

Clayton State University Academic Affairs
Innovative Teaching Practice Grant Proposal Guide

I. Abstract

*Is the abstract written in a clear way that describes a well-structured, logical project?
Does it plainly illustrate why it should be funded?
Does it explicitly relate how the project will contribute to the teaching practice discipline?*

II. Description

Purpose of Project

*Are the Innovative Teaching Practice goals clearly stated and why it should be investigated?
Are the goals stated as a SMART; specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time limited?*

Theoretical Framework

*Does this section synthesize recent literature in innovative teaching practice for the field or subject area?
Does it demonstrate knowledge of issues involved and provide conceptual framework for project?*

Impact

*Will the project add to teaching practices?
Will it improve/enhance student learning and can it be measured?
Does the opportunity relate to one of the [University's strategic planning goals](#)?*

Dissemination of Results

*Is the plan clear and doable?
Has how and where the results will be disseminated to internal and external interested parties been identified?*

III. Timeframe

Timeline of Activities:

*Provides a clear and logical timeline of proposed project activities from start to finish?
Is the format of timeline an annotated list of dates and activities?*

IV. Requested Budget (and Other Funding, applicable)

*Is the budget itemized and does it include only allowable costs and is it <\$2,500?
Does the budget directly support the project activities and is fully justified?*

Other Funding

*Have you applied for or have you received funding for this project from any other source(s)? If yes, please give details (when, source of funding, amount of funding, etc.).
Is current or past funding information provided, if applicable?*

Innovative Teaching Practice Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____

Department: _____

Date: _____

Evaluation Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Abstract	Clearly describes a well-structured project, provides compelling justification for funding, and explains contribution to innovative teaching practice.	Project and rationale are clear.	Project is somewhat unclear or weakly justified.	Abstract is incomplete, unclear, or lacks justification.	____/4
Description / Purpose	Description and purpose are clearly defined, significant, and strongly justified.	Description and purpose are clear and reasonably justified.	Description and purpose lacks sufficient clarity or significance.	Purpose is unclear or unsupported.	____/4
SMART Objectives	Objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time-limited.	Most SMART elements are evident.	Some SMART components are present.	SMART framework is largely absent.	____/4
Theoretical Framework	Demonstrates strong synthesis of current literature and a clear conceptual framework.	Literature and framework adequately support the project.	Limited literature review or conceptual grounding.	Minimal theoretical framework provided.	____/4
Methodology	Research design clearly addresses teaching questions and explains data collection and analysis.	Methods are appropriate and mostly clear.	Methods need additional detail or alignment.	Methods are unclear or inappropriate.	____/4
Impact on Teaching Practice	Strong potential to improve and advance teaching practices.	Positive impact on teaching is evident.	Impact is limited or insufficiently explained.	Impact is unclear.	____/4
Impact on Student Learning	Strong evidence that student learning will improve and outcomes can be measured.	Benefits to student learning are clear.	Limited evidence of measurable impact.	Student learning impact is unclear.	____/4
Alignment with University Strategic Goals	Strong, explicit connection to one or more university strategic planning goals.	Alignment is evident and adequately explained.	Limited discussion of strategic alignment.	No meaningful connection to strategic goals.	____/4
Dissemination Plan	Clear and feasible dissemination plan identifying internal and external audiences.	Dissemination plan is adequate.	Plan lacks detail.	Plan is missing or unrealistic.	____/4
Timeline	Detailed, logical, annotated timeline with milestones from beginning to completion.	Timeline is realistic and complete.	Timeline lacks sufficient detail.	Timeline is incomplete or missing.	____/4
Budget	Budget is clearly itemized, contains only allowable expenses, is fully justified, and complies with funding limits.	Budget is itemized, contains only allowable expenses, is sufficiently justified, and complies with funding limits.	Budget requires clarification, itemization, and/or stronger justification.	Budget exceeds guidelines, includes unallowable costs, or lacks justification.	____/4
Project Funding Disclosure	Current or previous funding is fully documented when applicable.	Funding history is adequately addressed.	Funding information is incomplete.	Funding information is absent.	____/4

Scoring Summary

Total Points Earned: _____ / 48

Total Score	Recommendation
44–48	Highly Recommend Funding
38–43	Recommend Funding
30–37	Recommend Funding with Reservations
0–29	Do Not Recommend Funding

Reviewer Comments

Proposal Strengths

Areas for Improvement

Final Recommendation

- ☐ Highly Recommend Funding
- ☐ Recommend Funding
- ☐ Recommend Funding with Reservations
- ☐ Do Not Recommend Funding