RATING DEFINITIONS

Teacher-Scholar Mini Grant Program 2023-2024

Evaluation Ratings:

1. Poor: Specific elements are not provided, or the information provided shows the project to be underdeveloped in key areas. The proposal should not be funded.

2. Fair: Significant weaknesses exist that negatively impact the likelihood of success. The proposal should not be funded but may be worthy of revision.

3. Good: The proposal is adequate in terms of project description, methods, intellectual merit, and suggests impacts, but would benefit from revision. The proposal might be fundable and could produce relevant knowledge/results as written, but the merit and impact would be improved with revision.

4. Very Good: The proposal is well-developed, well-grounded, methodologically sound, with clear intellectual merit and impacts. The proposal will produce relevant knowledge/results and should be funded.

5. Excellent: The proposal is outstanding in all areas and does not warrant revision to improve any area. The proposal will produce transformative relevant knowledge/results and should absolutely be funded.

Relevance to the Teacher-scholar Model (30%)

- Does this proposal advance discovery, integration, application, and/or engagement in the context of teaching and learning?
- Does this proposal provide clear, actionable, and assessable outcomes with relevance to teaching & learning? OR produce research, scholarly or creative outcomes that enhance discovery or translation?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor. <strong>Deficient</strong> in advancing discover and translation OR teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Fair. Inadequate</strong> information provided to evaluate how this proposal contributes to discovery and translation OR teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Good. Adequate</strong> information provided to evaluate the proposal’s potential contribution to discovery and translation OR teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Very Good. Clear</strong> information provided to evaluate the specific contributions to discovery and translation AND/OR teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Excellent. Articulate and relevant</strong> information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance discovery and translation AND/OR teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intellectual Merit (25%)

- What is the potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?
• To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
• Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
• Are the proposed methods appropriate to the scope of work?

1 Poor. Deficient in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan for producing results/knowledge.
2 Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful/transformational results.
3 Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce meaningful/transformational creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
4 Very Good. Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce meaningful/transformational creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
5 Excellent. Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.

Broader Impacts (25%)  
• What is the potential for the proposed activity to benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes?
• To what extent do the proposed activities advance lasting institutional or disciplinary goals?
• To what extent does the project contribute to student-related outcomes?
• To what extent does the project contribute to the PI/co-PI’s professional development?

1 Poor. Deficient in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan advancing societal, institutional, or learning outcomes.
2 Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results with societal, institutional, or learning outcomes.
3 Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce results with societal, institutional, or learning outcomes.
4 Very Good. Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce stated societal, institutional, or learning outcomes.
5 Excellent. Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance stated societal, institutional, or learning outcomes.

Feasibility (10%)  
• Does the proposed research include a plan to accomplish the proposed scope of work?
• Is the time committed to the project adequate?
• Are there adequate resources available to the Principal Investigator (PI) either at Cal Poly or through collaborations to carry out the proposed activities?
• Is the timeline appropriate to the proposed scope of work?
1 Poor. *Deficient* in key areas allowing for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide appropriate methods, timeline and/or resources for achieving stated aims.

2 Fair. *Inadequate* information provided to evaluate key areas, or methods, timeline and/or resources are likely not appropriate for achieving stated aims.

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to evaluate all areas with methods, timeline and/or resources likely appropriate achieving stated aims.

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal with methods, timeline and/or resources appropriate for achieving stated aims.

5 Excellent. *Articulate and relevant* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that methods, timeline, and resources are highly appropriate for achieving all stated aims in the timeframe specified.

**PI (& other team members) Qualifications (10%)**

- How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
- Does the individual or team have a track record of project completion?

1 Poor. *Deficient* in key areas allowing for evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and/or record of completion of similar projects.

2 Fair. *Inadequate* information provided to evaluate if PI/co-PI qualifications and/or record of completion of similar projects suggests low likelihood for timely results.

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to evaluate PI/co-PI qualifications and/or record of completion of similar projects suggests that this project is likely to yield timely results.

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing PI/co-PI qualifications and/or record of completion of similar projects suggests that this project will yield timely results.

5 Excellent. *Articulate and relevant* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion of similar projects highly suggestive that this project will yield timely results.