Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning (CTEL)
Teaching Excellence: Conference/Workshop
Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Required Application Materials Checklist

___ All required application materials arranged in order within one pdf attachment.

___ Completed Travel Authorization form

___ One letter of support from applicant's department chair/director/immediate supervisor

If any of the above are missing or incomplete, the grant proposal will not be reviewed.

	Very Strong (3)	Strong (2)	Adequate (1)	Weak (0)
Abstract:	A brief overview clearly summarizes the project and explicitly identifies its key features.	A brief overview clearly summarizes the project and its key features.	A brief overview generally summarizes the project.	The overview is vague, confusing, or missing completely.
Project Description:	A detailed description of the conference/workshop and travel experience (who, what, when, where, why) is provided, including specifics for both conference/workshop and travel, lodging, etc. It is clear that the project has been carefully researched and planned.	A detailed description of the conference/ workshop and travel experience (who, what, when, where, why) is provided, including specifics for both the conference/ workshop and travel, lodging, etc.	A description of the conference/workshop and travel experience (who, what, when, why, where) is provided, but explained in very general terms.	Only a general overview of the conference/workshop and travel experience is provided, making it difficult to envision due to lack of detail or vague information.
Project Significance:	The project relates to Bradley's strategic plan and/or core curriculum and features a refereed presentation or exhibition; a convincing argument is made that the conference/workshop and travel experience will support the applicant's teaching practice and research agenda as well benefit others; the claim is elaborated with specifics or examples.	The project features a refereed presentation or exhibition; a convincing argument is made that the conference/workshop travel experience will support the applicant's teaching practice and research agenda.	The project features a presentation or exhibition, but it is not refereed; an argument is made that the conference/workshop and travel experience will support the applicant's teaching practice and/or research agenda, but the claim is general, confusing, or vague.	Refereed presentation or exhibition is not included in the project, and/or it is doubtful that the conference/ workshop and travel experience will support the applicant's teaching practice or research agenda.

	Very Strong (3)	Strong (2)	Adequate (1)	Weak (0)
Travel Itinerary:	A detailed travel itinerary clearly outlines the conference/workshop and travel experience, including presentation/ exhibition titles, days, and times. The applicant's professional development is emphasized.	A detailed travel itinerary clearly outlines the conference/workshop and travel experience, including presentation/ exhibition titles, days, and times.	A general travel itinerary outlines the conference/workshop and travel experience.	The travel itinerary is vague, confusing, or only partially completed.
Budget:	An itemized list of all travel expenses is provided and clearly explained. Funding from other sources is identified, including at least 25% from the applicant's department or college. **(WAIVED for 2019-2020)** The budget seems likely to deliver maximum returns based on the scope and goals of the project.	An itemized list of all travel expenses is provided and clearly explained. Funding from other sources is identified, including at least 25% from the applicant's department or college. The budget is reasonable based on the scope and goals of the project.	An itemized list of travel expenses is provided, but some items are not clearly explained and/or funding from other sources is not always clear. The budget is reasonable based on the scope and goals of the project.	The travel expenses are vague, confusing, or missing; some items are not clearly explained, funding from other sources is not clear, or the budget is unrealistic or unreasonable based on the scope and goals of the project.
Faculty Rank	Non-tenured, tenure track	Tenured faculty	Full professor	
Previous TE: C/W Grants	The final report or a one paragraph description of the applicant's most recently received TE: C/W grant is provided.			