

FCTL & Education Abroad Grant Proposal

Scoring Rubric (Total: 100 points)

1. Alignment with Grant Purpose & Education Abroad Outcomes (20 points)

Score Range	Criteria
18–20 (Excellent)	Proposal clearly and compellingly examines the educational impact of education abroad on student outcomes (e.g., global awareness, adaptability, intercultural communication, civic responsibility). The international learning environment is central—not peripheral—to the research design.
14–17 (Strong)	Proposal addresses education abroad outcomes with clear relevance, though connections between program context and outcomes could be more fully articulated.
10–13 (Adequate)	Education abroad context is present but underdeveloped or not fully integrated into the research focus.
0–9 (Weak)	Limited or unclear connection between the project and education abroad learning environments or student outcomes.

2. SoTL Framework & Research Question (20 points)

Score Range	Criteria
18–20 (Excellent)	Clearly articulated SoTL framework grounded in established SoTL literature. Research question is specific, measurable, and focused on student learning. Demonstrates reflective, inquiry-based teaching improvement.
14–17 (Strong)	SoTL principles are evident and appropriate; research question is clear but may need refinement in scope or measurability.
10–13 (Adequate)	SoTL elements are mentioned but not fully integrated; research question is broad or loosely tied to learning outcomes.
0–9 (Weak)	Minimal engagement with SoTL principles; research question is unclear, descriptive only, or not learning-centered.

3. Project Design, Methods, & Evaluation Plan (25 points)

Score Range	Criteria
23–25 (Excellent)	Methods are rigorous, well-aligned with the research question, and feasible. Clear evaluation plan using appropriate qualitative and/or quantitative measures (e.g., pre/post assessments, comparative analysis). Thoughtful reflection and self-assessment protocols included.
18–22 (Strong)	Methods and evaluation plan are appropriate but may lack detail or depth in analysis or reflection strategies.
13–17 (Adequate)	Basic methods described, but evaluation plan is limited, unclear, or weakly aligned with outcomes.
0–12 (Weak)	Methods are poorly developed, unrealistic, or not aligned with research question or outcomes.

4. Research-Based Strategies & Use of Education Abroad as a High-Impact Practice (15 points)

Score Range	Criteria
14–15 (Excellent)	Strong integration of research-based strategies supported by relevant literature. Effectively leverages education abroad as a high-impact practice. Appropriate frameworks (e.g., IDI, AAC&U VALUE Rubrics, SDGs) are meaningfully applied.
11–13 (Strong)	Research-based strategies are relevant but connections to education abroad frameworks could be stronger.
8–10 (Adequate)	Strategies are described but minimally grounded in research or high-impact practice frameworks.
0–7 (Weak)	Little evidence of research-based strategy or meaningful use of education abroad as a high-impact practice.

5. Budget & Justification (10 points)

Score Range	Criteria
9–10 (Excellent)	Budget is detailed, reasonable, clearly justified, and fully aligned with project activities. All expenses comply with grant restrictions and stay within the \$3,000 limit.
7–8 (Strong)	Budget is appropriate but justification could be clearer or more detailed.
5–6 (Adequate)	Budget is generally acceptable but lacks clarity, detail, or strong alignment with project goals.

Score Range	Criteria
0–4 (Weak)	Budget is incomplete, unclear, unrealistic, or includes unallowable expenses.

6. Plans for Sharing & Scholarly Dissemination (10 points)

Score Range	Criteria
9–10 (Excellent)	Clear, feasible, and well-articulated plan for sharing results at FCTL events and relevant education abroad conferences (e.g., Forum on Education Abroad, NAFSA). Demonstrates commitment to SoTL dissemination.
7–8 (Strong)	Sharing plans are appropriate but lack specificity or breadth.
5–6 (Adequate)	Minimal sharing plan; limited to required venues without broader scholarly engagement.
0–4 (Weak)	Little or no plan for sharing results.

Overall Recommendation Categories

- **90–100:** Highly Competitive – Recommend for Funding
- **75–89:** Competitive – Recommend if Funds Allow
- **60–74:** Marginal – Revisions Recommended
- **Below 60:** Not Recommended for Funding