RATING DEFINITIONS & CRITERIA

Teacher-Scholar Mini Grant Program 26-27:
Discovery & Translation and Teaching & Learning tracks

PI(s) is/are qualified (Y/N)

Intellectual Merit (7 pts)

- 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	Poor/Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, and proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful/transformative results.
3	Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful/transformative results.
4	Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
5	Very Good. Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
6	Very Good / Excellent Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
7	Excellent. Information provided exceeds all criteria necessary to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.

Broader Impacts (7 pts)

- 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 for advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
2	Poor/Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
3	Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
4	Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
5	Very Good. Clear information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance 1 or more broad impact areas.
6	Very Good / Excellent Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance 1 or more broad impact areas.
7	Excellent. Information provided exceeds all criteria necessary to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance 1 or more broad impact areas.

Relevance to the Teacher-scholar Model (4 pts)

- Does this proposal advance discovery, integration, application, and/or engagement in the context of discovery and translation?
- Does this proposal produce research, scholarly or creative outcomes that enhance discovery or translation?
- Do the proposed activities align with a Teacher-Scholar approach to discovery and translation?

1	Poor. Deficient in advancing your track discovery and translation.
2	Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate how this proposal contributes to your track.
3	Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate the proposal's potential contribution to your track.
4	Excellent. Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance your track.

Feasibility (4 pts)

- Does the proposed research include a plan to accomplish the proposed scope of work?
- 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?

- 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 plan, resources or qualifications to achieve stated aims.
2	Fair. Inadequate information provided to evaluate plan, resources or qualifications to achieve stated aims.
3	Good. Adequate information provided to evaluate plan, resources or qualifications to achieve stated aims.
4	Excellent. Articulate and relevant information provided to evaluate all areas of plan, resources and qualifications to achieve stated aims.

If content or sections were substantially developed by AI and not readily disclosed in the proposal, return without review.