

	1 (underdeveloped)	2 (sufficient)	3 (excellent)	points
Aligns with University Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan	Little or no reference made to the University Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan	Some reference to and alignment with the University Learning and Teaching Plan	Clear alignment with the University Learning and Teaching Plan	
Teaching & Learning Area to be Investigated	The proposal does not comprehensively describe the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides limited contextual reference for the proposed work i.e. 1) little fit with relevant literature; and 2) will not contribute to current thinking in the area. It appears that there is little potential for contribution to the educator(s)' own practice	The proposal describes the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides some contextual reference for the proposed work i.e. 1) fits with relevant literature; and 2) shows some promise in providing a contribution to current thinking in the area. It appears that there is some potential for contribution to the educator(s)' own practice	The proposal clearly describes the teaching and learning area to be investigated, and provides a contextual reference for the proposed work, i.e. 1) fits with relevant literature; and 2) will contribute to current thinking in the area. The contribution to the educator(s)' own practice is clear area.	
Innovative approaches	Approach described shows little knowledge of existing practice.	Existing practice is referenced but innovation is not evident.	Innovation clearly articulated with respect to existing practice. Evidence-based arguments support the level of innovation.	
Enhancing student engagement, active learning and meeting learning outcomes	The proposal has limited potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.	The proposal has some potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.	The proposal has strong potential to positively impact teaching and learning and student outcomes.	
Overall Quality of the Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem definition is unclear or not present. Argument for the most part is unclear and/or inconsistent. • The research questions are unclear. • The necessary elements of the proposal are poorly aligned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem definition is accurate but limited. Argument is clear, but superficial. • The research questions are sufficiently articulated and are related to the description of the teaching and learning area to be investigated. • The necessary elements of the proposal are sufficiently aligned, coherent and consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem definition is precise, accurate and based on reliable sources of information. • Argument is clear, in-depth, logical and consistent. • The research questions are clearly articulated and follow logically from the description of the teaching and learning area to be investigated. • The necessary elements of the proposal are clearly aligned, coherent and consistent. 	

<p>Methods to be used</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed methods do not logically follow from the research question. Major elements of the research (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure) are not articulated. Does not identify specific steps to ensure results are valid. Methods do not include an evaluation of any strategy or intervention implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed methods follow from the research question. All elements of the research (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure), are included, although some elements lack sufficient detail. Some specific steps to ensure valid results are identified. Evaluation of any strategy or intervention implemented lacks validity and/or reliability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed methods follow logically from the research question. All elements of the research, (including planning, data collection, analysis, reporting, and project closure) are included. All specific steps to ensure valid results are included. Methods include comprehensive evaluation of any strategy or intervention implemented. 	
<p>Justification of proposed budget and feasibility of project schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project costs are relatively well articulated and defensible 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project costs are clearly articulated and defensible. The work plan is logical 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. 	

Ref: adapted from University of Guelph Learning Enhancement Fund evaluation