

Appendix C - Teaching and Research Grant Rubric

| | Fair (1) | Good (2) | Exemplary (3) |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Problem and Justification | The proposal states a problem to be addressed. However, the problem 1) lacks clarity, 2) pertinent literature is lacking, 3) the justification is unclear, and/or 4) the grant activities may not address the problem. | The proposal states a problem to be addressed and builds a justification that includes pertinent literature. It is likely that the grant activities will address an aspect of the problem. | The proposal clearly states a problem to be addressed and builds a compelling justification that includes pertinent literature. It is very likely that the grant activities will address an aspect of the problem. |
| Goals Alignment | The project objectives are ambiguous (lack clarity, measure, and/or feasibility) | The project objectives are clear, measurable, and feasible; however, it is less clear how they relate to the individual's professional goals, unit mission/goals, and/or CHBS goals. | The project objectives are clear, measurable, and feasible. They relate to the individual's professional goals, unit mission/goals, and/or CHBS goals. |
| Procedures | The specific procedures of the project are unclear and/or important procedures lack description; OR there are concerns for human subject safety that lack appropriate mitigation strategies. | The major elements of the procedures are described. Some procedures could benefit from a more thorough description. If IRB approval is required it is acknowledged in accordance with the grant governing policies. | The procedures are clear and appropriate for the objective. All procedures are described in appropriate detail. If IRB approval is required it is acknowledged in accordance with the grant governing policies. |
| Student Involvement | The proposed work does not include students directly. | The proposed work directly involves at least one student. | The proposed work clearly and directly involves more than one student. |
| Timeline | The timeline is included and either lacks major benchmarks for assessing progress or the timeline seems unreasonable. | The timeline is included and includes major benchmarks for assessing progress. The reviewer has at least one question about the timeline and its likelihood for completion. | The timeline is outlined, reasonable, and includes major benchmarks for assessing progress. It seems the project stands a good chance for success. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Future Scholarship | It is unclear how winning this grant will propel the awardee's future scholarly activities or pedagogical developments | Winning this grant will <u>likely</u> propel the awardee's future scholarly activities or pedagogical developments. | Winning this grant will <u>clearly</u> propel the awardee's future scholarly activities or pedagogical developments. |
| Budget | The budget is unrealistic, lacking detail, misaligned with project goals, or requests funds that are not eligible (e.g., faculty summer pay). | The budget is realistic and well detailed and funding and <u>would</u> allow for project goals to be reached. It's possible the project may be completed without grant funding. | The budget is realistic and well detailed and funding <u>would</u> allow for project goals to be reached. Project is dependent on funding. |
| Overall Proposal Quality | The proposal was lacking. | The proposal was good, but there were areas/gaps identified that could be improved. | The proposal was well-written, complete, and strong. |
| Inclusive Excellence (evaluated only if selected) | The work provides insufficient evidence that is it linked to an inclusive excellence problem and/or solution. | The work provides some evidence that it is linked to an inclusive excellence problem and/or solution. | The work provides strong evidence that it is clearly linked to an important inclusive excellence problem and/or impactful solution. |