Affordable Learning Georgia Research Grants Proposal Evaluation Rubric

|  | **5: Outstanding** | **4: Excellent** | **3: Fair** | **2: Needs Work** | **1: Missing / Lacking Relevance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization, Planning, and Feasibility** | The project plan shows an extremely high level of preparedness to fulfill the goals of the project, with a detailed and realistic plan and clearly defined roles. | The project plan shows a high level of preparedness to fulfill the goals of the project, with a mostly detailed and realistic plan and some defined roles. | The project plan shows an average level of preparedness to fulfill the goals of the project, with a basic plan and basic assigned roles. | The project plan shows some preparedness to fulfill the goals of the project, but plan details are somewhat vague and leave the reviewer with questions. | The project plan is not set up to fulfill the goals of the project, and plan details are either scarce or disorganized. |
| **Research Topic Impact\*** | This research project has the potential to make a highly significant impact on our knowledge of OER and/or other affordable materials practices. | This research project has the potential to make a significant impact on our knowledge of OER and/or other affordable materials practices. | This research project has the potential to make a minimal but still significant impact on our knowledge of OER and/or other affordable materials practices. | This research project does not have much potential to make an impact on our knowledge of OER and/or other affordable materials practices, but it does at least give some local context missing in the literature. | This research project does not have the potential to make any impact on our knowledge of OER and/or other affordable materials practices. |
| **COUP Framework Alignment** | The research project clearly addresses and is aligned with multiple aspects of the Open Education Group’s COUP Framework (Cost, Outcomes, Usage, and Perceptions). | The research project clearly addresses and is aligned with at least one aspect of the Open Education Group’s COUP Framework (Cost, Outcomes, Usage, and Perceptions). | The research project addresses at least one aspects of the Open Education Group’s COUP Framework (Cost, Outcomes, Usage, and Perceptions), but alignment could be more clearly articulated. | The research project does not address any aspects of the Open Education Group’s COUP Framework (Cost, Outcomes, Usage, and Perceptions), but could be adjusted or reworked to meet this goal. | The research project does not relate in any way to the Open Education Group’s COUP Framework (Cost, Outcomes, Usage, and Perceptions). |
| **Qualitative and/or Quantitative Methods** | Qualitative and/or quantitative methods are explained and planned in detail with explicit methodologies and/or tools, and measures will gather extremely meaningful insights into the research topic. | Qualitative and/or quantitative methods are explained and planned broadly with methodologies and/or tools, and measures will gather some meaningful insights into the research topic. | Qualitative and/or quantitative methods are somewhat explained, and measures will gather average insights into the research topic. | There are not enough meaningful qualitative and/or quantitative methods explained in the proposal; more clarifications or details are needed. | Critical qualitative and/or quantitative methods are lacking or absent entirely in the proposal, and measures will not lead to any insights into the research topic. |