DEAN 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 College/School, then a Dean Evaluation has to be provided for each College/School.

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 Dean: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Signature: ________________________________
Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

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: