

First Stage: Peer Review

1. Managed through the online IITG system
2. Reviewers use Likert scales to score each section
3. Comments shared (anonymously) with applicants

Second Stage: Innovative Instruction Research Council (IIRC)

1. Review peer evaluations in rank order
2. Discuss alignment with SUNY RFP goals
3. Escalate to Provost with funding recommendations

Final Review: SUNY Provost

1. May accept recommendations
2. May consult with IIRC & Staff
3. May re-align or change recommendations based on current funding and priorities.

**Become a
Reviewer**

[Sign Up!](#)

Evaluation

* = Required Field

Project Rankings

Please score the following criteria mapped directly from the IITG 2014 Request for Proposal (RFP). The higher the number, the higher the ranking. The Likert scale will automatically tabulate a cumulative score total that will be placed in rank order for funding consideration. You may return to a proposal and adjust a score any time before the review window closes.

Project Innovation*

Please rank the proposed project in terms of innovation. Is it a novel approach? Is it good use of technology in service of pedagogy? (Consider that "innovation" may include application of a recognized technology-related solution to a new discipline area such as literature or international studies.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Project Narrative*

How clear is the project description and vision? Has the proposed innovation, practice or method articulated the value/impact it will have? Does that value include future potential for collaboration or an opportunity to scale across SUNY?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Budget Narrative*

Is the budget narrative clear? Is the expenditure rationale well supported? Is the spreadsheet information and narrative well-aligned?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Project Timeline *

How **feasible** is the project timeline? Is the amount of work described in the project and budget narrative achievable in the time frame described?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Endorsement & Support*

Is there adequate evidence of support at the local campus level? Is it reasonable to assume that this project has been well-vetted at the local campus level regarding any potential resource concerns?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Assessment Plan*

Does the assessment plan clearly describe **how** the project will be assessed? Does it describe **what** is being assessed? (e.g., student learning? technology effectiveness?). Do you have confidence that the methods described will provide evidence of outcomes? Is the assessment described achievable within the timeline described?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Communication Plan*

Does the narrative explain how the outcomes will be shared? Is it clear that the PI is thinking proactively about how to share and leverage the outcomes? Is there evidence of commitment to documentation/process in order to replicate and build upon the outcomes?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Adoption Feasibility*

Overall, has the proposed innovation, practice or method been described in a manner where outcomes have the potential to be adopted and replicated across a discipline or community of practice across multiple SUNY campuses or University-wide?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

There are **four separate comment fields** below:

- Project & Budget Narrative Feedback;
- Assessment Plan Feedback;
- (If Applicable) How the project meets the Provost's criteria for funding renewal consideration;
- Any additional comments or feedback that falls outside of the above comment focus areas.

This **feedback is critical both** to the PI and to the Office of the Provost staff who will be guided in part by the peer review.

Your comments and scores will be shared (anonymously) with the PI's. It is important that you share frankly how this proposal did (or did not) respond effectively to the RFP, and specifically where improvement might be realized for future consideration.

Quality of the Narratives*

What is your overall impression of the **narrative**? Please share a couple of brief sentences regarding why you would (or would not) recommend this project for consideration. Are there specifics in how the proposal was presented that might make it stronger? What about the **budget narrative** or **spreadsheet** - did it seem feasible and realistic?

[2500 characters left of 2500]

Comments on the Project Assessment*

What is your overall impression of the **assessment plan**? Do you have any concerns for how this project will be measured to meet the stated objectives?

[2500 characters left of 2500]

Project Funding Renewal (if applicable)

Funds to continue a **previously funded project** must meet additional criteria:

- Progress against original objectives must be well documented;
- Structure and process for moving forward must be clearly articulated;
- Budget narrative and accompanying excel file must justify the need;
- **A vision for sustaining the project without IITG funds in the future must be articulated as part of the narrative.**

Please describe why this project should (or should not) be considered for additional funding:

[2500 characters left of 2500]

Any Additional Comments (if applicable)

Please take this opportunity to provide any other comments, suggestions or feedback you may wish to share regarding the project proposal.

[2500 characters left of 2500]

IITG Review Process

Reviewers: SUNY Distinguished Professors, FACT² Council and Campus Reps, SUNY Provost Staff – **and You!**

- Reviewers assigned between 5-10 proposals each
- Will not be assigned “home campus” proposals
- Required to self-identify any potential conflicts of interest
- 4-8 hours of time required (a couple of evenings) depending upon experience and willingness to provide feedback
- Peer review – February 24- March 16

IITG Review Process

Reviewers: SUNY Distinguished Professors, FACT² Council and Campus Reps, SUNY Provost Staff – **and You!**

- IIRC and Provost Staff Review – March 17 - Apr. 17
- Go to <http://innovate.suny.edu/iitg/> and click “Become a Reviewer” (before Feb. 14th) to participate!
- Benefits? Service to SUNY, a “Thank You” for your file, and greater knowledge of peer innovation across SUNY!

Become a Reviewer

Sign Up!