



# Evaluation Rubric: Full Proposal

2020-21 Grand Challenge:

*Overcoming the Calculus Barrier to STEM Success*

Proposal Title: \_\_\_\_\_

## Section A: Full Proposal

“Overcoming the Calculus Barrier to STEM Success” Grand Challenge grants will provide funding for intersegmental faculty teams whose projects reconceptualize the role of and approach to calculus in students’ first-year introductory STEM experience, either by seeking to directly transform the calculus sequence or reimagining the role of calculus in STEM majors where calculus is a prerequisite.

Applicant teams selected to move forward from the concept proposal stage were asked to submit a FULL PROPOSAL with the following components (see [updated RFP](#), pages 12-14):

- Institutional Cover Letter (2-page max. for each host institution; partner institutions to sign host letter or submit their own cover letter)
- Project Narrative (8-10 pages max.; no smaller than 11-pt. Arial font; no less than 0.5” margins)
- Response to Selection Committee Notes (5-page max.)
- Endnotes/References (no page limit)
- Additional Team Member Information (2-page max. for all additional team members)
- Budget (using the budget template accessed through Learning Lab’s [website](#))

In an email that applicants received entitled, “Learning Lab’s 2021 Selection Committee Feedback for Grand Challenge Applicant,” applicants were asked to respond to specific questions about their concept proposal either within the Project Narrative or the Response to Selection Committee Notes section listed above.

Applicants were asked to submit the full proposal through Submittable.

Please evaluate the full proposal based on the following questions. These questions correspond to key elements/components of the full proposal instruction section of the RFP.

For each question, provide a brief assessment and numeric score, based on a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 reflecting an excellent or very strong response, and 1 reflecting a poor or weak response. Please evaluate each component within the context and entirety of the overall proposal.

\*Please note that the Evaluation Rubric for this stage includes questions related to support from host and partner institutions, scalability, and additional information requested upon selection to move forward at the concept stage. You will also assess projects based on how effectively they align with statutory selection criteria ([Government Code 65059.2 \(b\)\(1\)\(A-I\)](#)) and prepare an overall assessment.

Question	Reference	Reviewer Assessment (100 words per response max.)	Score (1-5)
1. <u>Institutional support</u> : How strongly is the proposed project supported by the host and partner institutions? How well does the proposed project align with the goals of the host and partner institutions?	RFP, p.8 and Institutional Cover Letter requirement, p.12		
2. <u>Project approach</u> : Does the proposed project have a well-considered, innovative approach to overcome the calculus barrier to STEM success? Evaluate the applicant’s example of how the project will work in practice, if provided.	RFP, p.13		
3. <u>Diversity/Variation of student preparation</u> : How well does the project accommodate a diversity or variation of student preparation and help all students succeed?	RFP, p.8		
4. <u>Expertise of team and strength of collaboration</u> : How well does the project demonstrate authentic collaboration among partner institutions? Leverage a diverse array of practitioners and researchers with expertise in areas such as instructional design, cognitive psychology, culturally responsive pedagogy, learning technologies, and expertise in relevant STEM discipline(s)?	RFP, p.8		
5. <u>Effective and inclusive pedagogical practices</u> : How well does the project explain the target populations and target interventions including the size and scope of each?  How well will the project apply practices demonstrated to have positive impacts on how the identified student groups learn (e.g., active learning, adaptive learning, applied learning, project-based learning) and include interventions in the affective domain (e.g., sense of belonging/identity; social/emotional/ cultural contexts; growth mindsets, including faculty growth mindset)?	RFP, p. 13  RFP, p.8		

Question	Reference	Reviewer Assessment (100 words per response max.)	Score (1-5)
<p>6. <u>Data and technology tools</u>: Does the project include a well-considered plan to use and/or develop technology tools including an approach to adaptive learning (broadly defined; see updated RFP, p.17)?</p> <p>How well will the project capture and catalog data and practices to share with other practitioners and researchers, and utilize data to iterate improvements to the project?</p>	<p>RFP, p.13</p> <p>RFP, p.8</p>		
<p>7. <u>Professional development component</u>: How well does the project’s professional development component address how to attend to and close racial and gender equity gaps?</p> <p>Does the project include strategies for changing faculty mindset and practices, including the adoption of more inclusive and effective teaching practices?</p>	<p>RFP, p.8</p> <p>RFP, p.4</p>		
<p>8. <u>Goals and implementation</u>: Does the proposal outline specific goals and include a well-considered implementation plan (e.g., project team, timeline, assessment plan)?</p> <p>Will the project’s concrete, measurable short and long-term goals lead to positive outcomes for faculty and students, in alignment with Grand Challenge expectations?</p>	<p>RFP, p.13</p> <p>RFP, p.9</p>		
<p>9. <u>Sustainable change</u>: Does the project demonstrate strong potential to have lasting impact on participating campuses, and be scaled and/or replicated? Is there supportive evidence of its potential such as references to successful models? How well will the project disseminate its results?</p> <p>Will the project’s impact be sustained beyond the life of the grant award?</p>	<p>RFP, p.13</p> <p>RFP, p.9</p>		





**Section C: Overall Assessment of Impact**

The following evaluation should be based on your overall assessment of the proposal as a whole. Please assess the project’s potential to successfully achieve its goals in overcoming the calculus barrier to STEM success.

Please use the following key to evaluate this overall impact:

**High** (score 5 or 4)

- Project is likely to achieve its goals and have a significant impact in overcoming the calculus barrier to STEM success. The proposed project is well-constructed and addresses all major components in the RFP.

**Medium** (score 3)

- Project may achieve its goals and may have a significant impact in overcoming the calculus barrier to STEM success, but the proposed project has weaknesses and does not fully address all major components in the RFP.

**Low** (score 2 or 1)

- Project is unlikely to achieve its goals or have a significant impact in overcoming the calculus barrier to STEM success. The proposed project has major weaknesses and does not fully address all major components in the RFP.

**Please provide 250-350 words explaining your overall assessment** of the proposal’s likely impact. Highlight the proposal’s strengths and weaknesses, including any constructive suggestions or project/project budget modifications should this applicant receive an award. Please state whether you would recommend this project for a Grand Challenge award.

**Please note: This feedback may inform the grant agreement if an award is offered, or the denial response if an award is not offered.**

**Overall Assessment of Impact Score: (1-5)**