CHAIR EVALUATION
R. PATRICIA WALSH GRANTS IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING, 2012-2013

This form is due latest by Monday, Feb 6, 2012, at the Center for Teaching Excellence (either as hardcopy to Will Martinez or Dorothea Herreiner, UHall Suite 3000; or by email as an attachment (scanned pdf) sent from the Evaluator’s email address; or online HERE). If the application is for a collaborative project with faculty members from more than one Department, then a Chair Evaluation has to be provided for each Department.

If the Chair of a Department is submitting a grant application him/herself the applicant may select another faculty member in the same department or field in consultation with and after approval by the CTE Director. If the applicant wishes to have someone other than the Chair provide this evaluation for other reasons, then this needs to be discussed with and approved by the CTE Director before the grant submission. If this form is completed by someone other than the Department Chair, please provide a short explanation below.

The Committee on Excellence in Teaching (CET) would appreciate your candid evaluation of the grant application. To assist the CET in reaching a fair and consistent evaluation of all proposals, please pick only one answer for each question (by ticking the appropriate box).

Name of Applicant: _______________________________ ________________________

Name of Chair: _______________________________ ________________________

Name of Evaluator: _______________________________ ________________________
(if not the Chair)

Date: _______________________________ ________________________

Signature: _______________________________ ________________________
1. **Project Question**: Has the applicant clearly defined the teaching issue to be investigated and formulated an appropriate and well-defined research question?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| The applicant has not defined the teaching issue or stated a research question. | The applicant has defined the teaching issue but has not stated a research question. | The applicant has defined the teaching issue but the stated research question is not appropriate. | The applicant has defined the teaching issue and a research question but there are concerns with the research question. | The applicant has clearly defined the teaching issue and the research question is appropriate. |

Comments:

2. **Background Research**: Has the applicant thoroughly researched the scholarly literature on the teaching aspect addressed in the project and situated his/her project in the context of the extant literature?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| The applicant has not performed background research on the teaching aspect and situated the project in the context of the extant literature. | The applicant appears to have researched the discipline but not the teaching aspect. | The applicant appears to have done a cursory research on the teaching aspect of the topic. | The applicant has done a decent job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic and relates the project to the extant literature. | The applicant has done a thorough job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic and situates the project in the context of the extant literature. |

Comments:
3. Learning Outcomes: Are expected learning outcomes clearly delineated and appropriate?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| There are no learning outcomes. | The learning outcomes are not clearly stated. | The learning outcomes are clearly stated but do not seem appropriate for the research question of the project. | The learning outcomes are clearly stated but there are some concerns with them. | The learning outcomes are clearly stated and appropriate for the research question. |

Comments:

4. Methods: Is the methodology of the project clearly stated and appropriate?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| The applicant does not state any methodology. | The methodology is not appropriate or has not been developed. | The methodology is barely appropriate or is missing important details. | The methodology is mostly appropriate and has been basically developed. | The methodology is appropriate and has been carefully and fully developed. |

Comments:
5. **Assessment:** Is there a clearly defined, appropriate, and significant assessment plan for the project?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| There is no assessment plan. | There is an assessment plan but details are vague. | There is a clear assessment plan but it is not appropriate for the research question. | There is a clear assessment plan but there are concerns with the assessment plan. | There is a clear, significant, and appropriate assessment plan. |

Comments:

6. **Substance:** In your opinion, is the project significant enough to warrant funding through a SoTL grant? Please provide a short explanation.

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

| The project is not substantial enough to warrant a SoTL grant. | The project is somewhat substantial. | The project is substantial enough to warrant a SoTL grant. |

Explanation:
7. Calendar: Does it seem plausible that the project will be completed in the project time frame?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The project is not likely to be completed in the proposed time frame.</th>
<th>The project might be completed in the proposed time frame.</th>
<th>The project will almost certainly be completed in the proposed time frame.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate below if it is unlikely or impossible for the applicant to teach the classes relevant for the proposal before the end of the academic year 2012-13.

Comments:

8. Interest: Are the results of this project likely to be of interest or relevance to the teaching of other LMU faculty members?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The topic and results of this project seem to be of minimal interest to anyone at LMU but the applicant.</th>
<th>The topic and results of this project should be of some interest to other faculty members or disciplines at LMU.</th>
<th>The topic and results of this project should be of high interest and relevance to other faculty members and disciplines at LMU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
9. Dissemination: Do you believe the results of this project to be of interest or relevance to the scholarly teaching and learning community beyond LMU?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The results of this project are not likely to garner much interest beyond LMU.</th>
<th>The results of this project should be of interest or relevance beyond LMU.</th>
<th>The results of this project are almost certainly of strong interest and relevance beyond LMU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

10. Rating: Overall, how would you rate the quality of the proposal?

Please tick the appropriate box (select one only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal does not merit funding.</th>
<th>The proposal is weak.</th>
<th>The proposal has some merit.</th>
<th>The proposal is good.</th>
<th>The proposal is outstanding and funding should be provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: