

## Teaching Enhancement Grants Reviewer Instructions and Rubric Overview

Updated 2023

**Overview:** Four or more Teaching Enhancement Grants will be given for the purpose of helping faculty members enhance their teaching.

**Guidelines:** Almost any idea will be considered by the committee. For example, funds may be used for teaching materials such as maps, charts, models, software, hardware, classroom and field experience equipment, etc. However, the committee has decided not to fund requests for release time from teaching or seed money for grants. This is because of the limited amount of money available and the feeling that teachers on this campus have more immediate needs in the area of classroom support. Other things being equal, proposals that impact a greater number of students across more than one semester may be judged more favorably. (**Please note:** The Kraemer Family Library often has budgets for the purchase of books, videos, dvd's, etc. If your request contains items of this nature, please check with the Library first.)

Committee Chair: Chair of the [Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching](#)

Committee Reviewers: Members of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching

Eligibility Criteria Met?

- Anyone who is currently teaching at UCCS is eligible.

Application Complete?

- A one page proposal outlining the request and budget.

*If yes to all these items, continue to score:*

### Instructions to Reviewers: Getting Oriented\*

Thank you for taking the time to review the proposals for this award. Your work in evaluating the submissions and selecting the award recipients is important and familiar work for faculty. You may be less familiar with the research on peer reviewing, which has shown there are some common pitfalls in the process that lead to unintentional bias in the outcomes. Briefly, those pitfalls have to do with taking procedural shortcuts in peer review that lead reviewers to rely on intellectual shortcuts (*e.g.*, biases) in our thinking.

**Keep in mind:** biases may appear in the very materials that you are asked to review as part of the proposal. There are several ways that bias may unintentionally get baked in. To overcome this, give yourself enough time to review. Research consistently shows that biases are most likely to occur when we are rushed. After you read the proposals consider going back over all of them and reflect on the group as a whole. Just like grading papers, sometimes our criteria can shift as we see what is submitted. Make sure you go back and ask yourself if you were too hard on or too easy on proposals.

### Nomination Scoring

We are modeling the NIH reviewer system in which we will use a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor) in whole numbers (no decimals) to determine the **Four Criterion Strengths** and **Overall Teaching Impact** scores for all applications. Scores of 1 or 9 should be used less frequently than the other scores. 5 is for a good medium-impact application and considered an average score.

Overall Teaching Impact or Criterion Strength	Score	Descriptor
High	1	Exceptional
	2	Outstanding
	3	Excellent
Medium	4	Very Good
	5	Good
	6	Satisfactory
Low	7	Fair
	8	Marginal
	9	Poor

You will score an application as presented in its entirety and may not modify your scores based on personal knowledge of the proposer. **Please notify the Chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching of any possible conflicts of interest *prior* to your review.**

Consider the **Four Criterion Strengths**:

- Quality of the proposal
- Degree of pedagogical innovation
- Degree of active student engagement
- Number of students/courses/semesters impacted

**Holistic Impression:** You should give equal weight to the above criteria in assessing the comprehensive strength of the proposal to derive an overall holistic score.

You will also be asked to provide a very brief ( $\leq 50$ -word) summary in support of your overall score.

Your scoring will take place online, via the Qualtrics Review Portal.

You will input the proposer's name in your review and repeat the reviewer form for each proposer.

**Final Selection:** The scores are summed across reviewers for all proposers. Up to the maximum funding available, the lowest scores are selected as the winners. In the event of a numerical tie, the reviewer summary comments will be considered by the Chair of the Faculty Assembly Committee on Teaching, who will make the final selection in consultation with the review committee.

*\* Modified from [UMass ADVANCE](#) template for peer review.*