



**2012 CELT Instructional Grants
Request for Proposals
for the Enhancement of Instruction**

The Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching offers faculty and staff awards of up to \$5,000 to enhance instruction. Projects that strongly enhance student learning and have a demonstrable impact receive priority consideration. Proposals should address relevance to the University Strategic Plan. Funds awarded spring of 2012 are for the 2012-2013 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 advise their deans, chairs, and sponsoring faculty about materials, supplies, and services they believe would enhance classroom instruction. The ideas of all faculty, staff, and students are welcomed and needed to help make wise choices about the use of CELT funds.

What types of proposals are funded?

The committee encourages all proposals that meet our criteria. Some of the most recently funded proposals have been for:

- **Reassigned time (one course release)** to develop curricula that support community service learning, to redesign courses or curricula in order to enhance student learning, for instance, via the incorporation of academic technologies.
- **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.)
- The committee is especially interested in proposals that demonstrate **potential for long-term, broad, and/or targeted impact**.
- The committee appreciates proposals that articulate **the expected improvement of student learning with reference to current pedagogical thought** (e.g. how project will support High Impact Practices; how project will maintain or increase quality student-instructor and student-student engagement).

NOTE: Tasks 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?

Submit the **ORIGINAL** copy of the proposal to your college dean by **Friday, March 2, 2012 at 5 PM**. Your original with letters of endorsement and an electronic copy must be submitted to the Office of the Provost, Campus zip 110 by **Wednesday, March 7, 2012 at 5 PM** (the electronic version may be sent directly to CELT@csuchico.edu).

The application form must be completed as indicated, and the proposal should total **no more than five additional pages, including the 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 Student Learning Objectives (SLO) 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. Rationale and Objectives:
 - a. history and significance of problem or need
 - b. brief general explanation of how project will address problem
 - c. specific objectives of project; rationale and evidence that the methodology/project plan is pedagogically sound and will be effective in improving student learning
 - d. adherence to federally mandated accessibility requirements (Universal Design for Learning)
 - e. overview of immediate and long-term impact of the project (may include impact on campus, profession, and/or community, but special emphasis should be on student learning)
 - f. description of how project is unique, innovative, or particularly suited to CSU Chico
 - g. relevance to the Mission and Strategic Plan of the University
3. Plan: Outline intended steps to implement and timeline of entire project, including evaluation and reporting.
4. Evaluation: Explain in detail how success of the project will be evaluated and reported to CELT. A clear assessment plan is a vital component of the proposal. A quality assessment plan would typically reference how each of the student learning outcomes described in 2 c and 2 e will be measured.
5. Briefly explain how this project falls outside of your normal scope of work or typical workload.
6. Provide budget with breakdown of specific costs.
7. Include 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.

Who evaluates the proposals, and what criteria are used?

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

When are announcements made? On or before Monday, May 14, 2012.

What type of reporting is required? A final written report within 30 days of completion or by Monday, June 3, 2013 is required. Outcomes of the project, budget allocations, and assessment of instructional impact should be included. Funded proposals and final reports from those proposals will be made publically accessible via the CELT website. You will not be permitted to apply for a future CELT grant if your final written report is not submitted.

How will I know CELT has received my proposal? If you do not receive an email receipt from CELT (usually by email) within 10 working days after delivery to CELT, please contact CELT@csuchico.edu.



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. Rationale and Objectives: (See instruction sheet)

III. Plan: intended steps to implement and timeline (See instruction sheet)

IV. Evaluation of project success and reporting (See instruction sheet)

V. Explanation of how project falls outside of normal scope of work (See instruction sheet)

VI. Budget

Total estimated cost of project: \$ _____

Specify funds requested/committed from other sources: \$ _____ from _____

Total amount of funding requested from CELT: \$ _____

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= \$4,969 + GSI) **\$4,969 + 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. Rationale and Objectives		Rationale and/or objectives are unclear. Does not address all elements from instruction sheet. Insufficient research cited.	Rationale and objectives are clear. Addresses all elements from instruction sheet. Objectives based on student outcomes.	Rationale is significant and convincing. Addresses all elements from instruction sheet. Current research cited. Objectives specifically linked to enhancement of student learning.
III. Plan: intended steps to implement and timeline		Plan is not clear, or implementation is vague.	Plan is identified and implementation is outlined.	Detailed and reasonable plan identified, Implementation clearly presented and directly aligned with evaluation.
		Vague, incomplete, or unreasonable sequence; no timeline.	Adequate sequence and timeline.	Well-delineated and appropriate sequence and timeline
IV. Evaluation of Project Success	Evaluation Instruments/ Methods	No instruments or methods specified.	Instruments and/or methods are identified.	Well thought-out plan of evaluation is articulated clearly, including instruments and/or methods.
	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.
V. Explanation of how project falls outside of normal scope of work		Explanation missing, or unclear.	Explanation is included.	Explanation is significant and convincing.
VI. Budget		No budget or incomplete budget.	Budget provides specific breakdown of costs.	Provides specific breakdown of costs. Costs are clearly aligned to rationale and objectives. Effective use of money.
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 visual presentation; poor organization of information; unclear.	Only few minor 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.