RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS Categories 1, 3, 4, 5
*(Council Member Review)*
REVIEW CRITERIA (rev. 10/12/2026)

| | Pre-screen | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Factor 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RATING | FPDC Category | PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES | PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD | STUDENT OUTCOMES | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | RESEARCH & ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY/ CREATIVE PROCESS | BUDGET |
| 5 (Exemplary) | • Proposal is in the correct category<br><br>Check if true ____ | • All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives.<br>. | • Literature review is very clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art.<br>• Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated.<br>• Proposal substantiates the project contributions or significance is very important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. | • Student success objectives and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated in the Project Objectives and Outcomes.<br><br>**Must be in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.** | Project will significantly enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large. | • Methodology/process is well stated, very appropriate and very comprehensive.<br>• It is very likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the research & assessment methodology.<br>• The Project (i.e. the research idea or concept) itself is very rational/logical throughout.<br>• Named personnel have the expertise and exemplary abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• All costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 4 | X | • Majority of the objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Literature review is clear and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art.<br>• Project contributions or significance are well stated.<br>• Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance is important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. | • Student success objectives and outcomes are clear and demonstrated in the Project Objectives and Outcomes.<br><br>**Must be in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.** | Project will enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/society at large. | • Methodology/process is understandable, appropriate and comprehensive.<br>• It is likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the research & assessment methodology.<br>• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is rational/logical.<br>• Named personnel have some expertise and required basic abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 (Good) | | • Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Literature review is somewhat clear, current and comprehensive, indicative of the current state of the art.<br>• Project contributions or significance are somewhat well stated.<br>• Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance is somewhat important, valuable to the discipline and/or addresses a gap in research. | • Student success objectives and outcomes are somewhat clear and demonstrated in the Project Objectives and Outcomes.<br>**Must be in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.** | Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/ society at large. | • Methodology/process is understandable, appropriate and adequate.<br>• It is somewhat likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon the proposed research & assessment methodology.<br>• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationality/logic in limited areas.<br>• Named personnel have the required basic abilities (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Some costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 2 | | • Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe.<br>• Majority of outcomes do not relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Literature review is vague, contains some minor omissions; not indicative of the current state of the art.<br>• Project contributions or significance are vaguely stated.<br>• Proposal substantiates project contributions or significance may be somewhat important, somewhat valuable to the discipline and/or might address a gap in research. | • Student success objectives and outcomes are not clear or demonstrated in the Project Objectives and Outcomes.<br>**Must be in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.** | Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/ state/society at large. | • Methodology/process is incomplete and not understandable.<br>• It is barely likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon proposed research & assessment methodology.<br>• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) lacks rationale/logic throughout.<br>• Named personnel have some relevant abilities, but lack important aspects (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. | • Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project. |
| 1 (Poor) | • Proposal is NOT in the correct category<br>Check if true_____ | • No project objectives are stated.<br>• No project outcomes are stated.<br>• Objectives are very vague.<br>• Outcomes are very vague.<br>• Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe. | • Literature review is very vague and omits key information; not indicative of the current state of the art.<br>• Project contributions or significance are very vague or are omitted.<br>• Proposal does not substantiate project contributions or significance, value to the discipline and/or it addresses a gap in research. | • Student success objectives and outcomes are not evident in the Project Objectives and Outcomes.<br>**Must be in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.** | Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely. | • Methodology/process is very vague or omitted.<br>• It is not likely that the project's outcomes will be achieved based upon omission of, or vaguely stated, research & assessment methodology.<br>• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical.<br>• Named personnel lack any relevant ability (i.e. background knowledge & skills) to complete the project. | • Budget is unreasonable in all areas.<br>• Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project. |

L*EXICON:*
*Objectives* are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

*Outcomes* are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.

RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) Category 2 **PUBLIC SERVICE** GRANTS
*(Council Member Review)*
REVIEW CRITERIA (rev. 10/12/2026)

| | Pre-screen | Factor 1 | Factor 2 for Public Service (Category 2 only) | Factor 3* | Factor 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RATING | FPDC Category | PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES | PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE and/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD | STUDENT OUTCOMES | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT |
| 5 (Exemplary) | • Proposal is in the correct category<br>Check if true ____ | • All the project objectives are very specific (well-defined), clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• All project outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Community need is very clear, well demonstrated<br>• Project contributions or significance are very clearly stated<br>• A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are very appropriate to address the need. | Student success objectives and outcomes are very clear, well demonstrated in the Objectives and Outcomes sections. | Project will significantly enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/ society at large. |
| 4 | | • Majority of objectives are very specific, clearly measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• Majority of the outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Community need is clear<br>• Project contributions or significance are well stated<br>• A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need | Student success objectives and outcomes are clear in the Objectives and Outcomes sections. | Project will enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/ society at large. |
| 3 (Good) | | • Some objectives are specific, measurable or demonstrable, and attainable within the stated timeframe.<br>• Some outcomes relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Community need is somewhat clear<br>• Project contributions or significance are somewhat well stated<br>• A lit review confirms the services reflect current best practices in the field; are appropriate to address the need | Student success objectives and outcomes are somewhat clear in the Objectives and Outcomes sections. | Project may enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/state/ society at large. |
| 2 | | • Some objectives are stated but are not specific or measurable or demonstrable, or attainable within the timeframe.<br>• Majority of outcomes do not relate to the project goals and objectives. | • Community need is not clear<br>• Project contributions or significance are not clear<br>• A lit review is vague and the services may not reflect current best practices in the field | Student success objectives and outcomes are not clear in the Objectives and Outcomes sections. | Project is not likely to enhance author's professional development, ability to teach and/or serve the community/ state/society at large. |
| 1 (Poor) | • Proposal is NOT in the correct category<br>Check if true_____ | • No project objectives are stated.<br>• No project outcomes are stated.<br>• Objectives are very vague.<br>• Outcomes are very vague.<br>• Objectives are clearly not attainable in the project timeframe. | • Community need is not evident<br>• Project contributions or significance are not stated; not impactful<br>• A lit review is missing or insufficient to draw any conclusions if the services are appropriate or will impact on the need | Student success and outcomes are not evident in the Objectives and Outcomes sections. | Contribution of project to author's professional development is very vague or omitted entirely. |

*** Student Outcomes must be address in Objectives and Outcomes or score will be a 1 on rubric.**

| | Factor 5 for Public Service (Category 2 only) | Factor 6 |
|---|---|---|
| RATING | PROJECT METHODOLOGY and ASSESSMENT (Category 2 only) | BUDGET |
| 5 (Exemplary) | • Methodology, procedures, activities assessment are well stated, appropriate and very comprehensive<br>• It is very likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'.<br>• The project itself is very rational, logical throughout | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• All costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• All costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 4 | • Methodology, procedures, activities assessment are understandable, appropriate and comprehensive<br>• It is likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'<br>• The project itself is rational/ logical | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Majority of costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Majority of costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 3 (Good) | • Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are understandable, appropriate and adequate<br>• It is somewhat likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'<br>• The project itself lacks rationality/logic in limited areas | • Budget is comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Some costs are justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Some costs are relevant and essential to this project. |
| 2 | • Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are incomplete and not understandable or appropriate<br>• It is barely likely the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'<br>• The project itself lacks rational/ logic throughout | • Budget is not comprehensive and reasonable.<br>• Costs are partly justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Some costs are partly relevant and essential to this project. |
| 1 (Poor) | • Methodology, procedures, activities, assessment are very vague or omitted.<br>• It is not likely that the project outcomes will result in 'significant service' to the community/region or 'student/faculty growth in understanding community needs'.<br>• Project itself (i.e. the research idea or concept) is not at all rational/logical. | • Budget is unreasonable in all areas.<br>• Costs are not justified in the budget narrative or notes.<br>• Many costs are not relevant and essential to this project. |

L*EXICON:*

*Objectives* are statements of what the Project Director (PD) intends to accomplish and which are measurable.

*Outcomes* are the results or accomplishments of the project and are therefore directly reflective of the objectives.

PI is the Principal Investigator or Project Director. In evaluating expertise and skill, one includes co-Principal Investigators and co-Project Directors.

# Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC)
# Grants Council Member Review Form (rev 10.12.2026)

**PASSHE PROPOSAL #:** _____ **DATE**:_____
**INVESTIGATOR(S) NAME(S):** _____
**NAME OF UNIVERSITY:**_____
**REVIEWER'S NAME:**_____

**Please refer to the rubric & guide for interpretation of the review criteria. A Proposal MUST score a minimum of 3 on <u>every</u> criterion.**

**Is the proposal in the Correct CATEGORY?** A subcommittee majority makes this determination **Yes_____ No _____**

| Review Criteria | Please **Mark** (**X**) ***<u>only one number</u>*** or score for each criterion | | | | | Score | Weight | Weighted Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Poor | | | | Exemplary | | | |
| PROJECT OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES ( Factor 1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X3 | |
| | Poor | | | | Exemplary | | | |
| PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE &/or CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD (Factor 2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X1 | |
| | Poor | | | | Exemplary | | | |
| STUDENT SUCCESS (Factor 3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X3 | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Factor 4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X5 | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| RESEARCH METHODOLOGY/CREATIVE PROCESS (Factor 5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X3 | |
| | Poor | | | | Exemplary | | | |
| BUDGET (Factor 6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | X1 | |
| **Probationary Faculty _____ Yes _____No** | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL SCORE (possible Maximum Weighted Score is 80)** | | | | | | | | |

**IRB/IACUC Requirements** (Please Check): ☐ Approved ☐ Pending ☐ Missing ☐ Not Applicable
Comments:_____

_____

_____

## GUIDE TO THE FPDC REVIEW FORM & RUBRIC

**Components of the Review Form**

The FPDC Review Form is comprised of the following pieces of information: a) PASSHE-assigned Proposal Number; b) Investigator(s) Name(s); c) Investigator(s) Institution(s); d) Reviewer's Initials; e) Date of Review of Proposal; f) Six Review Criteria or Factors; g) Five-point Evaluation Scale with Operational Definitions of each Review Criteria; h) Institutional Review Board (IRB) Need, and i) Open-ended Review Comments.

**Pre-screen**: Is the Proposal in the correct category? The majority of members of the FPDC sub-committee must agree that the proposal is in the correct category. However, some distinctions between categories are subjective (e.g. joint faculty-student projects) and a close reading and a careful discussion of the proposal is necessary to make an informed judgment. If the majority of the Council Subcommittee believes the proposal is NOT in the correct category, it should be disqualified without finalizing a score. NO POINTS or weight are awarded for this criterion.

**Review Criteria:** All complete FPDC grant applications will be evaluated using the following six criteria:

- ☒ Project Objectives & Outcomes
- ☒ Project Significance &/or Contribution to the Field
- ☒ Student Outcomes
- ☒ Professional Development
- ☒ Research Methodology
- ☒ Budget

Operational Definitions of each Review Criterion or Factor are explained on the RUBRIC FOR FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (FPDC) GRANTS with a Five-point Evaluation Scale. Each of the six review criteria in the complete FPDC grant proposal is evaluated based on a five-point scale; with 1 indicating Poor and 5 indicating Exemplary.

**Interpreting the Rubric:**

A Proposal must receive a minimum score of 3 on every Criterion in order to be considered eligible for funding. If a Proposal scores less than 3 on any Criterion from more than one reviewer the proposal is not eligible for funding.

Before using the FPDC Rubric to score each applicant's proposal, the reviewer should become very familiar with its contents. In employing the FPDC Rubric to evaluate each proposal, it's strongly recommended to start from the *bottom of the instrument (*equivalent to a rating of one) *and proceed* upwards (until a maximum possible rating of five). Faculty applicant must demonstrate that the statements identified within each level of each Review Criterion are all applicable or not applicable before proceeding upwards to the next scale or level. For example, if an applicant has met all the indicators or statements identified at level 1 for "Project Objectives & Outcomes", then the Reviewer should proceed to the level 2 to determine if he/she has met all indicators, and so on. If an applicant has met all indicators in levels 1, 2, 3, 4, but not 5, then he/she should receive a maximum score of 4 for that particular Review Criterion. Prospective and successful investigators, in achieving a maximum score of 5, must fulfill ALL of the performance indicators or operational definitions contained within each of the Review Criteria or Factors.

Multiply the score of 1 to 5 by the weight to arrive at the weighted score for each factor. Total Score is the sum of the weighted score column. Add 5 points if the Project Director is probationary faculty (see proposal title page).The total possible or maximum score that an applicant can receive, after weighting, is 80.