



CELТ Instructional Grants for the Enhancement of Instruction

The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching offers faculty and staff approximately 10 to 15 awards per year of up to \$5,000 to enhance instruction. Proposals with strong support of one or more elements of the University Strategic Plan receive priority consideration. Funds awarded spring of 2009 are for the 2009-2010 academic year.

Who may apply?

All faculty, both part-time and tenure-track, and staff may apply. Graduate students employed as Teaching Associates (TAs) are not eligible, but they are encouraged to let their deans, chairs, and sponsoring faculty know about materials, supplies, and services they believe would help to enhance classroom instruction. The ideas of all faculty, staff, and students are welcomed and needed to help make wise choices about the use of CELТ funds.

What types of proposals are funded?

Since the inception of CELТ in fall 1994, the most frequently funded proposals have been for

- **Reassigned time (one course release)** for faculty from different departments to team-teach, to develop interdisciplinary courses related to the GE program, to develop curricula that support community service learning, to investigate the use of new technologies to enhance learning, to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning
- **Non-consumable instructional materials and equipment that are beyond the ability of a college, department, or program to provide, and are not provided elsewhere on campus (Note: You must check with Academic Technologies (ATEC) on campus in advance of submitting your proposal to have any technology issues, concerns or questions addressed.)**
- **Tasks that are typical of regular faculty workload and expectations, summer stipends, and funding for conference attendance or travel are not funded with Instructional Grants.**

How does one apply?

The application form must be completed as indicated and the proposal should total **no more than five additional pages, including a budget page**. Endorsement letters from the department chair and college dean are required, and it is essential that they indicate how the proposal supports the mission of the college, department or unit. The proposal needs to include the following in this order:

1. Cover page application—please include principal requestor and title on this page
2. Relevance to the Mission and Strategic Plan of the University
3. Rationale and Objectives: the problem—history, significance, how proposal will help, specific objectives, future impact of the project
4. Plan: research plan or design, and intended steps to implement (i.e. materials and methods), timeline
5. Evaluation of project success: instrument/methods of evaluation, final report expectations
6. Budget with breakdown of specific costs
7. Letters of endorsement from department chair and dean

Be sure to proofread your proposal for basic writing mechanics, comprehensibility and style. See the Rubric for additional information on what is expected in acceptable and/or target grant proposals.

Submit the ORIGINAL and ONE ELECTRONIC copy of the proposal to your college dean by Monday, March 2, 2009 at 5 PM. Your dean needs to submit your proposal and your additional copy to the Office of the Provost, Campus zip 110 by **Monday, March 9, 2009 at 5 PM.**

Who evaluates the proposals, and what criteria are used?

A subcommittee of the CELТ Advisory Committee, comprising faculty and staff, use the criteria found in the **Rubric for CELТ Instructional Grants** to make a recommendation to the CELТ Director and Provost, who make the final decision.

When are announcements made? On or before Friday, May 1, 2009.

What type of reporting is required? A final written report within 30 days of completion or by June 2, 2010 is required. Outcomes of the project, budget allocations, and assessment of instructional impact should be included. You will not be permitted to apply for a future CELТ grant if your final written report is not submitted.

How will I know CELТ has received my proposal? If you do not receive an email receipt from CELТ (usually by within 10 working days after delivery to CELТ), please contact the Provost's Office at 530-898-6101.



The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching
Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Chico

Application for **CELT Instructional Grants** for the **Enhancement of Instruction**

I. Principal requestor, contact person, and project title

Name _____ Date _____

Title Professor Associate Professor Assistant Professor Lecturer Staff

Department _____ Zip _____

Phone (Office) _____ (Home or cell) _____

Signature of Applicant _____

Names of co-requestors _____

(Provide above information for co-requestor(s) on a separate page.)

Title _____

(Provide brief title to indicate the nature of the project.)

II. Relevance to Mission and Strategic Plan of the University

III. Rationale and Objectives: (Provide a brief summary of the problem addressed, project significance, how it will enhance students' learning, what other specific objectives of the project are, and future impact of the project)

IV. Research plan or design, and intended steps to implement (i.e. materials and methods), timeline

V. Evaluation of project success: (Provide information regarding the instruments/methods that will be used for assessing the project, the timeline for assessment, and how your final report fits into the plan.)

VI. Budget

Total amount of funding requested \$ _____

Check below what the funds will be used for and provide specific breakdown of costs in the proposal:

- Reassigned Time @ Lecturer A/2, Step 7 (.2= \$4,744 + GSI) \$ 4,744 + GSI
- Printing \$ _____
- Student Assistance \$ _____
- Guest Lecturer \$ _____
- Other \$ _____

VII. Endorsements (Attach two letters, one from the chair, or unit head, and one from the dean. It is essential that they each specifically indicate how the proposal supports the mission of the college, department and/or unit.)

Rubric for CELT Instructional Grant Proposals

Criteria		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
II. Relevance to Mission of University, Strategic Plan		Fails to include reference to either the mission or the strategic plan.	Some demonstration of alignment with University Mission and Strategic Plan.	Strong demonstration of alignment with University Mission and one or more elements of the Strategic Plan.
III. Rationale and Objectives		Missing rationale or objectives are listed as general goals. Insufficient research cited.	Current research cited; objectives based on student outcomes.	Rationale is significant and convincing; current research cited; objectives specifically state student outcomes.
IV. Research Plan or Design and Steps to Implement (i.e. materials and methods)		Plan is not identified, or implementation is vague.	Plan is identified and implementation is outlined.	Detailed plan identified, implementation clearly presented and directly aligned with evaluation.
		Vague, incomplete, or unreasonable sequence; no timeline.	Appropriate sequence and timeline.	Appropriate sequence and timeline specifically delineated.
V. Evaluation of Project Success	Evaluation Instruments/ Methods	No instruments or methods specified.	Instruments and/or methods are identified.	Example(s) of instrument(s) or narrative description. Form of analysis indicated.
	Final Report to CELT	Not included in plan, and/or no indication of accountability for final report.	Built into evaluation plan. Statement of who is accountable for submitting final report.	Built into evaluation plan and timeline. Statement of who is accountable for submitting final report.
VI. Budget		No budget or incomplete budget.	Provides specific breakdown of costs.	Provides specific breakdown of costs. Costs are clearly aligned to rationale and objectives. Effective use of \$.
VII. College or Departmental Commitment		No letters of endorsements or only one letter.	Endorsements from Chair and Dean included.	Strong endorsements from Chair and Dean included.
Mechanics within Document (Spelling, Grammar, Formatting)		Grammar and/or spelling mistakes; typos; inconsistency in fonts, spacing, or organization of information.	Few grammar or spelling mistakes; follows proposal guidelines; comprehensible language.	No grammar or spelling mistakes; follows proposal guidelines; easy to read and comprehend; well written.

Note. In constructing your narrative be aware that reviewers from many disciplines are reading your submission. While technical accuracy and specificity are important, it is also important that your proposal be understandable by those not in your specific discipline.