

IL**LU**MINATE Grants for the Improvement of Teaching

Scoring Rubric

Grant Title: _____ Scorer Initials: _____

	Not Evident / Needs Improvement	Fair / Acceptable	Proficient / Fully Completed and Detailed	Points Awarded (55)
Application Process (5)	Application was not well written or responses were brief or incomplete. (0-2)	Application was fairly well written, fairly detailed, and complete. (3-4)	Application was well written, fully detailed, and complete. (5)	
Clarity of Purpose and Explanation of Project (5)	Proposal fails to clearly explain the project and/or lacks details on the purpose. (0-2)	Proposal somewhat explains the project and the purpose. (3-4)	Proposal clearly explains the project, what will be done, and the purpose. (5)	
Learning Outcomes (3)	Learning outcomes were not present. (0)	Learning outcomes were not measurable. (1-2)	Learning outcomes were measurable. (3)	
Potential to Impact Teaching (5)	Proposal is unlikely to positively impact teaching practices. (0-2)	Proposal is likely to positively impact teaching practices. (3-4)	Proposal will certainly positively impact teaching practices. (5)	
Evidence of Active Learning/ Student Engagement (20)	There is limited or no evidence of student engagement/active learning techniques. (0-9)	There is some evidence of student engagement/active learning techniques. (10-15)	There is ample evidence of student engagement/active learning techniques. (16-20)	
Promotion of Higher-Order Thinking Skills (3)	No evidence of the promotion of higher-order thinking skills. (0)	Evidence of the promotion of higher-order thinking skills can be inferred. (1-2)	There is clear evidence of the promotion of higher-order thinking skills. (3)	
Originality of Project (3)	Proposal is not original. (0)	Proposal is somewhat original. (1-2)	Proposal is highly original. (3)	
Return on Investment/ Funding Requested (5)	Proposal provides a poor return on investment. Funding requests are unreasonable or impermissible. (0-2)	Proposal provides a modest return on investment. Funding requests are reasonable and permissible. (3-4)	Proposal provides a good return on investment. Funding requests are reasonable and permissible. (5)	
Plan to Assess (3)	There is a weak plan to assess success. (0-1)	There is a somewhat clear plan to success. (2)	There is a clear plan to assess success. (3)	
Previous Funding (3)	Lead author received a previous grant. (0)	Supporting author(s) received a previous grant. (1)	Previously never received a grant. (3)	
Total Points Earned				