

SoTL Fellow Application Rubric (2022)

Criteria	Description	Category and Points			Reviewer notes or comments
		Exceptional	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	
		2	1	0	
A. Personal commitment	A1. Does the application describe personal and professional experience needed to achieve intended results? If lacking personal and professional experience, does the application describe a relevant track record that supports being able to complete this project?	Great evidence of personal and professional experience needed to achieve intended results are provided OR if lacking personal and professional experience, a clearly articulated relevant track record that supports being able to complete this project is provided	Some evidence of personal and professional experience needed to achieve intended results are provided OR if lacking personal and professional experience, a somewhat articulated relevant track record that supports being able to complete this project is provided	No evidence of personal and professional experience needed to achieve intended results are provided AND no articulated relevant track record that supports being able to complete this project is provided	
	A2. Does the application provide evidence of the candidate's commitment to the fellowship (e.g., time, energy, and resource investments required)?	Great evidence of the candidate's commitment to the fellowship is provided	Some evidence of the candidate's commitment to the fellowship is provided	No evidence of the candidate's commitment to the fellowship is provided	
B. Engagement	B1. Does the application describe interest in and enthusiasm for participating in the SoTL FLC ?	Great interest in and enthusiasm for participating in the SoTL FLC is indicated	Some interest in and enthusiasm for participating in the SoTL FLC is indicated	No interest in and enthusiasm for participating in the SoTL FLC is indicated	
	B2. Does the application describe interest in, enthusiasm for, and plans for participating in promoting assessment and SoTL excellence at SU ?	Great interest in, enthusiasm for, and clearly articulated plans for participating in and promoting assessment and SoTL excellence at SU are indicated	Some interest in, enthusiasm for, and somewhat articulated plans for participating in and promoting assessment and SoTL excellence at SU are indicated	No interest in, enthusiasm for, or articulated plans for participating in and promoting assessment and SoTL excellence at SU are indicated	
C. Quality and scholarship of the proposed project	C1. Is the project well-defined?	The project is well-defined	The project is somewhat-defined	The project is not well-defined	
	C2. Does the proposed project include evidence of relevant background research and theoretical framework(s)?	Relevant background research and theoretical framework(s) are clearly described	Relevant background research and theoretical framework(s) are somewhat described	Relevant background research and theoretical framework(s) are not described	
	C3. Does the project have clearly articulated questions or goals?	The project has clearly articulated questions or goals	The project has vague questions or goals	The project has no questions or goals	
D. Project feasibility	D1. Does the project have clearly articulated (tentative) action steps, outlined plan, or a timeline provided?	Clearly articulated (tentative) action steps, outlined plan, or timeline is provided.	Vague (tentative) action steps, outlined plan, or timeline is provided.	No (tentative) action steps, outlined plan, or timeline is provided.	
	D2. Are contingencies provided in case the tentative planning or project itself needs to be altered?	Well-thought out contingencies are provided in case the tentative planning or project itself needs to be altered.	Under-developed contingencies are provided in case the tentative planning or project itself needs to be altered.	No contingencies are provided in case the project itself needs to be altered.	

SoTL Fellow Application Rubric (2022)

Criteria	Description	Category and Points			Reviewer notes or comments
		Exceptional	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	
		2	1	0	
D. Project feasibility, continued	D3. Are potential challenges and limitations discussed?	Challenges and limitations are well researched, identified, and addressed. Acceptable solutions or adjustments to the project, or rationale when no solutions are available, are provided.	Challenges and limitations are somewhat researched, identified, and/or addressed. Questionable or incomplete solutions or adjustments to the project, or rationale when no solutions are available, are provided.	Challenges and limitations are not researched, identified, or addressed. No solutions, adjustments, or rationale are provided.	
E. Impact of the proposed project (lasting, widespread, and scalable results)	E1. Does the application state the professional development impact this opportunity will have for the candidate ?	Clearly states the professional development impact this opportunity will have for the candidate	Vaguely states the professional development impact this opportunity will have for the candidate	Does not state the professional development impact this opportunity will have for the candidate	
	E2. Does the application state the impact this opportunity will have for students ? How many students will be impacted?	Clearly states the impact(s) this project will have for students, with either many or great likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many students over time	Vaguely states the impact(s) this project will have for students, with either a fair amount of or fair likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many students over time	Does not state the impact(s) this project will have for students, with few students being impacted and little to no likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many students over time	
	E3. Does the application state the impact this opportunity will have for broader groups (e.g., program, office, school/college, SU, Salisbury community, community of practice, disciplinary field/practitioners, etc.)? How many broader groups will be impacted?	Clearly states the impact(s) this project will have for other broader groups, with either many or great likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many broader groups over time	Vaguely states the impact(s) this project will have for other broader groups, with either a fair amount of or fair likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many broader groups over time	Does not state the impact(s) this project will have for other broader groups, with few broader groups being impacted and little to no likelihood for lasting, widespread, or scalable results to impact many broader groups over time	
	E4. Does the application state the impact this project will have for generating new knowledge, tactics, methods, resources, and/or expertise for long-term change ?	Clearly states the impact(s) this project will have for generating new knowledge, tactics, methods, resources, and/or expertise for long-term change	Vaguely states the impact(s) this project will have for generating new knowledge, tactics, methods, resources, and/or expertise and unclear if change will be long-term	Does not state the impact(s) this project will have for generating new knowledge, tactics, methods, resources, and/or expertise and unlikely that change will persist beyond the project's lifespan	
F. Persuasiveness	Does the application demonstrate the candidate's need for the fellowship?	The application is extremely compelling . The candidate's application stands out above other candidates .	The application is compelling , but does not stand out above the other candidates' applications.	The application is compelling , but not when compared to the other candidates' applications.	

SoTL Fellow Application Rubric (2022)

Criteria	Description	Category and Points			Reviewer notes or comments
		Exceptional	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	
		2	1	0	
G. (ONLY AS NEEDED*) Recommendation(s)	Does the person listed in support of the application recommend this candidate for the fellowship?	Clearly indicates positive and enthusiastic observations regarding the candidate and their ability to succeed in this fellowship AND provides specific and aligned examples related to those observations.	Clearly OR somewhat indicates positive and enthusiastic observations regarding the candidate and their ability to succeed in this fellowship AND provides only general examples related to those observations.	Somewhat indicates OR does not indicate positive and enthusiastic observations regarding the candidate and their ability to succeed in this fellowship AND does not provide examples related to those observations.	

Notes for Reviewers:

For the 2022 applications, although the 2021 SoTL Fellowship Application Rubric above was not altered at this time (decided to wait until after the review of applications, since new questions were added), the reviewers will consider the responses to the new questions when deciding awards (e.g., to help ensure a range of projects, with varying status and scope of impacts, are supported). The three new questions were: "At which LEVEL(S) will your project impact others?"; "Which of the following describes the TYPE of project you are proposing?"; and "Which of the following BEST describes the CURRENT STATUS AND SCOPE OF IMPACT of your proposed project? We ask this because we would like to support a range of projects with outcomes and impacts of an emergent and smaller scope, as well as those that may generate publications."

In addition to any relevant information provided elsewhere in application, the applicants' responses to "WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING are you interested in pursuing as a SoTL Fellow?" question [checkboxes or details in "Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE)" response option], can be used to inform scoring of **A2** and **B2** in the rubric.

Asterisk (*) for criterion **G** denotes that the contact(s) listed that could provide recommendations for the candidates will only be contacted IF there is a tie in other scores or considerable disagreement between raters - OR - if it is unclear that the supervisor has approved the applicant's additional work involved in the proposal, which could potentially be outside of their primary duties.

Consider this as a DRAFT rubric, originally created based upon criteria in similar rubrics for the 2019 Assessment Fellow application review and updated based upon reviewer feedback of the 2020 SoTL Fellow application review (i.e., D1 altered; Notes for Reviewers updated, including the IRB question response options updated). Please provide feedback on the clarity, usefulness, and alignment of this rubric to the 2021 SoTL Fellow Application. Also, note any criteria that you are interested in evaluating for future SoTL Fellow applications that was NOT evidenced in the current application materials (to adjust the subsequent SoTL Fellow Application accordingly).

Will the proposed project require IRB application? **CIRCLE ONE**

Note: Although this will not affect the scoring of the applications, it will allow the SoTL FLC to identify the need for IRB-related professional development for any individuals' whose proposals are selected for funding - to ensure appropriate alignment with IRB-related protocols and processes.

- (A) No
- (B) Yes, and the IRB proposal submission WAS included as part of the planning of the project
- (C) Yes, although the IRB proposal submission WAS NOT included as part of the planning of the project
- (D) I do not know