

**Evaluation Rubric for Teaching Grants**  
Spring 2016

Proposal/PI: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: Categories are not weighted. Scores are used to ensure consistency among reviewers and as a guide to differentiate and rank-order proposals prior to final funding decisions.

---

**Project Importance**

Does the proposal make a compelling case that the project:

- Addresses an issue or problem of importance to Penn State teaching and learning?
- Has the potential to impact other Penn State faculty?

**Comments:**

**Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ (5 = exceeds criteria, 3-4 = partially meets criteria, 0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria)

---

**Project Objectives**

- Are the expected outcomes realistic?
- Does the evidence align with the expected outcome?

**Comments:**

**Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)

---

**Project Activities and Timeline**

- Are the activities reasonable within the project timeline?
- Are the activities achievable by the individual or group listed?

**Comments:**

**Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)

---

**Budget**

- Do the budget items appear to contribute to the successful completion of the project?
- Do the amounts appear to be based on tangible expected costs?

**Comments:**

**Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)

---

**Project Longevity**

- Is the plan for continuing the project without additional funding feasible?

**Comments:**

**Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ (0-2 = fails to meet many/all criteria, 3 = partially meets, 4-5 = meets/exceeds criteria)

---

**Total Points Earned** \_\_\_\_\_ /25

**Final Comments**

**Recommendation (choose one)**

Fully fund

Partially fund

Do not fund

Revise/resubmit