

PEER REVIEW FORM FOR VITAL MINIGRANT PROPOSALS – 2026 - 2027
(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.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

____ Fund as requested

____ Fund with conditions/modifications

____ Do not fund

Please explain the rating.