<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PALM Application Rubric</th>
<th>Excellent (1)</th>
<th>Average (3)</th>
<th>Poor (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mentor Selection**    | • Mentor is skilled in active learning strategies and evidence-based teaching  
  • Mentor’s practices align specifically with the principles outlined in Vision and Change  
  • Mentor has been recognized (either formally or informally) within the education community for these skills  
  • Mentor has agreed to and encouraged this experience | • Mentor has demonstrated some active learning strategies and evidence-based teaching  
  • Mentor is familiar with Vision and Change  
  • Mentor has agreed to and encouraged this experience | • Mentor has not clearly demonstrated experience with active learning strategies or evidence-based teaching aligning with the principles of Vision and Change  
  • Mentor has agreed to the experience but is not particularly encouraging or enthusiastic about mentoring |
| **Learning Outcomes for PALM Fellow** | • Applicant has clearly defined the active learning methods or strategies to be learned from this mentorship  
  • Applicant has established specific goals to be achieved as a result of this mentorship | • Applicant has defined some methods and goals to be learned and achieved through this mentorship, but they could be clearer or more specific | • Applicant has a vague or nebulous description of active learning methods and goals from this mentorship, but nothing is clearly or specifically defined |
| **Plan for Mentoring Interactions** | • Proposal contains considerable detail about frequency, duration, type of interaction between Fellow and mentor (: X times a month by phone or teleconference? Y number of days in person? observing video of mentor teaching before visiting mentor?) | • Proposal contains some information about frequency, duration, and type of interaction between Fellow and mentor. | • Proposal contains little or no about frequency, duration, type of interaction between Fellow and mentor, or plan seems unreasonable. |
| **Plan for Implementation** | • Classroom setting is well-defined and a reasonable timeline within six months  
  • Proposal includes detailed description of | • Classroom setting and timeline are defined  
  • Proposal includes detailed description of | • Classroom setting and/or timeline for implementation are not well-defined, are not reasonable, or fall outside the six |
| **Budget (for project or other professional development only, NOT for dissemination)** | • Proposed costs are reasonable and well defined, and properly reflect the immersion experience | • Proposed costs and/or room and board costs are reasonable but not well-defined | • Proposed costs and/or room and board costs are not reasonable given the intended mentoring location and are not well-defined |
| **Plan for Dissemination (budget for this not needed in application)** | • Proposal includes appropriate and well-defined mechanism for disseminating materials beyond own classroom (e.g. departmental, media streams, publication) | • Proposal includes some mechanism for disseminating materials beyond own classroom (e.g. departmental, media streams, publication) | • Proposal does not include appropriate mechanism for disseminating materials beyond own classroom (e.g. departmental, media streams, publication) |
| **Support and Sustainability** | • Proposal suggests that PALM is likely to have a sustained and lasting effect on the Fellow’s pedagogical practices  
• If applicant is a postdoc, letter of recommendation shows support of lab research advisor  
• Proposal includes a set of reasonable goals to sustain use of new skills and materials | • If applicant is a postdoc, letter of recommendation shows support of lab research advisor  
• Proposal alludes to sustained use of new skills and materials | • Proposal does not include a letter of recommendation  
• Proposal does not refer to sustained use of new skills and materials |

**Total score**