Summer Teaching Development Grant Evaluation Rubric

TOTAL POINTS: 100

NOTE: Rubrics indicate general guidelines; projects do not have to hit every point in every category to fulfill it.

Your first and last name

Your Kent State email address

Number of the proposal that you are evaluating

Project Overview (15 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Provide a general description of your project with enough detail for a layperson to understand. Make sure to explain how your proposal exceeds normal course preparation.)

- ○ Poor (0 pts) - Does not exceed normal course preparation; unclear or off-topic description; includes jargon; project not clearly defined; no details provided; project does not support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Fair (5 pts) - Marginally exceeds normal course preparation; generally clear and understandable but some jargon used; lacks detail; may support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Good (10 pts) - Exceeds normal course preparation; enough information provided to understand the project; good level of detail; supports innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Excellent (15 pts) - Exceeds normal course preparation; clear, concise description; project is immediately understandable and detailed; no ambiguities; clearly supports innovative teaching and pedagogy

Background & Rationale (15 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Provide detailed background information and justification for the project from a scholarly teaching perspective.)

- ○ Poor (0 pts) -No evidence of scholarly perspective; no justification provided; no details provided; project does not support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Fair (5 pts) - Lacks evidence of scholarly perspective; weak justification for the project; could be more detailed; may support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Good (10 pts) - Generally well written; includes some evidence of understanding teaching scholarship; good overall justification; support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Excellent (15 pts) - Clearly written from a scholarly teaching perspective; demonstrates knowledge of best practices and prior research; justification for the project is compelling; research examples (citations) included; clearly support innovative teaching and pedagogy

Specific Goals & Activities (15 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Provide a detailed detailed description of the goals and activities of your project.)

- ○ Poor (0 pts) - Goals and activities not articulated or vague; lacking in detail (i.e. only brief statements provided); goals do not support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Fair (5 pts) - Some goals and activities described; alignment between goals and activities inadequate or unclear; goals may support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Good (10 pts) - Adequate level of detail to understand the goals and activities but leaving some questions unanswered or including some ambiguities; alignment between goals and activities somewhat unclear; goals support innovative teaching and pedagogy
- ○ Excellent (15 pts) - Goals and activities are clearly described; detailed explanation of how the activities will meet the goals; goals and activities clearly support innovative teaching and pedagogy

Impact on Student Learning (15 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Describe your project's anticipated impacts on student learning, including 1) the number of students impacted within a context to explain the significance of that number, 2)the specific nature of the impact on student learning, 3) an explanation of the impacts on the curriculum and/or your discipline.)

- ○ Poor (0 pts) -Impacts on student learning not articulated or explained; lack of detailed description; no alignment with Kent State Strategic Priorities; does not impact Kent State students
- ○ Fair (5 pts) - Impacts on student learning not clearly articulated; little breadth or depth of impact in terms of numbers in context, or minimal impact on individual student learning; little or no explanation of impacts on curriculum or discipline
- ○ Good (10 pts) - Clear and detailed description; moderate breadth or depth of students impacted within context; high impact on student learning; good explanation of how project fits into curriculum or discipline
- ○ Excellent (15 pts) -Impacts on student learning are clearly articulated and detailed; individual impact on students is high; substantial breadth or depth of impact in terms of number in context; reach of the impact demonstrates broader impact on student learning, including large numbers or percentages of students, and on the discipline or curriculum; specific student learning need(s) addressed

Provide Timeline of Activities (10 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Provide a detailed description of the specific activities involved in your project and your anticipated timeline for completing those activities. If more than one applicant is involved, please articulate who will be responsible for completing each activity on the timeline.)

- ○ Poor/Fair (0 pts) - Limited number of activities; general timeline (no specific dates included); timeline includes unreasonable expectations; person responsible not identified
- ○ Good (5 pts) - Dates and specific activities included; descriptions may leave some questions about whether the activities can be accomplished within the timeline; workload is appropriate for multiple participants (if applicable)
- ○ Excellent (10 pts) - Specific activities listed with dates and responsibility clearly articulated; appropriate to requested support; activities can be reasonably accomplished within timeline; workload is appropriate for multiple participants (if applicable)

Evaluation Plan (10 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Please describe how you will evaluate the project, including an explanation of how the impact(s) on student learning will be measured in a scholarly manner.)

- ○ Poor/Fair (0 pts) - No clear measurable outputs or outcomes included; evaluation limited to student course evaluations (SSIs); no clear alignment between evaluation criteria and project goals; little or no description provided; no mention of project impacts or goals
- ○ Good (5 pts) - Some alignment between evaluation measures and project activities; evaluation criteria addresses project impacts and goals; evaluation criteria limited to outputs (e.g. student performance) and/or overall course performance rather than outcomes related to specific impacts of project
- ○ Excellent (10 pts) -Evaluation plan clearly addresses project impacts and goals; measurable outputs and/or outcomes included; plan includes specific details about evaluative instruments (e.g., focus groups, specifically designed surveys); includes discussion of comparison data from prior to implementation of project

Communication Plan (10 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: In the space below, please provide specific details about how you will disseminate the findings or results of your project including (but not limited to) your participation in the University Teaching Council Conference (e.g. publications, conference or other presentations, etc.)

- ○ Poor/Fair (0 pts) - No plan to disseminate findings or dissemination limited to informal channels
- ○ Good (5 pts) - Will participate in UTCC; discusses one or two other avenues for sharing project
- ○ Excellent (10 pts) - Will participate in UTCC; discusses several specific avenues for sharing project (e.g. external conferences, journal titles), ideally at the level of publication or comparable peer-reviewed venue; includes specific details about the content that will be disseminated

Professional Background (10 PTS)

(Instructions provided to proposal applicants: Please provide a brief description of your professional background as it relates to this project. Do NOT include your vita or resume.)

- ○ Poor/Fair (0 pts) - Includes anecdotal material not related to professional background; very little detail provided (e.g. limited to title and rank); background not sufficient to accomplish goals of project
- ○ Good (5 pts) - Includes details about teaching and/or disciplinary background but not specifically tailored to this project (e.g. copied their bio from their website); background sufficient to accomplish goals of project
- ○ Excellent (10 pts) - Includes specific details about how teaching and/or disciplinary background is applicable to this project; discussion of previous publications or presentations related to project; background indicates prior experience with similar projects and/or evaluative techniques