not Approved: Does not meet the Significant Engagement requirement OR receives 1s in any scored categories OR does not receive a score higher than 2 in any category.

Optional Reviewer Comments (please include in your notes on reviewer spreadsheet)

Strengths of proposal:

Areas for revision:

Suggestions to strengthen alignment with evaluation criteria: