**Call for Proposals: The Open Education Stimulation Fund 2023**

**Rubric for evaluation criteria**

Reviewer instructions: Please use the below rubric as an evaluation tool to review project proposals for the Open Education Stimulation Fund 2022. Please indicate for each of the five review aspects how many points you award to the proposal. Please also write a short comment (1 or 2 paragraphs) to explain your choice. Please include the title and code of the project proposal in your review and send it to m.dejong-1@tudelft.nl

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **0 point** | **1 point** | **2 points** | **3 points** |
| **Relevance** | The project does not clearly address any existing problem, and it is unclear what the added value of the project is to the teaching and learning community of TU Delft. | The project addresses an existing problem; however, the problem is not delineated clearly enough in the proposal. Contextual factors are missing or are incomplete, and the problem definition is unclear. The problem is not relevant enough to the educational community of TU Delft. | The project addresses a clearly defined problem, and while contextual factors are taken into consideration in the problem definition, it is not entirely clear how the problem and the context align. The proposed solution fits the problem. | The project addresses a problem that is relevant to the educational community. The relevance is clearly explained and is supported by concrete examples. The context in which the problem exists is defined, and the solution proposed is fitting to this context. |
| **Originality** | The project does not propose any new or innovative approaches to using open resources or open practices to enhance teachers’ teaching practice at TU Delft.If the project goal is to upscale existing practices, it does not propose any novelty in the teaching practice of the stakeholders involved. | The project introduces a way of working with open resources or open practices, but in a way that is already being done in various courses across TU Delft.If the project goal is to upscale existing practices, it considers the possibility of also including changes in the teaching practice of the stakeholders involved. | The project introduces a way of working with open resources and/or open practices that is not yet done.If the project goal is to upscale existing practices, it considers the fact that new stakeholders will need to change their teaching practice if they want to be involved. | The project introduces a completely new way of working with open resources and open practices that changes the way teachers and student interact, in a manner that is not yet being done at TU Delft.If the project goal is to upscale existing practices, it proposes a clear plan for how all potential stakeholders are facilitated with changing their teaching practice, as part of their involvement in the project. |
| **Feasibility** | The proposal does not consider the feasibility of the project within the available timeframe and funding or provides an inaccurate assessment. Stakeholders are not considered, and risks are ignored. | The proposal considers the feasibility of the project; however, the feasibility of the project remains ambiguous. Risks are either not considered at all, or are not assessed accurately, and the solutions to these risks are unclear. | The proposal provides a clear feasibility assessment. Financial and time constraints are considered. A risk assessment is provided; however, risks and their impact are not assessed accurately. | The proposal clearly demonstrates that the project can be successfully carried out within the financial constraints and timeline of the project. Stakeholders are considered, and their roles in the project are described.  A risk analysis considers the potential risks and offers solutions for these potential risks.  |
| **Impact** | The proposal does not address the impact of the project or has no impact on the educational community of TU Delft. | The impact of the project is considered, however, expectations from the project are unrealistic or not well supported by facts. Not all the potentially important stakeholders are considered.  | The impact is clearly described and is supported by facts, however, not all ways to utilize the project are considered. Focus is more on the short-term perspective, long term impact is either not considered sufficiently, or it is unclear why sustainability is not relevant for the project outcomes. The community/stakeholders are sufficiently defined, however, not all stakeholders are considered. | Impact is considered both from a short and a long-term perspective. The potential impact is well supported by facts. The community/stakeholders who benefit from the project are clearly defined, together with the precise impact of the project on these community/stakeholders. Sustainability is also considered, or justification is given why sustainability is not a relevant factor for the project. |
| **Collaboration** | The project does not mention any partnerships with students or other faculties. The project does not mention potential partners that would want to be involved, depending on the results of the project | The project does not mention any of partnerships with students or other faculties. The project does describe potential partners that would want to use the results of the project. | The project is a collaboration between teachers and students, or between teachers from different faculties. The project describes how the results will be applied broadly within the campus education of TU Delft. | The project clearly describes the partners during the project and potential partners that could be included after the project term ends. The project is a collaboration of teachers from different faculties and the results are clearly applicable within the teaching of all the involved faculties. The project also describes how students are actively involved. |