

Clayton State University Academic Affairs
Professional Development Grant Proposal Guide

I. Abstract

Is the abstract written in a way that plainly illustrates why it should be funded; puts opportunity in context; explicitly relates how the opportunity contributes to the development of the faculty and to the discipline?

II. Professional Development Description

Professional Development Goals

Are they stated as SMART; specific, measurable, attainable, reasonable, and time limited?

Professional Development Activities

Is it clear that this is a relevant and applicable opportunity? Are the activities clearly stated?

Professional Impact

How will the activities advance the professional growth of the faculty?

Institutional Impact

Is the Professional Development impact clear?

Will it contribute to teaching and/or classes?

Does the opportunity relate to one of the [University's strategic planning goals](#)?

III. Proposal Timeframe

Timeline of Activities

Provides a clear timeframe for when the opportunity activity(ies) will occur?

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 proposal activities and is fully justified?

Other Project Funding

Have you applied for or have you received funding for this opportunity 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?

Clayton State University Academic Affairs

Professional Development Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____

Department: _____

Date: _____

Evaluation Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Needs Improvement (1)	Score
Abstract	Clearly explains the opportunity, compellingly justifies funding, places the activity in context, and demonstrates contributions to faculty development and the discipline.	Opportunity and rationale are clear with minor omissions.	Limited justification or unclear connection to professional development.	Abstract is unclear, incomplete, or lacks a compelling rationale.	____/4
Professional Development Goals	Goals are clearly stated and fully satisfy SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Reasonable, Time-Bound).	Goals are clear and contain most SMART elements.	Goals are somewhat vague or missing key SMART components.	Goals are poorly defined or not measurable.	____/4
Professional Development Activities	Activities are highly relevant, clearly described, and align directly with stated goals and outcomes.	Activities are appropriate and generally well described.	Activities lack sufficient detail or alignment.	Activities are unclear, incomplete, or unsupported.	____/4
Professional Impact	Demonstrates substantial potential to advance faculty knowledge, expertise, scholarship, leadership, or professional practice.	Professional growth benefits are evident.	Some professional benefit is identified but lacks detail.	Professional impact is unclear or minimal.	____/4
Institutional Impact	Clearly demonstrates significant benefits to teaching, courses, students, academic programs, or institutional effectiveness.	Institutional benefits are evident and reasonably explained.	Institutional impact is mentioned but underdeveloped.	Institutional benefit is unclear or unsupported.	____/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
Overall Relevance and Applicability	Opportunity is exceptionally relevant to the applicant's role and demonstrates clear applicability to professional growth and academic success.	Opportunity is relevant and applicable.	Relevance is somewhat limited or unclear.	Relevance is not adequately demonstrated.	____/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	Clearly identifies current, pending, or past funding sources and fully documents funding history.	Funding information is adequately provided.	Funding information is incomplete.	Funding disclosure requirements are not addressed.	____/4

Scoring Summary

Total Points Earned: _____ / 36

Total Score	Recommendation
32–36	Highly Recommend Funding
28–31	Recommend Funding
21–27	Recommend Funding with Reservations
0–20	Do Not Recommend Funding

Reviewer Comments

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

Final Recommendation

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