

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

2005-06 Faculty Development Mini-Grants

PROPOSALS DUE SEPTEMBER 15, 2005

Office of Faculty Development
California State University Channel Islands
facdev@csuci.edu

Questions About this Request for Proposals?

Faculty with questions about this RFP or about their project ideas can contact the Director of Faculty Development (facdev@csuci.edu,)

Overview of the Mini-Grant Program

All faculty members are invited to request support for instructional innovation and research projects to be conducted during the 2005-06 academic year. These projects should benefit the University and students through advancing faculty efforts as teachers and scholars.

The purpose of this grant program is to assist faculty (or faculty teams) with launching or maintaining a line of work that supports the mission of the campus, enhances their success in their assignments at CSU Channel Islands, to support faculty success in their evaluation (Retention, Tenure, and Promotion; Lecturer evaluation; post-tenure review); and to promote innovations in teaching, scholarship, and creative activity.

Faculty may request reassigned time for Spring 2006 (the equivalent of \$6000 in funding, including benefits), and/or up to \$3,000 for *Other Expenses*. The reassigned time portion of this faculty development program will be available to tenure-track faculty only. Examples of *Other Expenses* include costs for publications, equipment and supplies, student assistant wages, travel, and other project-related expenses.

Interested faculty should submit a 1 – 3 page proposal that conforms to the Proposal Guidelines section of this RFP. Only one proposal per faculty member will be accepted. Mini-grant proposals may include a team of faculty members.

Proposals are due by noon September 15, 2005, submitted via email to the Office of Faculty Development (facdev@csuci.edu), with a copy to the relevant Program Chair(s) and to the Dean.

Mini-Grant Review Process and Evaluation Form

The proposals will be evaluated anonymously by at least three faculty members, one of which will be in the general disciplinary area of the Investigator. Members of the Faculty Development Advisory Committee who have not submitted Mini-Grant proposals during this funding cycle, and members of the faculty at-large will serve as reviewers. Prior to completing a Mini-Grant Proposal Evaluation Form (provided at the end of this RFP), each reviewer will be trained on the use of this Form, including a practice evaluation of example proposals. Funding requests should not exceed one course reassigned time (2 – 4 WTU) per tenure-track faculty investigator, and/or \$3,000. Individuals must have submitted a progress report on prior mini-grant funding. If the reviewers of a proposal determine that the proposal does not meet the minimum requirements on the Mini-Grant Evaluation Form, the proposal will not be reviewed.

Point System

Proposals will be evaluated according to the six required sections described in the Proposal Guidelines. One of four ratings will be used for each element under the six sections. The definitions and evidence required for that rating are listed below.

Persuasively articulated (3 pts):

The proposal clearly describes the required element and also provides a compelling reason why the project warrants funding.

Articulated (2 pts):

The proposal clearly describes the required element and provides a reason why the project warrants funding.

Vaguely described (1 pt):

The proposal provides an outline or components of the required element but does not provide a strong reason why the project warrants funding.

Not evident (0 pts):

Either this section of the proposal is missing entirely or it only provides a component of the required element, and the proposal does not provide a reason why the project warrants funding.

Alternate Sources of Funds

In some cases, reviewers may recommend that the investigator(s) seek funding from one of the following sources: Instructionally-Related Activities (IRA, website), Lottery Funding (Dean's Office), or Program funding. General guidelines for determining whether a proposal is appropriate for Faculty Development Mini-Grant funds are listed below.

- The project involves curriculum development that will mainly benefit students: *Program funding or funding from the Dean is more appropriate*
- The project involves the acquisition of materials or speakers for a specific course: *Instructionally-Related Activities funding is more appropriate*
- The project involves infrastructure/ equipment acquisition where students are the main beneficiaries (i.e., instructional lab development or specialty facility/ software): *Lottery money, Program funding, or funding from the Dean is more appropriate.*

Examples of funded Mini-Grant proposals are available in the campus Public Folders in the *Faculty Development* public folder in Outlook.

Institutional Review Board Approval

If your project involves research on human subjects, your proposal should be submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on or before September 15, 2005. Information about the IRB approval process can be obtained from the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects; contact Barbara Thorpe (Barbara.Thorpe@csuci.edu) or Amanda Quintero (Amanda.Quintero@csuci.edu) for more information about the IRB process.

Reporting requirements for funded projects

Brief reports summarizing accomplishments and itemizing project expenditures are due to the Director of Faculty Development, with copies sent to the relevant Program Chair(s), no later than June 30, 2006.

What to Consider in a Mini-Grant Budget

Reassigned Time. Faculty should indicate how many units of reassigned time are being requested. Reassigned time can only be requested for the Spring 2006 semester. Reassigned time for lecturers is not supported by the mini-grant program and must, instead, be negotiated with the lecturer's Chair as part the annual/ semester contract.

Other Expenses. The maximum funding available for the Other Expenses portion of a mini-grant is \$3,000. Because program resources are state funds available the 2005-06 fiscal year only, awards *must be spent by June 30, 2006*. Equipment and supplies must be *requisitioned and encumbered even earlier than June 30, 2006*. Expenses that can be paid using an Other Expenses award include:

1. **Equipment.** Equipment (including computer hardware) that is essential to the project can be purchased *via requisition*. The total should include 8% state sales tax, shipping and handling, and costs for maintenance agreements, if required. Equipment purchased with these funds is the property of CSU Channel Islands and must be made available for others to use. Faculty should review the

listing of campus equipment available for individuals to use before requesting equipment. When requested equipment is already available on campus, this portion of a mini-grant will be cut from the budget. In some cases, the equipment may be available but has limitations for its use that should be clearly indicated in the proposal.

2. Supplies and services. Supplies and services include requisitioned items such as software and publications, cartridges and chemicals, film and batteries, paints and page charges. Budgets must include funds for sales tax and for shipping and handling charges. Books purchased on a Mini-Grant become the property of the CSU Channel Islands Library.

3. Travel expenses for faculty. Travel expenses (transportation, lodging, and meals) must be integral to the success of the project. Mini-Grant funding is not intended to be a substitute for travel funds provided for tenure-track faculty and tenure-track faculty must provide a statement in the proposal that indicates how the program travel funds will be expended. The amount of reimbursement is limited to the *per diem* rates established by the state.

4. Student assistants. Students can be paid an hourly wage for their assistance with the project, but they must be hired as regular student assistants, following campus procedures. Students can work no more than 20 hours per week when classes are in session. In planning a project, faculty should recognize that having student assistants involves a significant supervisory and bookkeeping responsibility for the project director. Faculty Affairs can provide additional information on wages, classifications, and other matters related to planning a project that will involve student assistant employees. The student assistant classification and rate of pay should be clearly indicated in the budget for a mini-grant proposal.

PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

Minimum Requirements for Submitted Projects

All proposals must meet the following four criteria, which apply to the Mini-Grant Proposal as a whole.

1. *The proposal is aligned with the mission of CSUCI*

Proposals should clearly indicate how they relate to one or more of the following elements of the CSUCI Mission Statement.

- Student-centered educational experience
- Experiential and service learning
- Within and across disciplines through integrative approaches
- Multicultural perspectives
- International perspectives

2. *The proposal helps faculty succeed in the evaluation process at CSUCI.*

For temporary faculty, the proposed project should relate to their teaching responsibilities at CSUCI and/or enhance their professional goals as a teacher. A case should be made by the temporary faculty member how a proposed project will help them succeed in the review of lecturers (annual review for annual contract lecturers and semester review for semester contract lecturers).

Tenure-track and tenured faculty should relate their project to their evaluation in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process and/or their professional development in the categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, or service.

3. *The proposal describes how the project informs the investigator as a teacher/ scholar.*

The Faculty Development Mini-Grant proposals are designed to encourage a teacher/ scholar model for faculty members. Proposals related to teaching must indicate how the project relates to instructional effectiveness and innovation. Proposals requesting support for scholarly and creative activities must indicate how the proposed activities will enhance their teaching.

4. *Supporting this project is an appropriate use of faculty development funds.*

Several alternative sources of funding are available on campus, including Program Areas, the Instructionally-Related Activities Fund, and Lottery Funds. Examples of appropriate funding and funding requests that are not appropriate for funding as a Mini-Grant are shown in Table 1. Prior to writing a Mini-Grant proposal

faculty are encouraged to talk with the Director of Faculty Development to determine whether a proposal idea would be appropriate for funding as a Faculty Development Mini-Grant.

An Appropriate Use of Mini-Grant Funds	Not An Appropriate Use of Mini-Grant Funds
A proposal from a temporary faculty member seeks to travel to a conference to present a paper and, at the same time, to attend a conference strand on student learning styles.	A proposal from a temporary faculty member seeks to travel to a conference to present a paper related to their doctoral research. <i>(Note: program funds may be available for this purpose)</i>
A tenure-track faculty member seeks funding to purchase graphing calculators for a math class and then assess how pre-credential teachers' attitudes toward the graphing calculators change during the course.	A tenure-track faculty member seeks funding to purchase graphing calculators for a math class. <i>(Note: program funds or lottery funds may be available for this purpose)</i>
A tenured faculty member seeks funding to present a workshop to the campus on writing across the disciplines.	A tenured faculty member seeks funding to publish student writings created by students in her course. <i>(Note: Instructionally-Related Activities funds may be available for this purpose)</i>

Table 1. Examples of Appropriate and Not Appropriate Requests for Mini-Grant Funds

Proposal Content

Proposals should be no longer than three, single-spaced pages and should contain the following sections. The point values and percentage of the evaluation on individual sections are provided below and on the Mini-Grant Evaluation Form. The points (maximum 48) for each section of the proposal should be reflected in relative lengths of the sections in your proposal.

I) Goals and Anticipated Outcomes (12 points)

This section of the proposal should list the goals of the project and the anticipated outcomes during the period of funding of the mini-grant. If you list longer-term goals or anticipated outcomes that will extend beyond the duration of the mini-grant, clearly differentiate these from the goals/ outcomes during the period of funding of the mini-grant. The goals and anticipated outcomes should be significant and the outcomes should follow logically from the goals.

The proposal should indicate how the goals and objectives are aligned with the CSUCI mission. A persuasive argument should be provided for how the project will assist the faculty member or members succeed in their evaluation process at CSU Channel Islands. For lecturers, this involves their annual or semester review of their teaching by the Chair of their program area. For tenure-track and tenured faculty, an argument should be made based on the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process, including post-tenure review which has not yet been implemented on campus.

II) Plans and Procedures (9 points)

Plans and procedures are the processes by which the project will be implemented. This proposal should persuasively describe how the goals and anticipated outcomes will be achieved during the funding period of the mini-grant. Plans and procedures should be written so that they are clear to a person who is not in the faculty member's discipline, and they should lead logically to achieving the goals and outcomes of the project. The role of the investigator(s) and any student assistants must be clearly indicated in this section of the proposal with a workload that is consistent with the requested funding for the mini-grant proposal.

III) Professional Development Benefits for the Participants and the University Community (9 points)

Proposals should delineate how the project will lead to the professional development of the investigator(s). Examples of professional development include the following opportunities:

- to examine/ develop a new approach to teaching
- to present work to disciplinary peers and receive constructive feedback
- to enhance one's writing skills
- to secure research results that will lead to research funding
- to examine/ develop new creative techniques
- to learn new classroom/ program assessment techniques
- to research an area of scholarly work related to one's scholarship

All proposals must help faculty members develop as teacher-scholars. As a result, proposals should indicate how the proposed project assists faculty in examining and promoting instructional effectiveness and innovation, scholarly pursuits, and/or creative activities that will inform their teaching.

In addition to the professional development benefits to the individual(s) participating in the min-grant project, the proposal should indicate how the campus and/or local community will benefit from the proposed project.

IV) Plans for Dissemination of the Project Results (6 points)

The proposal should clearly indicate how the goals/ anticipated outcomes will be disseminated. All projects must have some form of dissemination as appropriate to the proposal. In some cases, dissemination may only involve a written report to the Dean/ Director of Faculty Development while for other projects, a presentation at a conference may be appropriate.

Examples of appropriate dissemination are listed below:

- Presentation of a scholarly/ creative activity to a national, regional, or local disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) audience

- Oral report to the members of one's discipline on a conference attended on a teaching innovation
- Written report of progress on writing of chapters for a manuscript and/ or letter to publisher accompanying chapters written during a mini-grant funding period.

V) Timeline for the Project (6 points)

Each proposal must include a proposed timeline for the project that outlines what work will be conducted during the funding period of the mini-grant. If the project will extend beyond the funding period of the mini-grant, clearly indicate what portion of the work will be accomplished during the funding period. The amount of work proposed to be performed during the mini-grant funding period should be realistic considering the individual(s) who will be working on the project.

VI) Budget Narrative and Justification (6 points)

The proposal should include a narrative on how the requested budget will allow the project to be achieved during the funding period of the mini-grant and how the requested funding is appropriate considering the nature of the proposed work. See the section on **What to Consider in a Mini-Grant Budget**.

A copy of the Mini-Grant Proposal Evaluation Form, which will be used by reviewers of mini-grant proposals, is attached to this document.

MINI-GRANT EVALUATION FORM

Minimum Requirements: Proposals failing to meet the following criteria will not be reviewed for funding	
1. The proposal is aligned with the mission of CSUCI.	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Meets <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Does Not Meet
2. The proposal helps faculty succeed in the evaluation process at CSUCI.	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Meets <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Does Not Meet
3. The proposal describes how the project informs the investigator as a teacher/ scholar	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Meets <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Does Not Meet
4. Supporting this project is an appropriate use of faculty development funds.	<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Meets <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Does Not Meet

Proposal Evaluation: Proposals will be evaluated based on individual sections of the proposal using the following criteria. A total of 48 points are possible in this evaluation.	
1. Goals and Anticipated Outcomes (12 points)	
The goals of the proposal are well-defined.	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The anticipated outcomes are consistent with the goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The goals and anticipated outcomes are aligned with the CSUCI mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The proposal delineates how the project will help the faculty member(s) succeed in the evaluation process (RTP, lecturer review, post-tenure review).	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
2. Plans and Procedures (9 points)	
The plans and procedures for achieving the goals are clear and well-developed	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The plans and procedures are appropriate for the anticipated outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The plans and procedures describe the activities of the investigator(s) and any student assistants.	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)

3. Professional Development Benefits for the Participants and the University or Local Community (9 points)	
The proposal demonstrates the professional development benefits to the investigator(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The proposal helps faculty examine and promote instructional effectiveness, innovation, scholarly pursuits, and/or creative activities that will inform their teaching.	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The project describes the benefits to the campus or local community	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
4. Plans for Dissemination of the Project Results (6 points)	
The proposal clearly identifies how the outcomes of the work will be disseminated and to whom	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The level of dissemination is appropriate for the goals and anticipated outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
5. Timeline for the Project (6 points)	
The activities are attainable within the timeline of the proposal	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The work to be conducted during the funded period is clearly outlined	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
6. Budget Narrative and Justification (6 points)	
The budget justifies the amount requested based on the goals of the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)
The budget request is appropriate and reasonable based on the goals of the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively articulated (3 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Articulated (2 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely described (1 pt) <input type="checkbox"/> Not evident (0 pts)