

Teaching Grants

Each application will be assessed based on the following criteria:

The quality and feasibility of the proposal. (1-5)

- 5 – Very high quality proposal, well planned, with clear timelines and definite understanding of how it is to be carried out including definitive methods for evaluation of effectiveness.
- 4 – High quality proposal, well planned, with timelines and moderate understanding of how it is to be carried out, includes robust methods for evaluation of effectiveness.
- 3 – Good quality proposal, with more detail required on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.
- 2 – Average quality proposal, with poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.
- 1 – Poor quality proposal, with very poor detail on timelines, planning, feasibility and evaluation.

*The calibre of the applicant. (1-5) **NOTE THIS SHOULD ASSESSED WITH REFERENCE TO EDUCATIONAL NOT PHYSIOLOGICAL RESEARCH TRACK RECORD.***

- 5 – Very high quality applicant with excellent track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and excellent references.
- 4 – High quality applicant with very good track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and very good references.
- 3 – Good quality applicant with average track record, evidenced by educational/teaching and learning publications, of teaching innovation and/or education research and average references.
- 2 – Average quality applicant with little evidence of teaching innovation, and/or education research, few/no educational or teaching publications, and average/poor references.
- 1 – Poor quality applicant with no evidence of teaching innovation and/or education research and poor references.

The impact of the research/ resource on physiology education, including the breadth of the dissemination of the work and the potential for widespread application. (1-5)

- 5 – Very high impact work with very clear potential for widespread application to improve core physiology education within host Institution, nationally and internationally. Definitive plans for how the work is to be disseminated.
- 4 – High impact work with potential for widespread application to improve core physiology education within host Institution, nationally and internationally. Clear plans for how the work is to be disseminated.
- 3 – Work has reasonable impact, but potential for application to improve physiology education is limited to host Institution and nationally. Some plans for how the work is to be disseminated.
- 2 – Work has some impact, but potential application is limited to local institution or to students to whom physiology is not a core discipline. Poor plans for dissemination of work.
- 1 – Likely to have low impact and little potential for application outside local institution/ department.

Resources required (1-3)

- 3 – Intended use of funding requested clear, appropriate, fully justified, no ineligible costs, could not be delivered with less funding and achieve same outcomes, project feasible for costs requested
- 2 – Could be greater clarity on intended use of funding, may not all be appropriate or fully justified, project may not be fully completed with costs requested and/or could be delivered with less funding yet achieve same outcomes. No ineligible costs
- 1 – Limited description of use and justification of funds requested and/or funding requested is excessive for proposal and/or contains ineligible costs