



## RATING DEFINITIONS & CRITERIA

### Teacher-Scholar Mini Grant Program 26-27: Professional Development track

#### Revision Plan (5 pts)

- Does the revision plan address reviewer concerns?
  - Programmatic & technical concerns (appropriateness, dissemination, impact, etc.)
  - Academic concerns (disciplinary grounding, relevant background)
  - Clarity
  - Methodology
- Has the applicant identified an extramural solicitation appropriate to the scope of work?
- Does the revision plan meet the funder goals and guidelines?
- Does the revision plan set forward a clear path to completion and resubmission?

---

1 Poor. *Deficient* in meeting all reviewer areas of concern and/or providing a plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.

2 Fair. *Inadequate* information provided to address one or more areas of reviewer concern and/or alignment with funder goals.

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to address at least most areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to address all areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.

5 Excellent. *Articulate and relevant* information provided to clearly address all areas of reviewer concerns, providing a compelling plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.

---

#### Broader Impacts of project under revisions (5 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?

---

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 Fair. *Inadequate* information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results advance 1 or more broad impact areas.

5 Excellent. *Articulate and relevant* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that contribution(s) significantly advance 1 or more broad impact areas.

---

### Intellectual Merit of project under revision (5 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 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 provide clear deliverables and/or 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/transformative results.

---

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.

---

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce meaningful/transformative 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.

---

### Feasibility of proposal when revised (5 pts)

- Does the proposal present a well-grounded case for funding the work according to revision plan?
- 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?
- 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 applicant either at Cal Poly or through collaborations to carry out the proposed activities?

---

1 Poor. *Deficient* in key areas allowing for proposal evaluation or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion of similar projects; OR revision plan is not sound.

---

2 Fair. *Inadequate* information provided to evaluate key areas allowing for proposal evaluation or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion of similar projects; OR to evaluate the revision plan.

---

3 Good. *Adequate* information provided to evaluate key areas of the proposal or evaluation of PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal could be funded.

---

4 Very Good. *Clear* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal and PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal has met reviewer concerns and could be funded.

---

5 Excellent. *Articulate and relevant* information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, and PI/co-PI qualifications and record of completion; AND to evaluate the revision plan indicating that the proposal has a high chance of being funded.

---

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