IPO Return Report Rubric

15 Points Total

IPO Return Report			
Included:	Explanation:		
Project title	Project title	N/A	
Bumpers College	Name PIs and Co-PIs	N/A	
Faculty Leaders			
International	-Identified all collaborators and noted any changes from the proposal:	/2	
Partners	names, titles, institutions and or third party providers – 2 points		
Project Objectives	-For Faculty-Led: Attached syllabus (including program objectives,	/3	
	student learning outcomes, and contact hours in and out of country) -1		
	point		
	-For exploratory return reports: described how the proposal varied		
	from actuality and what new information was learned that will help		
	meet the program objectives, measurable student learning outcomes and		
	unique student experiences. Attached an updated syllabus. – 1 point		
	-Included relevant program objectives as well as an analysis of		
	measurable student learning outcomes that support or enhance the IPO		
A **	mission. – 2 points	/2	
Activities	-Included all program activities and cultural immersion opportunities	/3	
	and how they met the proposal/ program objectives. – 2 points		
GC. C	-Attached the actual itinerary. – 1 point	/2	
Significance of	-Explained the program impact on student learning, sustainability (not	/2	
Program	including funding), multidisciplinary aspects, and how/ if planned		
	activities attracted students across departments and colleges. – 1 point -Evaluated how the program built and/or maintained the collaborative		
	experience with partner international institution(s) and/or UA College		
	collaboration. – 1 point		
Student numbers	-Anticipated student numbers were met – 1 point	/2	
Stadent namoets	-Student evaluations did not mention issues that were out of the control	, 2	
	of the faculty, program, or country of study – 1 point		
Part 2: Budget Sheet –			

Actual Budget	-Included all funding awarded. Listed in the budget how the funding	/3
sheet	was utilized (include grant source, award date, grant amounts, and	
	participating institutions). -1.5 points	
	-Submitted a detailed budget for faculty and students, and how the IPO	
	funding was used. Noted and explained differences from the proposal. –	
	1.5 points	

/15

Comments: