

**PEER REVIEW FORM FOR VITAL MINIGRANT PROPOSALS – 2024 - 2025**  
(Based on *Call for Proposals – Criteria for Judging the Merits of Each Proposal*)

Name(s) / Department(s) of Applicant(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Project: \_\_\_\_\_

**Rating Scale:**

3 = Criterion **fully** addressed/met

2 = Criterion **partially** addressed/met (*The information provided is unclear or needs greater specificity.*)

1 = Criterion **barely** addressed/met (*Little information is provided.*)

0 = Criterion **not** addressed/met at all

**Proposals that do not comply with the page limit guidelines will be returned without review.**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1. Proposal aligns strongly with educational goals of the department and/or College.		
2. Proposal offers a clear rationale, i.e., explains the learning issue addressed and describes how the project is expected to change/enhance students' learning.		
3. Proposal outlines well-defined goals for students' learning.		
4. Proposal describes instructional activities that support desired learning goals.		
5. Proposal presents assessments of students' learning that support the desired learning goals.		
6. Proposal specifies procedures for project implementation, outlines time schedule for grant work during the summer.		
7. Proposal establishes the potential for sustainability, i.e., continued offering and student enrollment. <b>New</b> course development: describes significance/relevance of new course and evidence of sustainability.		
8. Proposal demonstrates how scope of project represents effort above and beyond typical instruction-related activities expected of faculty.		
9. Proposal supports that funding requested is appropriate to scope of project, provides rationale for requested budget items, states approximate number of hours per week spent on project.		

**RECOMMENDATION:**

\_\_\_\_Fund as requested      \_\_\_\_Fund with the conditions/modifications below:      \_\_\_\_Do not fund