

Student-Staff Partnerships (SSP) Project Submission Rubric

	Successfully addressed	Partially addressed	Not sufficiently addressed
SCOPE & MOTIVATION			
Motivation	The project submission clearly articulates the need and/or challenge this partnership project seeks to resolve as well as how a specific UQ cohort of students/staff or the wider UQ community will benefit from this project.	The project submission could more clearly articulate the need and/or challenge this partnership project seeks to resolve, and how the UQ community will benefit from this project.	The project submission does not address a need or challenge. It does not explain how a specific UQ cohort of students/staff or the wider UQ community will benefit from this partnership project.
Scope	The project submission has taken into consideration the team size and level of student engagement, and clearly outlines a project scope that is appropriate to be completed within the project round timeframe.	The project submission provided limited details making it difficult to determine if the scope of the partnership is appropriate, and whether it can be achieved within the project round timeframe.	The scope of the project outlined seems inappropriate for the team size and level of student engagement requested, given the project round timeframe, coupled with the requirements of the SSP program.
Flexibility	The project submission appears to be flexible enough to enable other partners (both students and staff) to contribute their perspectives on the methods and outcomes for the project.	Some flexibility has been factored in; however the project is quite well-defined and other partners (students and/or staff) may not have sufficient opportunity to provide input and influence the methods and outcomes of the project.	The methods and outcomes of the project appeared very well-defined, with not enough room for other partners (students and/or staff) to contribute to the intellectual design of the project.
Outcomes	The project submission is not solely focused on research outcomes.	Research has been mentioned within this project submission, but is not the focus of the project. Any research-related steps (e.g. data collection, publications etc) should be conducted in partnership.	The project submission's primary focus appears to be research, either requiring a Research Assistant or is more appropriate to the Summer and Winter Research Program.
Innovation	This project submission proposes the creation of resources and/or support networks that do <u>not</u> already exist at UQ.	The project submission does not provide sufficient detail to determine if the resources and/or support networks already exist at UQ.	This project submission proposed the creation of resources and/or support networks that already exist at UQ. The SSP Team can help connect you with others in the UQ community who may be able to share existing resources and support networks relevant to your project idea.
PARTNERSHIP ETHOS			
Project Stream	The project clearly aligns to one of the SSP Project streams and has been identified correctly in the submission.	The project seems to align with a different project stream than the one identified in the submission.	The project does not align with any of the three SSP project stream.

Student-Staff Partnerships (SSP) Project Submission Rubric

	Successfully addressed	Partially addressed	Not sufficiently addressed
SSP Ethos	The project submission aligns to the SSP ethos, by clearly articulating how the project seeks to engage students and staff in the process of co-creation, co-delivery and/or a collaborative effort. The project is premised upon mutual learning, accountability and shared responsibility (i.e. not task delegation). Students and staff are valued as colleagues and equal partners.	The project submission addresses the co-creation/co-ownership of the project. However, staff or student partners are posited as the project lead and not as equal collaborators engaging in mutual learning. The submission does not explicitly address what staff and student partners are looking to learn during this experience and acknowledge mutual learning.	The project submission does not seem to align to the SSP ethos. There is little or no articulation of how the project seeks to engage students and staff in the process of co-creation, co-delivery and/or a collaborative effort. The project does not appear to be premised upon mutual learning, accountability, and shared responsibility (i.e. not task delegation). Students and staff do not appear to have the opportunity to collaborate as colleagues and equal partners.
Need for partnership	The project submission articulates why it is important to address this need and/or challenge in partnership. The submission clearly identifies how both student and staff perspectives are critical to addressing the challenges posed. There is clear articulation of the need for diverse perspectives to achieve the desired project outcome.	The project submission provides limited evidence of why it important to address this need and/or challenge in partnership. The submission identifies how both student and staff perspectives can be used to address the challenges posed.	The project submission does not provide an explanation as to why it is important to address this need and/or challenge in partnership. Or how both student and staff perspectives could be used to address the challenges posed.
TEAM STRUCTURE			
Team Size	The size of the team is appropriate considering the project scope and proposed aims, and will allow for effective collaboration and communication.		The size of the team appears to be too small to support the project scope and aims, or too large to facilitate effective collaboration and communication. A maximum of four (4) student partners can be funded for each SSP project.
Engagement Level	Student partners are all at the same engagement level, and the level of hours is appropriate for the project scope and proposed aims.	Student partners are all at the same engagement level, however the level of engagement (hours) may not be sufficient to achieve the proposed goals of the project.	Student partners are not at the same engagement level, and/or the level of engagement (hours) may not be sufficient to achieve the proposed goals of the project. (Note the student partner engagement level may be adjusted during the project if required.)