

# Staff Academy Evaluation Process

The Innovation Leaders from INGENIUM partner universities will review their own applications. They will evaluate and select the top five applicants from their university for each Staff Academy event.

The top five applications from each institution will be evaluated again in a second round by the INGENIUM Community Evaluators. The INGENIUM Community Evaluators are Innovation Leaders and WP5 Coordinators from different universities.

- **First Round:** The INGENIUM Innovation Leaders will evaluate the proposals and choose the top 5 from their own university on the application platform.
- **Second Round:** The INGENIUM Community Evaluators will assess the proposals.
  - The evaluators will choose one applicant from each Institution for each Staff Academy Event.
- The successful and rejected applicants will be informed via email shortly after the second round is completed.

## Evaluation Criteria:

The evaluation criteria are thorough and provide a structured way to assess the quality of proposals. The criteria are broken down into specific aspects and rated on a scale, making the evaluation process more objective. These criteria are published with the call for paper as a PDF attachment so the applicants know how their proposals will be assessed. Key evaluation points include:

**1. Student-Centered Learning:** Effectiveness, innovativeness, and the extent to which the proposal aligns with student-centered approaches.

**2. Research, Working Life, and Education Connection:** The connection between research, education, and practical application, highlighting the usefulness of the proposal for professional development.

**3. Blended Learning:** Effective use of modern learning environments, including open-source tools and session formats.

**4. Session Format:** The level of interactivity, planning, and structure in the session, ensuring a dynamic learning experience.

**5. Reviewer's Comments and Feedback:** Space for reviewer comments allows for personalised feedback and suggestions to improve the proposal.



	<b>4 Excellent</b>	<b>3 Good</b>	<b>2 Acceptable</b>	<b>1 Poor</b>
<b>Student-Centered Learning</b>				
<i>Effectiveness</i>	Provides analysis and results of innovation effectiveness	Provides preliminary results of innovation effectiveness	Provides a hypothesis of the potential benefits	Does not provide information on the results and benefits of innovation
<i>Innovative</i>	Describes clearly and concretely the innovative and strategic character.	Describe reasonable the innovative strategic character.	The proposal seems innovative, but it is not clearly justified.	The innovative nature is not clearly described.
<i>Students' consideration</i>	The innovation is focused on the students and provide a detailed description of the teacher's methodology	The innovation is focused on the student but not provide detail regarding the methodology	The innovation is focused in the learning process but not specifically in the student	The innovation is not focused on the student-centered approach.
<b>Research, Working Life, and Education Connection</b>				
<i>Background or effective use of current research</i>	Includes a very detailed analysis of the current research and previous needs that support the innovation.	Reasonable analysis of the current research and previous needs that support the innovation, guaranteeing its feasibility.	Low description of current research and prior needs analysis.	There is no prior needs analysis to support the innovation. Poor use of current research
<i>Connection between Education and Research or Working life</i>	Clear description of the innovation in relation with the connection to working life or research	Reasonable description of connection to working life or research	Low description of connection to working life or research	No connection to working life or research
<i>Professional Development is clearly articulated</i>	Clear benefit to professional development	Clear benefit to professional development	Low benefit to professional development	No clear benefit to professional development
<b>Blended Learning</b>				
<i>Learning environments</i>	Use of innovative and modern learning environments which are clearly described in the context of the innovation.	The modern learning environments used is described but it is not relevant for the innovation.	The description of the learning environments is poor and is irrelevant for the innovation.	No use of modern learning environments
<i>Technological tools</i>	Provide a description of the relevance of the technological tools in the learning process. The technological tool is key in the innovation.	Provide a description of the relevance of the technological tool but the tool is not very relevant for the innovation.	The technological tool is irrelevant in the innovation.	Does not describe the technological tool.
<b>Session format</b>				
<i>Active (i.e., workshop, seminar)</i>	The session format is active, practical and innovative.	The session format is active, but it is not practical or innovative.	The session format is traditional	The session format is not well described, or it is based on traditional lectures
<i>Well-planned timeline (Breakdown of time)</i>	The activities to be carried out are clearly planned in the time available	The activities to be carried out are well planned in the timeline available.	The activities are described but not the timeline.	The activities and the timeline are not described
<i>Well-structured activities (that suit the topic)</i>	The activities are well aligned to the topic and compliment the learning outcomes.	The activities are well-structured and fit the topic.	The activities are described but are misaligned from the topic.	The activities are unstructured and do not suit the topic.