

PICCE Evaluation Rubric for CEI Proposals – Category Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Rev Dec 2019)

A statement about reciprocity: the CEI Peer Review Board upholds reciprocity as a foremost value of engaged scholarship in teaching and learning. 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.

Criteria- CE Teaching & Learning	3. Exceeds Standard	2. Meets standard	1. Does not meet standard
A. Clarity of purpose of instructional project	3 points Proposal clearly addresses the project’s purpose, including the questions/needs of instructor & community partner-OR-student & community partner-OR-university & community partner.	2 points Proposal address the project’s purpose, including the questions/needs of instructor/student/university OR community partner, but not both.	1 point Project's purpose hard to discern; goals vague
B. Helpful or informative inferences are drawn	3 points Helpful/informative/Specific inferences or conclusions for both community partner AND instructor/student/university	2 points Inferences or conclusions are presented; less specific than those in B3; and/or presented only for community partner OR instructor/student/university	1 point Inferences/conclusions vague or missing; reviewer has to work to figure out if they are present.
C. Enhancement of knowledge base	3 points Clear indication of how both community partner and student's/instructor's/university's knowledge base is improved by project (enhanced or refined)	2 points Clear indication that knowledge base is improved by the project (enhanced or refined) for one of the stakeholder groups listed in C3.	1 point No reference to enhanced knowledge base of instructor, student or community partner - or reference in only the vaguest terms - e.g. 'my understanding of x was enhanced'
D. Effective presentation of proposal	3 points 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 The project is loosely organized, jargon is present or ideas are unclear. Reviewers experience difficulty quickly grasping central ideas, but may infer meaning.	1 point The project lacks organization; meaning is unclear; central ideas are not readily grasped. Reviewers are unable to fill in meaning.

PICCE Evaluation Rubric for CEI Proposals – Category Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Rev Dec 2019)

<p>E. Adequate preparation & appropriate methods</p>	<p>3 points The project references prior, related work; uses appropriate methods and describes both clearly.</p>	<p>2 points The project makes passing reference to prior work OR specifies appropriate methods.</p>	<p>1 point The project does not specify either prior, relevant work OR methods employed.</p>
<p>F. Instructor's project fits with mission and goals of community partner</p>	<p>3 points Project demonstrates clear alignment with community partner's mission and goals.</p>	<p>2 points Project aligns with either community partner's mission or goals, or alignment with both is less explicit than in F3.</p>	<p>1 point No reference to project alignment with community partner's mission or goals.</p>
<p>G. Expertise is present and relevant to project (* Expertise is defined as the application of faculty knowledge, development of student expertise or practical skills, or the application of community partner experience or knowledge.)</p>	<p>3 points Expertise is clearly present and relevant to project.</p>	<p>2 points Expertise is present in project but does not seem entirely relevant to project's purpose, methods or goals.</p>	<p>1 point It is difficult to discern the presence or relevance of expertise in the project.</p>
<p>H. Project evaluation</p>	<p>3 points The project demonstrates an important outcome or impact to community partner (in quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods format) AND other stakeholder group (students, institution, discipline).</p>	<p>2 points The project presents an important outcome or impact to the community partner OR another stakeholder group; or describes impact on both but without sufficient or clear evidence.</p>	<p>1 point Important impact or outcome to community partner or other stakeholder group is unclear or unknown.</p>