



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

Rubric for IDEC Foundation Special Projects Grant

Track II: Applied Initiatives

PURPOSE

This rubric guides the evaluation of proposals submitted to the IDEC Foundation Special Projects Grant. The grant funds creative, goal-oriented activities of a defined scope and duration that benefit interior design education and/or the profession (up to \$3,000). Funded projects must produce tangible results and reinforce the mission, core values, and vision of IDEC.

REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

- This is a blind review. If the abstract or budget contains identifying information (researcher name, institution, location, etc.), the application must be disqualified before scoring.
- Score each criterion on a 1–5 scale using the anchored descriptors.
- Each criterion has a fixed weight. The total weighted score is on a 5.00 scale. Do not use any number smaller than x.25 (e.g. 3.25, 4.75, etc.) The companion Excel sheet calculates the total automatically.
- Document specific strengths, concerns, and the basis for the scores in the Reviewer Comments section.
- Note: matching funds are not part of the evaluation. Proposals are judged solely on the merits of the work, not on access to institutional resources.

SCORING SCALE

Score	Meaning
5 — Exemplary	Substantially exceeds expectations; a model response on this criterion.
4 — Strong	Clearly meets expectations with notable strengths.
3 — Adequate	Meets expectations; competent but not distinctive.
2 — Developing	Partially meets expectations; notable gaps.
1 — Insufficient	Does not meet expectations; significant problems.



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

TRACK B: APPLIED INITIATIVES

Use this rubric for applied initiatives (symposia, workshops, speakers, public-service activities, community efforts, etc.) that address and expand knowledge of an issue impacting interior design or interior design education. Project design and plan of execution carry the heaviest weight on this track.

1. Idea Quality & Significance to Interior Design

Weight: 20%

The proposed activity addresses a meaningful issue impacting interior design education or the profession.

5	Idea is timely, important, and clearly addresses a significant issue facing interior design or interior design education.
4	Idea is important and clearly tied to a relevant issue in the field.
3	Idea is reasonable; significance is general rather than fully developed.
2	Idea is unclear in significance or only loosely connected to the field.
1	No clear connection to a significant issue in interior design.

Score for Criterion 1: _____ / 5

2. Project Design & Plan of Execution

Weight: 25%

The activity is structured and planned with clarity: defined scope, audience, format, partners, and a credible execution plan. (This is the parallel to research methodology for applied initiative projects.)

5	Plan is detailed, well structured, and persuasively designed. Audience, format, structure, partners, and execution are clearly articulated and internally consistent.
4	Plan is well organized and feasible. Some elements (e.g., audience, partner role, sequencing) could use elaboration.
3	Plan is identifiable and workable but under-specified in execution.
2	Plan is vague or contains notable gaps in audience definition, structure, or execution.
1	No clear project plan; execution is unsupported or incoherent.

Score for Criterion 2: _____ / 5

3. Contribution to Interior Design Education and/or the Profession

Weight: 20%



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

The activity will tangibly benefit interior design education or practice and address an issue meaningful to the field.

5	Activity will substantively advance interior design education and/or practice with broad or deep impact.
4	Activity will meaningfully benefit the field; impact is well described and credible.
3	Activity will contribute in a modest or focused way; impact is plausible but moderate.
2	Contribution is limited, redundant, or tangential to the field.
1	No meaningful contribution to interior design education or practice.

Score for Criterion 3: _____ / 5

4. Alignment with IDEC Mission, Values & Vision	Weight: 15%
--	--------------------

The activity clearly reinforces IDEC's mission, core values, and vision.

5	Strong, explicit, and well-reasoned alignment with IDEC's mission, values, and vision throughout the proposal.
4	Clear alignment; minor opportunities to strengthen the connection.
3	Alignment is plausible but stated generally rather than developed.
2	Connection to IDEC is weak or asserted without support.
1	No meaningful alignment with IDEC mission, values, or vision.

Score for Criterion 4: _____ / 5

5. Feasibility — Scope, Timeline & Budget	Weight: 15%
--	--------------------

The activity can be completed as described within the funding limit (\$3,000) and a realistic timeline. Budget items are reasonable, justified, and free of disallowed costs (F&A is not allowed).

5	Scope, timeline, and budget are realistic, internally consistent, and well justified. Costs are appropriate to the activity and within program rules.
4	Plan is feasible with minor concerns about scope, pacing, or budget alignment.
3	Generally feasible; some elements under-explained or marginal.



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

2	Significant feasibility concerns: overly ambitious scope, gaps in the timeline, or budget items poorly justified.
1	Activity as described cannot reasonably be completed; budget or timeline is inadequate or non-credible. Disallowed costs included.

Score for Criterion 5: _____ / 5

6. Dissemination of Outcomes

Weight: 5%

The activity produces tangible outcomes (event, materials, report, model, etc.) and a credible plan to share results.

5	Tangible outcomes are concrete and high quality (e.g., event delivered, public-facing materials, replicable model). Dissemination plan is well designed.
4	Outcomes and dissemination are clear and credible.
3	Outcomes exist; dissemination plan is general.
2	Limited tangible outputs or unclear dissemination.
1	No tangible outputs or dissemination identified.

Score for Criterion 6: _____ / 5



Interior Design Educators Council Foundation, Inc.

TRACK B SCORING SUMMARY

Criterion	Raw Score (1–5)	Weight	Weighted (Raw × Weight)
1. Idea Quality & Significance to Interior Design	_____	0.20	_____
2. Project Design & Plan of Execution	_____	0.25	_____
3. Contribution to Interior Design Education and/or the Profession	_____	0.20	_____
4. Alignment with IDEC Mission, Values & Vision	_____	0.15	_____
5. Feasibility — Scope, Timeline & Budget	_____	0.15	_____
6. Dissemination & Tangible Outcomes	_____	0.05	_____
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (out of 5.00)			_____

Reviewer Comments

Key strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses, concerns, or gaps:
