

D2L Innovation Award – Rating Form

Rate the project categories using the following scale:

1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Poor	Mediocre	Good	Very good	Excellent
Evidence present	Detailed evidence	Good analysis	Deep reflection	Exemplary reflection

Project title:	
Name of contact team member:	
Institution (for contact applicant):	
3a- Institutional Context: Clear description of the need for the innovation; the constraints or particular advantages of the context; use of resources; funding; time involved.	Rating: /10
Comments: <i>(*This table will expand as text is typed)</i>	
3b- Goals of the Project (Innovation): A clear description of the intended outcomes; challenges met; obstacles overcome.	Rating: /10
Comments:	
3c- Description of the Team: A description of the nature of the team and what makes the collaboration valuable.	Rating: /10
Comments:	
3d- Project (Innovation) Description: A clear description of what was done and what students were asked to do; the experiences of students; in the case of a course, the number, level and students involved.	Rating: /20
Comments:	
3e- Impact on Student Learning: Evidence that students learned what was intended; evidence of how collaboration contributed to student learning; and evidence of the lasting effects on students. Provided evidence might include pre- and post-tests, student ratings, surveys, focus groups, narrative accounts, visual representations, or letters from colleagues and students.	Rating: /20
Comments:	
3f- Future Developments: New Directions; adoption by other groups; ways the innovation might be diffused to other programs and faculties.	Rating: /10
Comments:	
3g- Bibliography: Since the award is designed to encourage the scholarship of teaching and learning, the paper should show how the project (design, implementation, practices, and assessment) was informed by the scholarship of others.	Rating: /10
Comments:	
Supporting documentation: Letters from students and colleagues outside collaborative team, feedback, ratings, excerpts of reports, newsletter contributions, or publications. Max. 5 pages.	Rating: /10
General Comments:	Total rating:

	/100
Round 1 question: Would you recommend this submission for the 2nd round? (Why? Describe strengths or improvements needed. What stands out? What's missing? Your comments will be used in the context of reviewer deliberations and will not be shared with applicants.	Yes No
Comments:	
Round 2 question: Would you recommend this application for the Award? (one of five recipients)	Definitely Yes No
Comments:	
Please provide specific comments (50 words max) to be shared with the applicant(s).	