

PICCE Evaluation Rubric for CEI Proposals – Category CE Research (Rev Dec 2019)

*A statement about reciprocity: the CEI Peer Review Board upholds reciprocity as a foremost value of engaged research. To this end, evaluation rubrics distinguish between a score of “3” and “2” primarily by giving the higher score in the given category to projects that demonstrate co-creation by campus and community partners.*

| <b>Criteria-<br/>Scholarship of CE<br/>Research</b>  | <b>3. Exceeds standard</b>  | <b>2. Meets standard</b>   | <b>1. Does not meet<br/>standard</b>   |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>A.<br/>Clarity of<br/>purpose of<br/>research project</b>   | 3 points<br>Proposal clearly addresses the purpose of the project including questions/needs of the community partner as well as one of the following: campus partner, university or other stakeholder group.          | 2 points<br>Proposal addresses the purpose of the project including questions/needs of only one of the following: campus partner, community partner, university or other stakeholder group.                        | 1 point<br>Project's purpose is hard to discern and its impacts are vague.   |
| <b>B.<br/>Helpful or<br/>informative<br/>inferences are<br/>drawn</b>  | 3 points<br>The project presents helpful/informative/specific inferences or conclusions for <b>both</b> the community partner <b>AND</b> one of the following: campus partner, university or other stakeholder group. | 2 points<br>Inferences or conclusions are presented; less specific than those in B3; and/or presented only for one of the following: community partner, campus partner, or institution or other stakeholder group. | 1 point<br>Inferences or conclusions are vague or missing; reviewer has to work to figure out if they are present.             |
| <b>C.<br/>Project contains<br/>reflection on<br/>process, power<br/>differentials,<br/>assumptions, or<br/>lessons learned</b> | 3 points<br>The project makes clear reflection on process, positionality, or lessons learned, affecting both campus and community partner.  | 2 points<br>The project makes some reference to process, positionality, or lessons learned, but in a manner less explicit than in C3 or for only one stakeholder.  | 1 point<br>The project presents no apparent reflection on process, positionality or lessons learned.                           |
| <b>D.<br/>Enhancement of<br/>knowledge base</b>  | 3 points<br>Clear indication in growth of knowledge base for both community partner and campus partner (individual, disciplinary, institutional). Knowledge base was  | 2 points<br>Clear indication of that knowledge base is improved by the project (enhanced or refined) for either  | 1 point<br>No reference to new knowledge created or such reference is noted in vague terms - e.g. ‘my knowledge was enhanced.’ |

PICCE Evaluation Rubric for CEI Proposals – Category CE Research (Rev Dec 2019)

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | refined or enhanced in a meaningful way.   | campus or community partner.   |  |
| <b>E. Effective presentation of proposal</b>   | 3 points<br>The project is well-organized. Ideas are clear. Absence of jargon and confusing verbiage. Where a specific vocabulary of disciplinary or community knowing is used, it is noted and explained. | 2 points<br>The project is poorly organized, jargon is present or ideas are unclear. Reviewers experience difficulty <b>quickly</b> grasping central ideas, but may infer meaning. | 1 point<br>The project lacks organization; meaning is unclear; central ideas are not readily grasped. Reviewers are unable to fill in meaning. |
| <b>F. Adequate preparation &amp; appropriate methods</b>   | 3 points<br>The project references prior, related work; uses appropriate methods; describes both clearly.  | 2 points<br>The project makes passing reference to prior work OR specifies appropriate methods.  | 1 point<br>The project does not specify either prior, relevant work OR methods employed.   |
| <b>G. Research project fits with mission and goals of community partner</b>  | 3 points<br>The project demonstrates clear alignment with community partner's mission AND goals  | 2 points<br>The project aligns with either the mission or goals of the community partner, OR aligns with both in a manner less explicit than in G3.                                | 1 point<br>No reference to research project's alignment with the mission or goals of community partner.  |
| <b>H. Expertise is present and relevant to project (Expertise is defined as the application of faculty knowledge or the application of community partner experience or knowledge.)</b> | 3 points<br>Expertise is clearly present and relevant to project.  | 2 points<br>Expertise is present in project but does not seem entirely relevant to project's purpose, methods or goals.  | 1 point<br>It is difficult to discern the presence or relevance of expertise in the project.   |
| <b>I. Project evaluation</b>   | 3 points<br>The project demonstrates a beneficial outcome or impact to community partner (in quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods format).   | 2 points<br>The project presents a beneficial outcome or impact to the community partner but without sufficient or clear evidence.   | 1 point<br>Beneficial impact or outcome to community partner is unclear or unknown.  |