

AVPA SoTL Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

| Criteria | Not Evident/ Submitted (0) | Does Not Meet Expectations (1) | Meets Expectations (2) | Exceeds Expectations (3) |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| <i>Literature Background / Rationale</i> | | | | |
| <i>Literature Review</i> | | | The proposal sufficiently describes and highlights peer reviewed works within the scholarly literature and /or other reports and communication, that grounds the research proposed and helps to identify a need/gap in the literature. | |
| <i>Framing of research question / rationale</i> | | | The rationale is clearly articulated in a manner that provides an overview of the proposed project. | |
| | | | The proposed project logically addresses the identified gap consistently throughout the application. | |

Research Question(s) and Impact

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Proposed research questions</i> | | | The research question(s) are clearly framed and stated, and use appropriate pedagogical language. | |
| | | | The research question is realistic and aligned with the stated rationale, timeline and supporting evidence. | |
| <i>Impact on teaching and learning</i> | | | There is a clear description as to how the project aligns with, and advances the field of teaching and learning. | |

Methods and Analysis

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Clearly Described Methods / Processes / Analysis with a logical flow</i> | | | Method(s) and processes stated are clearly outlined such that they logically flow and are easy to follow. | |
| <i>Methods are aligned within the proposal</i> | | | Methodology is aligned with the purpose and research question, and is appropriate for investigating the proposed question, <i>i.e.</i> the methodology is feasible. | |
| <i>Analysis aligned within the proposal</i> | | | The analysis and use of data are clearly articulated and appropriate for answering the guiding research questions. | |
| <i>Use of human subjects and associated data collection / storage processes are clearly described</i> | | | Authors have given due consideration to potentially working with human subjects and managing data gathered appropriately. REB has been / will be sought if required | |
| <i>Timeline is achievable</i> | | | The proposed timeline of activities for the project is clearly described and is achievable with the AVPA SoTL Grant funding period. | |

Logistics, Budget and Additional Requirements

| <i>Timeline</i> | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Yes | No | Comments |
| Timeline with dates and milestones/action items clearly outlined | | | |
| Clear dissemination plan included | | | |
| <i>Budget</i> | | | |
| | Yes | No | Comments |
| Detailed and itemized list | | | |
| In-kind contributions (if applicable) | | | |
| Other funding (if applicable) | | | |
| Is the proposed budget clearly articulated and defensible? | | | |
| <i>Co-Investigator(s)</i> | | | |
| | Yes | No | Comments |
| Co-Investigators and their specific roles/contributions clearly stated (if applicable). | | | |
| <i>Signatures and Letter(s) of Support</i> | | | |
| | Yes | No | Comments |
| Letter(s) of Support from each Collaborating Unit | | | |
| Signature of Applicant | | | |
| Signature of Chair / Director / Dean | | | |
| Signature(s) of Co-Investigators | | | |
| Are the letters of support well aligned with the objectives of the project described? | | | |