ED 500

Grant Writing Made Easy

Course Format: Online

Grade Type: Pass/Fail (Grade B equivalent, ≥80% mandatory for Pass)

Instructor Name & Contact Information: David Beyers | david@gfspd.com | (989) 350-3040

Catalog Description: Graduate topics in education. Each has a subtitle; no subtitle may be repeated for credit. Counts for M.Ed. credit with approval of Program Director.

Additional Course Description:
In this course students will gain an understanding of what it takes to research, select, prepare for, and write a successful grant application. By the end of the course students will have applied for two grants that have the opportunity to enhance their classroom or school. Participants will engage directly with the instructor and classmates through weekly discussions. Participants will also receive constructive feedback that can be directly applied into current and future grant writing pursuits.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards seeks to identify and recognize teachers who effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, abilities and commitments. This course aligns with 1 & 5 of those standards.

Required Text(s) and Other Materials: None.

Course Objectives:

- Analyze the components to grant writing.
- Evaluate the specificity of a grantee in accordance with the funding source.
- Collect the essential data necessary to provide qualifying status of the grantee.
- Develop the researching skill-set and communication tools necessary to find a funding source.
- Discuss presentation style characteristics; both desired and detrimental.
- Complete grant applications that meet qualifying standards and monetary limits.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs):
This course addresses the following student learning outcomes to the degree shown in the table. Degree Addressed is rated according to the following scale:
1=Basic, 2=Developing, 3=Proficient, 4=Advanced

Student Learning Outcome	Degree Addressed

1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge related to teaching assignment and the application of content knowledge to classroom instruction and assessment.	3
2. Understand scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement.	2
3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning.	2
4. Locate, interpret, synthesize, and apply educational research in best practices in teaching.	2
5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.	1
6. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change.	2
7. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change.	1
8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.	3
9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.	1

Course Requirements:

Topic	Learning Activities (Read & Watch)	Discussion (Post & Reply)	Assignment(s) (Research & Apply)	Hours
Topic 1: Grant Basics	*Grant Writing for the Classroom* -Joanne Kinsey How to Apply for a Grant How to Find Grants for Your Nonprofit Organization (4 hours)	Grant Writing Goals The Basics of Grant Writing (3 hours)	Institutional Data Collection (3 hours)	10
Topic 2: Database Development	Corporate and Foundational Grants Government Grants *Corporate Grants* -Don Peek *How Much Do Corporations Give?*	Grant Writing Experience (3 hours)	Article Review Database Development (6 hours)	13

	Explore Grants.gov (4 hours)			
Topics 3: Grant Applications (Small and Large)	Successful Tips and Resources Do's and Don'ts of Grant Writing Sample Grants (6 hours)	Grant Application Focus Grant Selection (Small and Large) (6 hours)	Small Grant Application Large Grant Application (10 hours)	22
			Total	45

Grading:

Grading Breakdown:

Discussion (4 @ 5 pts/each)	**20 points**
Institutional Data Collection	**10 points**
Article Review	**10 points**
Database Development	**15 points**
Small Grant Application	**30 points**
Large Grant Application	**30 points**
Total	**115 points**

Grading Scale:

92-115 pts	Satisfactory
<92 pts	Unsatisfactory

Rubrics:

Discussions (5 points):

Criteria	**Emerging**	**Competent**	**Proficient**

Initial Post (3 pts)	Initial post fails to address all of the required prompts. 0-1 point	Initial post addresses all of the required prompts. Application of course content is sufficient. 2 points	Initial post clearly and fully addresses all of the required prompts. Demonstrates thoughtful application of course content. 3 points
Responses (2 pts)	Responses to classmates are missing or insufficient. 0 points	Responses to classmates are sufficient. 1 point	Responses to classmates seek to further the discussion in meaningful ways. 2 points

Institutional Data Collection (10 points):

Criteria	Emerging	Competent	Proficient
Data Collected (10 pts)	Some or all of the required information is missing. 0-5 points	All required information is provided, with minor mistakes or inconsistencies. 6-8 points	Participant accurately provides the required information, including: ● Total itemized budget ● Proof on non-profit ● Board members ● Contact numbers ● Address ● Superintendent/CEO 9-10 points

Article Review (10 pts):

Criteria	Emerging	Competent	Proficient
Summary (5 pts)	Missing, incomplete, or off-topic. 0-2 points	Generally summarizes the author's assertions, with minor inconsistencies. 3-4 points	Accurately and completely summarizes the author's assertions. 5 points

Application (5 pts)	Fails to apply or discuss the author's assertions in a meaningful context. 0-2 points	Generally applies the author's assertion to grant-writing or teaching. 3-4 points	Thoughtfully and clearly critiques the author's assertions in a personal context. 5 points

Database Development (15 points):

Criteria	Emerging	Competent	Proficient
Completeness (5 points)	Includes fewer than 10 grant sources, and/or Sources are from a single type of entity. 0-2 points	Includes 10 or more unique grant sources, but those sources only come from two of the three required types of entities. 3-4 points	Includes 10 or more unique grant sources from a variety of government, community, and corporate entities. 5 points
Description (10 points)	Several entries are missing the required information. 0-5 points	All entries contain the required information, with minor mistakes or inconsistencies. 6-8 points	All entries clearly display all required information, including: ● link to grant ● type of grant ● goal of provider ● deadlines ● grant amounts 9-10 points

Small and Large Grant Applications (30 points/each):

Criteria	Emerging	Competent	Proficient
Purpose of Grant (10 points)	Fails to adequately identify and describe the necessary components. 0-5 points	Includes a general description of the targeted population, quotes of product, valid benchmark reasoning, and implementation strategy. 6-8 points	Contains a clear description of the targeted population, quotes of product, valid benchmark reasoning, and implementation strategy, including how the participant's proposal will benefit the identified population. 9-10 points

Qualifications (10 points)	Fails to make a clear connection between the request and the mission of the granting source. 0-5 points	Generally addresses a shared mission and other qualifying components, but may be unclear or unpersuasive. 6-10 points	Clearly outlines how the granting source and the grantee share the same mission in helping the identified demographic, and how the grantee meets the requirements of the grant. 9-10 points
Additional Components (5 points)	Application is incomplete or inaccurate. 0-2 points	The application is complete, but may be lacking in certain areas. 3-4 points	All required components of the application have been completed with clear, concise responses. 5 points
Submission (5 points)	No evidence of submission is provided. 0 points	Evidence of submission is provided. 3 points	Evidence of submission is provided. Submission takes into account instructor feedback where appropriate. 5 points

Incomplete Grades: Incomplete Grades will be handled according to the University Catalog. If an incomplete grade is issued, the student, instructor, and Associate Dean will develop an agreement for the terms of the incomplete and sign it.

Student Conduct: Students are required to follow the policies set within the Student Code of Conduct at CSU-Pueblo. This Code can be found on the Student Affairs website at https://www.csupueblo.edu/student-affairs/student-conduct/index.html. Students with questions regarding any guidelines within the Code should contact the Director of Student Conduct and Case Management at 719-549-2092.

Accommodations:

Colorado State University-Pueblo abides by the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which stipulates that no student shall be denied the benefits of an education "solely by reason of a handicap." If you have a documented disability that may impact your work in this class and for which you may require accommodations, please see the Disability Resource & Support Center as soon as possible to arrange accommodations. In order to receive accommodations, you must be registered with and provide documentation of your disability to the Disability Resource & Support Center, which is located in the Library and Academic Resources Center, Suite 169.

Academic Dishonesty:

Academic dishonesty is any form of cheating which results in students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work which is not their own. In cases of academic dishonesty, the instructor will inform the chair of the department prior to implementation of punitive action. Academic dishonesty is grounds for disciplinary action by both the instructor and the Dean of Student Services and Enrollment Management. Any student judged to have engaged in academic dishonesty may receive a failing grade for the work in question, a failing grade for the course, or any other lesser penalty which the instructor finds appropriate. To dispute an accusation of academic dishonest, the student should first consult with the instructor. If the dispute remains unresolved, the student may then state his or her case to the department chair (or the dean if the department chair is the instructor of the course).

Academic dishonesty is a behavioral issue, not an issue of academic performance. As such, it is considered an act of misconduct and is also subject to the University disciplinary process as defined in the CSU-Pueblo Student Code of Conduct Policies and Procedures Manual. Whether or not punitive action has been implemented by the faculty, a report of the infraction should be submitted to the Dean of Student Services and Enrollment Management who may initiate additional disciplinary action. A student may appeal a grade through the Academic Appeals Board. The Dean of Student Services and Enrollment Management's decision may be appealed through the process outlined in the Student Code of Conduct Policies and Procedures Manual.

Mandatory Reporting:

Colorado State University-Pueblo is committed to maintaining respectful, safe, and nonthreatening educational, working, and living environments. As part of this commitment, and in order to comply with federal law, the University has adopted a Policy on Discrimination, Protected Class Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Intimate Partner Violence, Stalking, & Retaliation. You can find information regarding this policy, how to report violations of this policy, and resources available to you, on the Office of Institutional Equity's website (www.csupueblo.edu/institutional-equity).