

Criteria for Evaluation

Research!America welcomes novel ideas to develop and test public engagement training content for those in STEMM fields. It is our goal to support current practitioners engaged in public engagement training and to bring new practitioners into the field. Furthermore, the content created through these microgrants will be publicly available, which will help fill the gap in science communication and public engagement training in current graduate STEMM curriculum.

The content can be delivered in a variety of ways, including classrooms, workshops, online instruction, and campus-based special interest groups. Below is a guiding rubric we will be using to evaluate the applications:

Highly competitive proposals will clearly address the following:

1. **Motivation:** The applicant's interest in creating the training is easy to understand, and prior experience aligns well with the proposed curriculum development.
2. **Learning Objectives:** The proposal identifies specific learning objectives and skills that are relevant to the needs of the target audience and that will improve the ability of scientists to engage with the public.
3. **Target Audience and Delivery Method:** The target audience and delivery method are appropriate and align with the stated learning objectives.
4. **Validation Plan:** A clear plan for beta testing the training content is provided.
5. **Timeline and Feasibility:** The proposed timeline is well-defined with realistic milestones. It is clear the curriculum development can be feasibly completed within the January to July timeframe.

Public Engagement Training Content Application Form

	Meets All Expectations (3)	Meets Many Expectations (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Missing Key Elements (0)	Score
Motivation	Clear, relevant experience and strong motivation are well-articulated.	Experience and motivation are mostly clear, but lacking some detail.	Rationale is somewhat explained but needs more detail.	Motivation and experience are difficult to understand.	
Learning Objectives	The learning objective(s) are specific and align with the stated rationale.	The learning objective(s) are somewhat broad and align with the stated rationale.	The learning objective(s) are somewhat broad and do not clearly align to the stated rationale.	The learning objective(s) are not clearly stated and do not align with the stated rationale.	
Target Audience & Delivery Method	The target audience and delivery methods selected align with the stated learning objectives.	The target audience and delivery methods selected somewhat align with the stated learning objectives	The target audience and delivery methods selected do not align with the stated learning objectives.	The target audience and delivery methods selected are not clear and do not align with the stated learning objectives.	
Validation Plan	The beta testing plan is clearly stated with a plan for piloting sections of the curriculum to gather feedback from target audiences.	The beta testing plan is somewhat stated with a plan for piloting the curriculum to gather feedback from target audiences.	The beta testing plan is in place but is not adequate to gather feedback from target audiences.	No beta testing plan to gather feedback is outlined.	
Timeline and Feasibility	The proposed timeline is well-defined with realistic milestones. It is clear the curriculum development can be feasibly completed within the January to July timeframe.	The timeline is generally realistic with key milestones identified, but some parts lack clarity or detail. The project appears feasible within the timeframe, though some deadlines could be challenging.	The timeline is partially defined but lacks several key milestones or is overly ambitious.	No timeline or milestones are provided,	
Total Score				(Max: 15)	