

New Group Proposal Scoring Sheet

New group proposals must score at least **20/30 points** based on this scoring sheet to be approved by SGS staff. Note that proposals that receive an **AUTO-FAIL** in any of the applicable categories will be denied even if the score is above threshold. **Approval of a new group proposal does not mean that the group has been officially recognized.**

UNIQUE MANDATE & SCOPE

"How is your group different from existing clubs and programs?"

(0) AUTO-FAIL	The proposed student group directly duplicates a pre-existing group on campus and/or campus program. If the student group has an external affiliate, the mandate and scope of the affiliate directly duplicates a pre-existing group on campus and/or campus program.
(2) FAIR	The proposed student group demonstrates some overlap with pre-existing programs or groups on campus. The value proposed by the group would over-saturate a specific niche on campus.
(4) GOOD	The proposed student group demonstrates some overlap with pre-existing programs or groups on campus. The value proposed by the group would complement existing efforts to fill a specific niche on campus, but the niche could be addressed by a currently existing organization.
(6) GREAT	The proposed student group demonstrates some overlap with pre-existing programs or groups on campus. The value proposed by the group would complement existing efforts to fill a specific niche on campus, and efforts would be enhanced by an additional organization.
(8) EXCELLENT	The proposed student group demonstrates no overlap with pre-existing programs or groups on campus. The value proposed by the group would completely fill a specific niche not yet addressed on campus.

CAMPUS & COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTIONS

"How does your group interact with and create value for your members, campus, and city?"

(0) AUTO-FAIL	The proposal does not demonstrate a contribution to or value for the University of Alberta campus or the greater Edmonton community. It only describes value for its individual members.
------------------------	---

(2) FAIR	The proposal demonstrates a contribution to and value for either campus or the greater community, in addition to value for its individual members.
(4) GOOD	The proposal demonstrates a sufficient contribution to and value for campus and the greater community, in addition to value for its individual members. It describes a group that interacts with the campus community rarely .
(6) GREAT	The proposal demonstrates a sufficient contribution to and value for campus and the greater community, in addition to value for its individual members. It describes a group that interacts with the campus community on a semi-regular basis .
(8) EXCELLENT	The proposal demonstrates an excellent contribution to and value for campus and the greater community, in addition to value for its individual members. It describes a group that interacts with the campus community on a regular basis .

SUSTAINABILITY

"How will your group continue to operate and meet recognition requirements in future years?"

(0) INSUFFICIENT	The proposal fails to address all categories , or fails to demonstrate, at minimum, sufficient understanding in all four categories.
(1) FAIR	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating a sufficient understanding: recruiting and retaining members, transitions and executive turnover, resolving conflict, and democratic electoral processes.
(2) GOOD	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in two topics: recruiting and retaining members, transitions and executive turnover, resolving conflict, and democratic electoral processes.
(3) GREAT	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in three topics: recruiting and retaining members, transitions and executive turnover, resolving conflict, and democratic electoral processes.
(4) EXCELLENT	The proposal addresses all categories , with an advanced understanding: recruiting and retaining members, transitions and executive turnover, resolving conflict, and democratic electoral processes.

FINANCES

"How will your group track and manage finances with integrity?"

(0) INSUFFICIENT	The proposal fails to address all categories , or fails to demonstrate, at minimum, sufficient understanding in all four categories.
(1) FAIR	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating a sufficient understanding: the duties and responsibilities of officers, responsible and ethical asset management, the maintenance of financial records, and long-term financial welfare.
(2) GOOD	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in two topics: the duties and responsibilities of officers, responsible and ethical asset management, the maintenance of financial records, and long-term financial welfare.
(3) GREAT	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in three topics: the duties and responsibilities of officers, responsible and ethical asset management, the maintenance of financial records, and long-term financial welfare.
(4) EXCELLENT	The proposal addresses all categories , with an advanced understanding: the duties and responsibilities of officers, responsible and ethical asset management, the maintenance of financial records, and long-term financial welfare.

EVENTS & ENGAGEMENT

"How will your group host events that engages your membership and solidifies your group's campus identity?"

(0) INSUFFICIENT	The proposal fails to address all categories , or fails to demonstrate, at minimum, sufficient understanding in all four categories.
(1) FAIR	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating a sufficient understanding: annual timeline and event frequencies, promotional strategies, event logistics, and event(s) relation to the group's mandate.
(2) GOOD	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in two topics: annual timeline and event frequencies, promotional strategies, event logistics, and event(s) relation to the group's mandate.

(3) GREAT	The proposal addresses all categories, demonstrating an advanced understanding in three topics: annual timeline and event frequencies, promotional strategies, event logistics, and event(s) relation to the group's mandate.
(4) EXCELLENT	The proposal addresses all categories , with an advanced understanding: annual timeline and event frequencies, promotional strategies, event logistics, and event(s) relation to the group's mandate.
MEMBERSHIP <i>"Students groups must be composed of (at least) ten student members."</i>	
(0) AUTO-FAIL	The proposal petition fails to achieve the minimum of ten (10) student members, excluding the founder(s).
(1) FAIR	The proposal petition succeeds in garnering at least ten (10) student members, excluding the founder(s).
SELF-RELIANCE <i>"Student groups are student-led initiatives, and must be distinct from any external affiliates."</i>	
(0) AUTO-FAIL	The group is tied to an external organization, and is completely reliant in terms of group activities, finances, events, and leadership. The affiliate's decision may override the group's autonomy. The affiliate may benefit off the privileges of student groups independent of the club itself.
(1) FAIR	<p>The group is completely independent and has no reliance on external organizations.</p> <p>Or the group is tied to an external organization, but the group's relationship with the external organization is in compliance with policies set by Student Group Services.</p>

Revision #21

Created 20 May 2025 17:11:16 by Selen Erkut

Updated 21 April 2026 16:15:45 by Selen Erkut