Educational Developers Grants for Exchanges (EDGEs) – Peer Review Rubric January 2018

Criteria	Outstanding (2 points)	Moderate (1 point)	Insufficient (0 points)
Alignment to EDGEs Outcomes Weighting: 2	The proposed exchange will support participants in achieving MORE THAN ONE of the following EDGEs outcomes:	The proposed exchange will support participants in achieving ONE of the following EDGEs outcomes:	Application did not make clear how one or more of the EDGEs outcomes would be met, and/or the proposed exchange is unlikely to support
	 i) Expanding their professional networks; ii) Improving collaboration and knowledge-sharing among educational developers and teaching centres; and iii) Celebrating, and reflecting upon the diversity of ED roles and functions 	 i) Expanding their professional networks; ii) Improving collaboration and knowledge-sharing among educational developers and teaching centres; and iii) Celebrating, and reflecting upon the diversity of ED roles and functions 	achievement of the EDGEs outcomes.
Priority Consideration Weighting: 1	Proposed exchange involves or supports individuals who meet MORE THAN ONE of the following criteria:	Proposed exchange involves or supports individuals who meet ONE of the following criteria:	Proposed exchange DOES NOT involve or support individuals who meet any of the priority criteria.
	 i) Have been working in the area of educational development for 5 years or less; 	i) Have been working in the area of educational development for 5 years or less;	
	 ii) Are in some way isolated, owing perhaps to geography, the specific nature of their work or other factors; 	 ii) Are in some way isolated, owing perhaps to geography, the specific nature of their work or other factors; 	

Educational Developers Grants for Exchanges (EDGEs) – Peer Review Rubric January 2018

	 iii) Who are considering or are in the midst of a career transition; 	 iii) Who are considering or are in the midst of a career transition; 	
Mutual Benefit for Exchange participants <i>Weighting: 2</i>	Applicants clearly and concretely articulate the ways in which all exchange participants (individuals and/or organizations) are likely to benefit from the exchange process.	Some benefits are clearly and concretely described, however there may be participants (individuals and/or organizations) for whom the benefit of the exchange remains unclear.	Benefits of the exchange are not clearly stated, or it is unlikely that the exchange, as described, will be of significant benefit to most of the involved parties.
Feasibility & Commitment Weighting: 2	Proposed exchange has a clear, reasonable and feasible timeline and associated budget. All appropriate approvals have been received at the time of the application. All exchange participants (individuals and/or organizations) have clearly expressed their support for and commitment to the exchange in writing at the time of proposal submission.	elements. Most appropriate approvals have been received. All key exchange participants (individuals and/or	Timeline and/or budget is not clearly stated, or is not achievable or feasible. Few, if any, of the appropriate approvals have been received at the time of proposal submission. There is limited support and commitment for the exchange among participating individuals and organizations.
Exchange Output Weighting: 1	Applicants have clearly identified one or more concrete outputs of their proposed exchange that are aligned to the intended EDGEs outcomes and that are	One or more outputs of the exchange are stated. The output is likely to be valuable to some, but not all, of the exchange participants.	Outputs are not articulated or those that are stated remain unclear or unfeasible.

Educational Developers Grants for Exchanges (EDGEs) – Peer Review Rubric January 2018

meaningful for ALL exchange participants, including the applicants, their host institution(s), home institution(s),	
and/or other audiences.	