3.1 Overview

The Engineering Technology Division (ETD) sponsors a Mini-Grant Program which provides members of the division an opportunity for partial funding on projects that will benefit ETD or a segment of the engineering technology community. This set of guidelines will help applicants develop a proposal for the grant and acquaint them with the evaluation criteria.

3.2 Project Types

While ETD members have latitude in the choice of project, it should benefit either the ET Division or a significant portion of the engineering technology community. Ideally, a project will align with the ETD Strategic Plan and benefit the entire engineering technology spectrum. It may focus on a single discipline and/or be of use to a particular college or system, as long as the results will benefit the larger ETD community.

3.3 Funding Levels

The ETD Executive Committee allocates funds to the Mini-Grant Program annually at the summer Executive Committee meeting. The recipient’s institution must match ETD funding 100%, as indicated by a support letter from the appropriate personnel. The match can be monetary or in-kind. The level of mini-grant funding will be announced to the ETD membership via the ETD listserv and website. University indirect or overhead costs are not eligible for mini-grant funding.

Successful applicants will receive 50% of the funding immediately upon approval of the proposal and the remaining funding when they completely fulfill the deliverables requirements below. The ETD Mini-Grant project director must be a member of the Engineering Technology Division of ASEE to qualify for funding.

3.4 Deliverables

Grant recipients MUST

3.4.1 Submit a report to the ETD Executive Committee at the conclusion of the project, detailing how the ETD funding was used. The recipient is strongly encouraged to publish findings/results in an article to be submitted to the Journal of Engineering Technology (JET), following journal guidelines, although actual publication would be at the discretion of the journal editors.

3.4.2 Present their findings/results at the Conference for Industry and Education Collaboration (CIEC).

3.5 Evaluation

An ad hoc committee composed of ETD Executive Committee members will evaluate all proposals (see attached scoring rubric) according to criteria that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

3.5.1 Breadth of Appeal: The interest/appeal that a proposed project will have to the broad range of programs and technical interests of ETD membership. Broad appeal is preferable.
3.5.2 *Innovation/Creativity:* The uniqueness, innovation, or creative thinking exhibited by the proposed project

3.5.3 *Practicality:* How practical it would be for other members of ETD to adopt, adapt, or use the results of a project. Applicants should consider items such as cost, resource demands, geography, environment, program size, etc. that would impact the use of project results by other programs.

3.5.4 *Affordability:* Affordability, cost effectiveness, and other resource demands required of other ETD members should they choose to replicate, adopt or otherwise use results of the completed project.

3.5.5 *Timeliness:* How well the proposed project reflects the current state of technology, educational emphasis, industrial interest, or developing subject matter in the area addressed by the proposal.

3.5.6 *Quality:* The proposal reflects sufficient attention to writing and project details.

### 3.6 Proposal Document

The proposal should include

3.6.1 Identification of project director, including institution and contact information

3.6.2 Abstract that includes an introduction and statement of the issue

3.6.3 Justification that includes the project’s purpose, objectives, goals, and benefits to the broader engineering technology community

3.6.4 Specific anticipated results to be provided in the report

3.6.5 Anticipated timeline (two years maximum) identifying key phases

3.6.6 Anticipated project budget showing the use of mini-grant and matching funds. Applicants must include a statement from appropriate personnel detailing the source of matching funds or in-kind.

3.6.7 Two-page curriculum vitae using ABET format for the project director

3.6.8 The proposal should be no longer than three pages, not including a one-page budget, project director curriculum vitae, and any supporting appendices.

### 3.7 Submission Procedure

The mini-grant request for proposals (RFP), including submission instructions, will be published via the ETD listserv and website in August when mini-grant funding is available.

### 3.8 Additional Information

3.8.1 *Unused Funds:* If the project is not completed, all ETD funds will be returned to the ETD treasurer.

3.8.2 *Logos:* Final work should include current ASEE and ETD logos.

3.8.3 *Revisions:* The review committee may suggest project modifications, but their inclusion is at the discretion of the project director.
3.8.4 Restrictions: Grant recipients should use funding in a prudent manner that advances project completion. ETD mini-grant funding cannot be used for travel; however, for presentation at the CIEC, candidates may include 25% of travel costs from the required match, or a maximum of $500.

3.8.5 Copies of Final Work: The project director should provide the ETD mini-grant coordinator with a digital copy of the completed project for inclusion in the ETD archive.

3.8.6 Consideration: Preference given to first time grant recipients

3.9 Process upon Approval

A representative of the ETD Executive Committee will notify the project director upon approval of the proposal. The project director will contact the ETD treasurer regarding transfer of funds and submission of a written agreement to provide the ETD Executive Committee with a copy of the final report on or before the date specified in the proposal.

The ETD Executive Committee will monitor the project status and may periodically request status reports.

3.10 Proposal Evaluation

Using a scale from 1 to 5, (1 does not meet criteria, 5 fully meets criteria), please rate each mini-grant proposal with respect to each of the criteria listed in the columns below. General descriptions of the criteria are listed below.

Note: This rubric is not intended to simply identify the “best” proposal submitted. Thus, your scores are not to be a relative ordering of the various proposals. Instead, the rating in each case should reflect your view of how well or poorly a proposed project addresses each scoring criterion.
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Definitions:

_Breadth of Appeal_ - The interest/appeal that a proposed project will have to the broad range of programs and technical interests of ETD membership. Broad appeal is preferable.

_Innovation/Creativity_ - The uniqueness, innovation, or creative thinking exhibited by the proposed project.

_Practicality_ - How practical it would be for other members of ETD to adopt, adapt, or use the results of a project. Applicants should consider items such as cost, resource demands, geography, environment, program size, etc. that would impact the use of project results by other programs.

_Affordability_ - Affordability, cost effectiveness, and other resource demands required of other ETD members should they choose to replicate, adopt or otherwise use results of the completed project.

_Timeliness_ - How well the proposed project reflects the current state of technology, educational emphasis, industrial interest, or developing subject matter in the area addressed by the proposal.

_Quality_ - The proposal reflects sufficient attention to writing and project details.