



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. <i>Deficient</i> in meeting all reviewer areas of concern and/or providing a plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
2	Fair. <i>Inadequate</i> information provided to address one or more areas of reviewer concern and/or alignment with funder goals.
3	Good. <i>Adequate</i> information provided to address at least most areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
4	Very Good. <i>Clear</i> information provided to address all areas of reviewer concerns, providing a clear plan for resubmission aligned with funder goals.
5	Excellent. <i>Articulate and relevant</i> 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. <i>Deficient</i> in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan for advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
2	Fair. <i>Inadequate</i> information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
3	Good. <i>Adequate</i> information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce results advancing 1 or more broad impact areas.
4	Very Good. <i>Clear</i> information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results advance 1 or more broad impact areas.
5	Excellent. <i>Articulate and relevant</i> 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. <i>Deficient</i> in key areas for proposal evaluation or proposal does not provide a clear plan for producing results/knowledge.
2	Fair. <i>Inadequate</i> information provided to evaluate key areas, or proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful/transformative results.
3	Good. <i>Adequate</i> information provided to evaluate all areas and can produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
4	Very Good. <i>Clear</i> information provided to evaluate all areas of proposal, showing that results will likely produce meaningful/transformative creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution.
5	Excellent. <i>Articulate and relevant</i> 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. <i>Deficient</i> 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. <i>Inadequate</i> 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. <i>Adequate</i> 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. <i>Clear</i> 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. <i>Articulate and relevant</i> 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.