

# CITL Course (re)Development Grant Rubric

Prior to evaluation, CITL staff will check each application for eligibility, including departmental approval. Any proposal that is found ineligible will not be reviewed by the committee.

---

*Total points possible: 35*

---

## Priority Consideration (5 pts)

Identify which of the following conditions are met. (1pt per item)

- Colonnade program,
- High DFW rate (over 15%),
- Enrollments of 25 or more students,
- Part of an online program (for online courses)
- Offered on an annual basis.

## Project Overview (15 pts)

**Instructions provided to redesign proposal applicants:** Please provide us with a general overview of this course? What role does it play in your curriculum? What do you intend to change about your course in this redesign? What new high-impact and/or evidence-based strategies or approaches will you be implementing? (High-impact teaching practices include, but are not limited to experiential learning, collaborative learning, undergraduate research, ePortfolios, etc.)

**Instructions provided to new course design proposal applicants:** Please provide us with a general overview of this course. What role will this new course play in your curriculum? Will you be utilizing any high impact teaching practices (experiential learning, collaborative learning, undergraduate research, ePortfolios, etc.) in this course?

***On a scale of 0-3, please evaluate each of the following categories where 0 means there is no evidence and 3 means there is substantial evidence. (15 possible points)***

1. The course plays an important role in the overall curriculum.
2. The course description is clear and substantive.
3. High-impact and/or evidence-based teaching practices are intentionally integrated into the proposed course design.
4. Teaching practices are appropriate for the content at hand and are fully-explained and aligned with the proposed course materials.
5. The proposed course incorporates authentic learning opportunities and supports innovative teaching and pedagogy.

## Learning Goals & Activities

**Instructions provided to proposal applicants:** Please provide the learning outcomes for this course.

Poor/Fair (0 pts) – Learning outcomes are not measurable and the course activities described throughout the proposal do not align with the stated outcomes.

Good (3 pts) – Learning outcomes are predominantly measurable and align with the course activities described throughout the proposal.

Excellent (5 pts) – Learning outcomes are clear and measurable and in alignment with the course activities described throughout the proposal.

## Engagement of the CITL (5pts)

**Instructions provided to proposal applicants:** As part of this project, you will work with members of the CITL team to design a mutually agreed upon contract outlining the details of your course (re)design. How do you envision the CITL being able to assist you in this process?

***On a scale of 0-3, please evaluate each of the following categories where 0 means there is no evidence and 3 means there is substantial evidence. (15 possible points)***

Poor/Fair (0 pts) – Expectations of CITL participation are not provided; the intended CITL participation is inappropriate.

Good (3 pts) – CITL partnership is reasonably articulated, but there is ambiguity on how much work is expected from the CITL team member in comparison to the faculty member.

Excellent (5 pts) – CITL partnership is clearly articulated and the expectation of CITL contribution is appropriate in comparison to the design project.

## Timeline (5pts)

**Instructions provided to proposal applicants:** This project is intended to be executed in two parts: (re)design and implementation. Please discuss your intended timeline. When will you be working on each phase of the project? If this is a team project, how will you divide the responsibilities?

Poor/Fair (0 pts) - Timeline provides no details or specific dates or timeframes; timeline includes unreasonable expectations; for team projects, individual responsibilities are not identified.

Good (3 pts) – Dates and/or specific timeframes are included; timeline is reasonable but the description may leave some questions about whether or not activities can be accomplished in the time allotted; for team projects, workload is appropriate for multiple participants.

Excellent (5 pts) – Dates provided correspond with specific activities; activities can reasonably be accomplished within the timeline; for team projects; workload is appropriate for multiple participants.