

Faculty Development Grant Committee

Faculty Development Grant Reviewer's Scoring Rubric

The review criteria noted below will guide the evaluation of each individual proposal for funding.

Criteria	Weak	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	Comments
Presentation of Proposal: Well-written and clear application that meets all requirements for funding and follows all application guidelines.	1 Ineffective communication of proposal; unclear objectives or purpose; missing sections of application	2	3 Some challenges in communicating proposal; sections are poorly defined, difficult to understand	4	5 Excellent communication of proposal; all sections present and well defined	
Significance to University: Proposal clearly aligns with the scholarship/teaching goals of the School or University. Proposal is likely to provide a benefit to students/department/institution	2 Meets 1 criteria of defined scholarly or teaching activity for that discipline.	4	6 Meets half of criteria of defined scholarly and/or teaching activity for that discipline.	8	10 Meets every criteria of defined scholarly and teaching activity for that discipline.	
Significance to Applicant: Proposal clearly aligns with the scholarship/teaching goals of the applicant for tenure or promotion.	2 Event does not maintain previous level of scholarly activity	4	6 Faculty concisely presents previous scholarly activities. Event maintains previous levels	8	10 Faculty concisely presents previous scholarly activities and Event maintains or exceeds previous levels	
Evaluation: Inclusion of S (specific) M (measurable) A (attainable) R (realistic) T (timely) stated objectives and outcomes.	2 1 clear SMART goal to achieve each outcome	4	6 2 clear SMART goals or goals to achieve outcomes are vague	8	10 Minimum of 3 clear SMART goals to achieve outcomes	
Implementation: Articulates a strong likelihood that plans to complete (interventions) travel/project objectives will be able to be implemented, meaningful, or impactful into teaching or scholarship;	1 Interventions are unclear, lack impact, depth, or may be ineffective	2	3 Interventions to achieve each outcome of interventions are loosely defined, lack impact or meaning	4	5 Clear interventions to achieve each outcome that are meaningful, impactful and likely to achieve desired outcomes	

Budget: Inclusion of a full, realistic budget that is clearly stated, justified and consistent. Other sources of funding should be noted if needed.	1	2	3	4	5	
Plan for peer dissemination	NO/0		CoTL/2		CoFS/2	Other/2 _____
If applicant received previous funds, did they present?	No/0			Yes/3		NA/3
Applicant tenure status	TENURED/0			NOT TENURE TRACK /4		TENURE TRACK/8
Applicant received FD grant within last 365 days?	YES /0			NO /5		
Will the applicant be presenting?	No/0	Poster/3		Speaker/5		
Questions for Applicant?						

Faculty Development Grant Committee

Faculty Development Grant Reviewer's Scoring Rubric

The review criteria noted below will guide the evaluation of each individual proposal for funding.

Priority funding criteria

1. Full-time faculty holding tenure-track positions will be given preference; full-time non-tenure track faculty will be given second preference. Permanent Part-time faculty and instructors will be given third preference.
2. Proposal from faculty who have not recently received a FD grant will be considered more favorably than faculty who have recently been granted faculty development money.
3. Priority will be given to activities that directly support the mission of Viterbo University, the applicant's progress toward tenure and promotion will also be given priority. Including presenting at a conference, (highest), activities that may lead to a paper/poster for presentation or publication (high priority).
4. Applications from faculty who have not filed Final reports and expense forms from previous grants awarded by the FDC will not be considered.

