



SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

RESEARCH REASSIGNED TIME (BOT/AAUP 10.6.4) SUBMISSION GUIDELINES & SCORING RUBRIC

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

In a maximum of two pages describe your proposed research project. This should include:

1. Explanation of the purpose of the project, research topic and questions.
2. Identify two or more specific outcomes of the project.
3. Brief literature review to situate research within the broader academic conversation; building upon existing scholarship
4. Overview of methodology/research plan, including description of proposed data collection and/or research/analysis methods.
5. Articulation of project timeline, including explanation of and justification for the reassigned time requested.
6. Description of the significance of the project to the broader goals and mission of the University with specific performance indicators tied to the School of Education.
7. Description of a dissemination plan for project results, including identification of proposed refereed presentations and refereed publications, etc.
8. Applicants who are currently receiving RRT for 2025-2026 should submit a summary or progress report outlining outcomes or actions that have occurred prior to receiving an award for 2026-2027.

Keep in mind that the faculty reviewing your proposal may not come from your department, so your project description should be clear to people outside of your discipline. The attached rubric will be used in reviewing the proposals. As you prepare your application, please refer to the rubric and address each category individually in your narrative.

School of Education

1615 Stanley Street, P.O. Box 4010, New Britain, CT 06050 | tel: 860.832.2101 | fax: 860.832.2295

ccsu.edu/education

	3	2	1	0	
Formatting 2 pages - single spaced 12-point font - New Times Roman (or equivalent)	Proposal adheres to the three core formatting elements	One component of the proposal formatting does not adhere to requirements	Two components of the proposal formatting do not adhere to requirements	Proposal does not meet the formatting requirements	Notes:
Clarity - Clarity of content - easy for a layperson to understand - Complete information - clearly defined purpose, significance, and impact - Has coherent structure	Proposal provides complete and specific information that meets the three Clarity criteria.	Proposal meets two Clarity criteria.	Proposal meets only one of the Clarity criteria.	Proposal is lacking all three Clarity criteria.	Notes:
Outcomes - - Two or more clearly articulated outcomes - Measurable – clearly states the indicators to be used to measure how well the research objectives have been achieved. - Attainable – practical/realistic and achievable within the given resources and timeframe - Relevant – ability to inform policy or practice	Proposal meets all Outcomes criteria.	Proposal meets most of the Outcomes criteria.	Outcomes are identified but are vague and must be interpreted by the reviewer.	No outcomes are identified.	Notes:
Research Plan - Clear, focused research questions - Well synthesized review of literature to establish context for the research - Clear description of the approach and procedures with data analysis plans	Proposal meets the three Research Plan criteria.	Proposal meets two criteria for a research plan.	Proposal meets only one of the Research Plan criteria.	No required elements are identified	Notes:
Timeline - Has a clear deadline or timeframe for achievement - Includes detailed explanation of each part - Includes justification to demonstrate plan is feasible and well-considered	Proposal meets the three Timeline criteria.	Proposal meets two Timeline criteria.	Proposal meets only one Timeline criteria.	No timeline requirements are identified.	Notes:
Significance Addresses the importance and relevance of the research to explain why it is necessary, its potential to improve existing concepts or practices or student learning as well as alignment with the SOE mission and goals	Proposal clearly addresses the Significance criteria.	Proposal clearly addresses most elements in the Significance criteria.	Proposal vaguely addresses elements in the Significance criteria.	Significance of the research proposal is missing.	Notes:
Dissemination Plan Well-defined dissemination channels (i.e., presentations, publications), target audience, and timeline.	Proposal clearly addresses the Dissemination Plan criteria.	Proposal clearly addresses most elements in the Dissemination Plan criteria.	Proposal vaguely addresses elements in the Dissemination Plan criteria.	Dissemination Plan for the project is missing.	
If faculty received RRT within the past 3 years, a summary of the most recent project is provided. If the faculty is a first time applicant or it has been 3 years since they received RRT, score a 3.	All stated outcomes of previous RRT Project were met OR the candidate has not received reassigned time in previous 3 years.	Previous RRT Project outcomes were partially met.	No previous RRT Project outcomes were met.	Summary of previous RRT is missing	Notes:
	Total (out of 24)				

School of Education

1615 Stanley Street, P.O. Box 4010, New Britain, CT 06050 | tel: 860.832.2101 | fax: 860.832.2295

ccsu.edu/education