

ECU Learning and Teaching Grant Assessment Rubric

	1 (poor)	2 (sufficient)	3 (excellent)	points
<b>Rationale for proposed project</b> <b>[Rationale for Project]*</b>	The proposal does not comprehensively describe the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides limited contextual reference for the proposed work. Research questions (aims) are either absent or poorly conceived.	The proposal describes the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides some contextual reference for the proposed work. Research questions (aims) reflect the rationale and project approach.	The proposal clearly describes the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides a contextual reference for the proposed work. Clearly articulated research questions (aims) frame the project	
<b>Best practice/ Innovation</b> <b>[Rationale for Project]*</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approach described shows little knowledge of existing practice.</li> <li>2. Little fit with relevant literature;</li> <li>3. Will not contribute to current thinking or practice in the area.</li> <li>4. It appears that there is little potential for contribution to the educator(s)' own practice.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing practice is referenced but innovation may not be evident.</li> <li>2. Fits with relevant literature;</li> <li>3. Shows some promise in providing a contribution to current practices and thinking in the area.</li> <li>4. It appears that there is some potential for contribution to the educator(s)' own practice.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Innovation clearly articulated with respect to existing practice. Evidence-based arguments support the level of innovation.</li> <li>2. Fits with relevant literature;</li> <li>3. Will contribute to current practice and thinking in the area.</li> <li>4. The contribution to the educator(s)' own practice is clear area.</li> </ol>	
<b>Impact:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing student engagement and meeting learning outcomes</li> <li>• Transferability of project</li> <li>• Dissemination</li> </ul> <b>[Rationale for Project]*</b> <b>[Dissemination Activities]*</b> <b>[Project Plan]*</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal has limited potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Outcomes of project have limited or no ability to be transferred to a wider cohort of students across school or university.</li> <li>3. Little or no thought has been given to appropriate dissemination of project outcome</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal has some potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Outcomes of project have the potential to be applicable to a wider cohort of students across the school or university.</li> <li>3. Dissemination plan involved a presentation at ECulture and at least one other relevant forum.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal has strong potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.</li> <li>2. Clear indications are given that the outcomes will be applied to a wider cohort of students across the school, university or sector.</li> <li>3. Well thought out and feasible dissemination plan that shares practice in an effective way is outlined</li> </ol>	
<b>Project Plan and timeline</b> <b>[Project Plan]*</b> <b>[Dissemination Activities]*</b>	The work plan is not well articulated. The milestones and timelines may be unrealistic, unclear, and/or do not address the lifecycle of the work, including planning, ethics, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure.	The work plan is well articulated. Most of the milestones of the lifecycle of the work, including planning, ethics, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure are identified.	The work plan is logical, feasible and well-articulated. All of the milestones are realistic, clearly identified, and address the lifecycle of the work, including planning, ethics, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure..	
<b>Evaluation Process</b> <b>[Project Plan]*</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed methods do not logically follow from the research question (aim).</li> <li>2. Major elements of the research (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure) are not articulated.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed methods follow from the research question (aim).</li> <li>2. All elements of the research (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure), are included, although some elements lack sufficient detail.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed methods follow logically from the research question (aim).</li> <li>2. All elements of the research, (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure) are included.</li> <li>3. All specific steps to ensure results are valid are included.</li> </ol>	

### ECU Learning and Teaching Grant Assessment Rubric

	3. Does not identify specific steps to ensure results are valid.	3. Some specific steps to ensure results are valid are identified.		
<b>Justification of proposed budget</b>  [Budget]*	The project costs are not well articulated and there is some question as to the need for the funds based on the information provided.	The project costs are relatively well articulated and defensible	The project costs are clearly articulated and defensible.	
<b>Overall Quality of the Proposal</b>  [Entire application]*	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Problem definition is unclear or not present. Argument for the most part is unclear and/or inconsistent.</li> <li>2. The research questions are unclear.</li> <li>3. The necessary elements of the proposal are poorly aligned.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Problem definition is accurate but limited. Argument is clear, but superficial.</li> <li>2. The research questions are sufficiently articulated and are related to the description of the teaching and learning area to be investigated.</li> <li>3. The necessary elements of the proposal are sufficiently aligned, coherent and consistent.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The problem definition is precise, accurate and based on reliable sources of information. Argument is clear, in-depth, logical and consistent.</li> <li>2. The research questions are clearly articulated and follow logically from the description of the teaching and learning area to be investigated.</li> <li>3. The necessary elements of the proposal are clearly aligned, coherent and consistent.</li> </ol>	

\*[Sections of the application that should reflect the criteria]

Comments: