

## Evaluation Criteria

The following rubric guides the proposal evaluation and scoring in line with the weighting categories:

### Quality: 40%

Roles and relevant experience of working team members are clearly outlined

Proposal includes a section that describes roles and responsibilities of working team members, and outlines their recent experience. Team members could include:

- faculty/discipline experts
- graduate students with appropriate faculty supervision
- instructional designer
- librarian

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** Proposal includes a clear and detailed breakdown of roles and responsibilities of each team member, along with recent experience with educational technology projects; proposed project team is diverse and includes a variety of relevant expertise that will benefit the proposed project

**Excellent (6-8pts):** Proposal includes a clear breakdown of the roles and responsibilities of each team member, but includes only some specific details, along with recent experience with educational technology projects; proposed project team is fairly diverse and includes at least discipline and instructional design expertise.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** Proposal includes a vague breakdown of the roles and responsibilities of each team member, with minimal detail, and outlines only some of their experience with educational technology; proposed project team is not diverse and includes only limited relevant expertise.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** Roles and responsibilities are not outlined. Project team is relatively homogeneous with no clear evidence of relevant expertise

Objectives of project are clearly

Proposal includes a section where objectives are clearly stated, using terminology that can be

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** The objectives are directly aligned to the goals of the

stated, measurable and attainable

understood by non-experts. The way objectives are stated makes them easily measurable. Objectives can reasonably be achieved within the available timeline.

funding, are clearly detailed and articulated, can be easily measured and can be easily understood.

Objectives can reasonably be attained within the proposed timeline.

**Excellent (6-8pts):** The objectives are somewhat aligned to the goals of the funding, are clearly stated, but not detailed, are measurable and easily understood. Objectives can reasonably be attained within the proposed timeline.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** The objectives are stated and can be measurable. They seem appropriate to the goals for funding. Objectives seem reasonable for the proposed timeline.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** The objectives are not clearly stated, are not measurable and leave questions about alignment with the goals for funding. There are serious questions about whether or not they can be attained within the proposed timeline.

Proposal includes a clear rationale that is reasonable and relevant

Rationale for the project is clearly explained and aligns with the funding goals.

If applicable: Rationale for integrating innovative technology and/or pedagogical approaches within the project is clearly articulated.

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** Proposal provides detailed explanation of the rationale for the project that clearly aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes reasons why the project is needed, how it is relevant to the institution and to the funding goals and its impact in the next 5 years. (??)

**Excellent (6-8pts):** Proposal provides detailed explanation of the rationale for the project that clearly aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes reasons why the project is needed, how it is relevant to the institution and to the funding goals.

Plans for carrying out the work and any approaches to be employed are clear, relevant, and feasible

Proposed methodology, strategies, or approach clearly support attainment of project objective. Key activities and procedures to complete the project are clearly articulated and reasonable.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** Proposal provides detailed explanation of the rationale for the project that clearly aligns it within the goals of the funding. Explanation includes a brief descriptions about the relevance of the project.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** Inadequate information is provided to support the rationale for the project.

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** The proposed methodology, strategy or approach are clearly described, are reasonable in terms of facilitating the completion of the project and support the attainment of the project goals. Key activities are articulated, outlining how the project goals are to be achieved.

**Excellent (6-8pts):** The proposed methodology, strategies, or approach are reasonable and clearly stated, and will support the attainment of the project goals. An outline of generic activities to attain the project goals is provided.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** Some information is provided regarding methodology or approach to be used to address the project objectives.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** Insufficient information is provided regarding approach or methodology to be used to attain the project goals.

**Impact: 40%**

**Applicability & transferability** The project clearly contributes to enhancing teaching and learning (the application of open practices in teaching and learning) and brings value to stakeholders (faculty, students, administration).  
The project contributes to the advancement of open educational practices across post-secondary institutions in BC.

**Collaboration** Plans for collaboration between individuals and/or institutions to develop the project are clearly articulated.

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** The proposal articulates how the project contributes to enhancing teaching and learning and describes the value that it brings to its stakeholders. The proposal makes clear how the project might be transferable to support open educational practice at other institutions.

**Excellent (6-8pts):** The proposal articulates how the project contributes to enhancing teaching and learning. It outlines how the project might be transferable to support open educational practice at other institutions.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** The proposal articulates how the project contributes to enhancing teaching and learning.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** The proposal provides limited information regarding the contributions and value of the project.

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** Proposal includes plans for cross-institutional collaboration for the development of the project, through a multi-institutional or multi-departmental team approach.

**Excellent (6-8pts):** Proposal includes plans for inter-departmental collaboration for the development of the project, through a multi-departmental team.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** Proposal includes plans for individual collaboration within the same department for the development of the project.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** Proposal provides insufficient information regarding any type of collaboration for the development of the project.

## Budget: 20%

Major cost projections.  
In-kind contributions.  
The budget is reasonable in regards to the work proposed.

The budget is easy to understand and clearly outlines the most significant cost line-items required for the development of the project, along with a reasonable timeline for the expenses. For each of the roles to be involved in the project (subject matter expert, instructional designer, project manager, etc.), FTE percentage and rate/cost are provide.  
Direct and in-kind costs are identified in sufficient detail to be clear.  
The budget is clear about when project work and related expenses will occur

**Exceptional (9-10pts):** The budget clearly outlines cost projections and the numbers accurately reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is easy to understand and provides sufficient detail for clarity about how funds will be used and when expenses will be incurred. The budget outlines all in-kind contributions, and is completely reasonable to the work proposed.

**Excellent (6-8pts):** The budget outlines cost projections and the numbers generally reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is clear and some level of detail is provided, but some questions remain. In-kind contributions are noted along with a broad timeline for incurring expenses. The budget is mostly reasonable to the work proposed.

**Acceptable (2-5pts):** The budget provides some cost projections; the numbers are not entirely reflective of project priorities. The budget is difficult to read and understand and provides insufficient detail. There is minimal indication of a timeline of expenses and no in-kind contributions are noted. The budget is not entirely reasonable to the work outlined.

**Incomplete (0-1pts):** The budget does not outline cost projections and the numbers do not reflect the priorities of the project. The budget is not clear and does not provide sufficient detail. The budget is not reasonable to the work proposed.

