

## UCAT Grant Guidelines

# Course Development Grant

## Overview

The Course Development Grant is intended to support faculty member(s) developing (either by designing or significantly redesigning) one course as part of a program development / improvement.

The maximum amount for a Course Development Grant is \$750, paid as a stipend directly to the faculty member(s).

## Notes

- For Fall 2020, all applications must be completed through Qualtrics. No paper copies will be accepted.
- It is strongly recommended applications be reviewed by your UCAT college representative prior to submission. The list of representatives, with email addresses, is available at: <https://www.unomaha.edu/faculty-support/teaching-excellence/index.php#ucat>.
- A successful application will establish the rationale for how the course development will enhance teaching/learning, by providing
  - (1) a clear description of the proposed activities,
  - (2) an overview of the scope of the activities,
  - (3) action steps that will be taken,
  - (4) expected outcomes, and
  - (5) how the course fits into existing program / curriculum, quantifying the course's projected impact when possible.
- Applications must contain a budget justification, detailing how the applicant(s) will utilize the stipend.
- Applications should be designed to be readily accessible to a multidisciplinary committee.
- Poorly described, incomplete, and/or unclear applications are not acceptable. Applicants should elaborate the details of their proposal with precision and without jargon.
- The rubric used to review and score applications is below. Please review before submitting.
- Faculty may not receive more than one award in each grant category for the academic year. However, applicants are eligible to apply for the other UCAT grants categories: Curriculum Development, Instructional Materials and Speaker Grants. Applicants applying for multiple grants should prepare grants separately, fulfilling their individual criteria appropriately, even when their grants may be related to the same course or curriculum. Faculty may not receive both a Course and Curriculum Development Grant for work on the same course(s). If materials are needed to support the proposed course development, faculty should apply separately for an Instructional Materials Grant.
- Applicants will be informed of the funding decision following the UCAT committee meeting held after application deadline, typically within 30 days.
- All previous grant reports must be submitted prior to consideration of new grant applications.

## Post-Award Requirements

A brief final report describing the implementation of your course redesign project should be submitted to UCAT via Qualtrics at the end of the semester in which the redesigned course is offered. This should include a syllabus, enrollment information, your assessment of the redesign's impact, and when the course will be offered again.

### UCAT Course Development Grant Rubric

Section	Evaluative Statement		
	Excellent	Average	Poor
Project Description Weight 35%	Application clearly describes the proposed project with pedagogical justification, addressing the scope of the activities, specific action steps, and expected outcomes. The work proposed is above and beyond typical course updating.	Application describes the proposed project, scope, action steps, and/or expected outcomes, but only in part. The extent to which the project is above and beyond typical course maintenance is not fully detailed.	Application lists the proposed changes, but the scope of the project, activities, and/or expected outcomes are not described. The project is not above and beyond typical course maintenance.
Impact at UNO Weight 35%	The application effectively demonstrates the value and impact of the course development to their unit, college, and/or UNO. Clear instructional goals of the development are presented. Application quantifies the number of students projected to be positively impacted.	The application somewhat demonstrates the value and impact of the course (re)development to their unit, college, and/or UNO. Instructional goals are present but not fully articulated. It is unclear how many students will benefit from the project.	The application vaguely or does not demonstrate the value and impact of the course (re)development to their unit, college, and/or UNO. Instructional goals are not presented.
Writing Mechanics Weight 20%	The application is appropriate for a multi-disciplinary audience and is well written, with no typos or mechanical errors.	The application is fairly-well written, but contains some typos or mechanical errors. Some instances of excessive technical jargon.	Frequent mechanical errors and typos are present. Application is jargon-heavy and not understandable to a multi-disciplinary committee.
Budget Justification Weight 10%	Budget justification is provided and outlines a timetable for tasks and deliverables.	Budget justification is unorganized and contains vague details.	Budget exceeds stated limit with no justification.