University of Findlay®

Faculty Development Grants for Enhanced Teaching and Scholarship (ETS)
2019-2020 Application Guidelines

Application deadline: Monday, June 3, 2019
Email completed applications as one PDF tofacultydevelopment@findlay.edu

Faculty Development Grants for Enhanced Teaching and Scholarship (ETS) are designed to encourage faculty to engage in professional activities that will enhance their growth as teachers and scholars, thereby supporting exceptional student learning. ETS Grants are highly competitive grants that award funds of up to $10,000 per project proposal (whether for individual or collaborative projects). Applications from individual faculty and faculty groups are invited. The Faculty Development Committee will give additional consideration to proposals that demonstrate cross-departmental collaboration. This year, up to $35,000 will be awarded.

The first priority in awarding ETS funds is to support proposals that most successfully demonstrate clear project viability, significance, and sustained impact beyond the grant period.

Not all applications will be awarded funding and possibly not all funds will be disbursed. The committee has the flexibility to determine which applications best meet the guidelines set forth in the Application Guidelines. Unused funds will be transferred to the general Faculty Development fund and made available to faculty applying for traditional professional development activities.

Applications are due by Monday, June 3, 2019. Awards will be announced via email by June 28. Funds will be available for disbursement August 1, 2019. All funds must be spent during the fiscal year in which they are awarded. (The fiscal year runs from August 1 through July 31 of the following year.)

ETS Grants will be awarded according to the following categories:

Teaching Grants are designed to enable exceptional student learning by encouraging instructors to expand their pedagogical and/or andragogical skills. Teaching Grants support proposals to improve pedagogical or andragogical skills through learning about, implementing and/or assessing new teaching strategies. This may include but is not limited to course development or redesign or application of innovative teaching practices. Interdisciplinary or collaborative proposals are encouraged.

Research/Creative Production Grants are designed to promote faculty scholarship and creative production that enable exceptional student learning. These grants support projects that exceed typical faculty development activities such as conference participation or attendance or publication fees. These projects may include but are not limited to research

expenses; seed money necessary to apply for external grants; costs to bring collaborators to campus; equipment necessary for scholarly or creative production.

Emerging Faculty Grants are designed as career development grants for faculty at the assistant rank or below within their first five years at UF. These grants support scholarly/creative production or enhancement of teaching skills. See specific criteria on proposal application form.

Eligibility

- All full-time faculty on a continuing appointment are eligible to apply for a Faculty Development ETS Grant.
- Individual faculty may submit one ETS grant application a year. However, applications from individual faculty members also applying as part of a group will be considered. Proposals (whether individual or collaborative) are eligible for grants of up to $10,000.
- Applications from faculty who will not be under employment contract (due to resignation or termination) to the University of Findlay during the whole of the grant period will not be considered. Should a faculty member's affiliation with UF end during the funding period, funds awarded must be repaid to the university.
- Applications from faculty who have not filed complete reports and expense forms on the use of previous grants awarded by the Faculty Development Committee will not be considered.

Application Process

For consideration of a grant please **complete the attached application and email as one PDF to** facultydevelopment@findlay.edu. Incomplete proposals or proposals that do not adhere to the guidelines will not be considered.

Proposals should be written for the non-specialist.

Proposals that involve human subjects or the use of human tissues are subject to the requirements of UF's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Proposals that involve the use of vertebrate animals are subject to the requirements of UF's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). *IRB and IACUC approvals are not a prerequisite to submitting an ETS Faculty Development Grant application but are required prior to the commencement of the research.*

Proposals must provide an impact statement that documents the project's effects on university infrastructure (facilities, ITS, etc.) and existing programs, including a review of cost and resource implications. Applications must include a completed Proposal Review Memorandum from each of the affected departments/areas/centers on campus. See specific instructions on proposal application form.

ETS Grant Review Process

ETS grants are reviewed by members of the Faculty Development Committee through a blind peer review process that evaluates the merit of the proposed activity according to the review criteria. Reviewers consider the clarity of the proposal (including the budget statement), paying particular attention to the project's potential to enhance the applicant's teaching and/or scholarship, and its adherence to the application guidelines and rubric.

ETS Grant Funds may be used for but are not limited to

- Faculty research projects, particularly those that may lead to external funding opportunities. Direct research activities completed during sabbatical may be eligible for funding—all other restrictions apply.
- Projects intended to advance teaching through scholarly inquiry into student learning.
- Development and evaluation of instructional innovations that will increase the faculty member's ability to promote student learning (e.g., learning new and improved methods of instruction, curricular development, learning the use of new instructional equipment, software and/or materials).
- Costs associated with instructional improvement or for faculty professional development, impacting student learning directly or indirectly.
- Instructional materials including specialized software (but not able to be purchased by ITS); must include assessment of the impact of the materials on student learning.
- Fees for access to facilities and services for the development of instructional and/or creative production/research materials.
- Travel for necessary research at most economical rates (the Faculty Development Committee has the right to deny reimbursement for any expenses deemed to be excessive [travel upgrades, luxury car rentals, etc.]).
- Essential research materials (books, journals, digital resources) not easily available through campus sources.
- Laboratory research materials (supplies, instruments, consumables, analytical services).
- Essential supplies and materials for artistic work (visual and performing arts).
- Performance costs (fees for professional actors or musicians; instruments; staging; space rental).

ETS Grant Funds may not be used for

- Travel to present research at or attend professional meetings. (Funding will be considered for attendance at special workshops/seminars when the applicant provides sufficient information to relate the value of the workshop/seminar to his or her research and/or teaching. In the event the workshop/seminar is being held in conjunction with a regular professional meeting, funding will be considered only for fees associated with the workshop/seminar portion of the meeting but may not be used for travel, housing, or meeting registration. Traditional Faculty Development funding may be applied for.)
- Projects that contribute directly to the earning of degrees or other professional terminal credentials required for employment.

- Costs associated with professional licensing and/or memberships in professional organizations.
- Reimbursement for expenditures made prior to the ETS Grant award.
- Payment of faculty salaries to provide leave or release time.
- Projects where alternative activities and/or resources are available on campus.

Reporting requirements

Faculty who receive an ETS Grant must file a report detailing project activity and outcomes by September 9, 2020. The report should include documentation of what the project accomplished, an explanation of the project's benefit to all impacted, and a final budget. Grant recipients are also expected to present their project progress and/or results to the UF community at the Faculty Awards Gala the fall following their funding year (Fall 2020). Presentations will be coordinated with the chair of the Faculty Development Committee and the Center for Teaching Excellence. **Failure to provide a project report and/or present to campus will preclude subsequent Faculty Development Committee funding.**

Deadline

Applications are due by June 3, 2019. Awards will be announced via email by June 28, 2019.

Important dates

Application Deadline	Awards Announced (via email)	Funds Available	Funds Must be Spent	Final Report Due	Poster Presentation
June 3, 2019	June 28, 2019 (Last Friday in June)	August 1, 2019 (Start of fiscal year)	by July 31, 2020 (End of fiscal year)	September 9, 2020	Faculty Awards Gala Fall 2020

Faculty Development ETS Grants 2019-2020 Application Form
Application deadline: Monday, June 3, 2019
Email completed applications as one PDF tofacultydevelopment@findlay.edu

Following is the ETS Grant application form. To be considered, the cover page must be completed and each of the items on the application form must be addressed. Be sure to write your proposal in clear language that can be understood by reviewers outside of your discipline. Application includes minimum requirements; applicants are encouraged to add supporting materials or any relevant documents that would strengthen their proposal.

ETS Grant Application Cover Page

Name(s) and College(s) of all applicants:

_____

Title of Project:

_____

For which grant you are applying?

Teaching Grant ☐   Research/Creative Production Grant ☐   Emerging Faculty Grant ☐

Amount of Funds Requested:

_____

Project Title:

I. Statement of Problem or Need
What is the problem or need to be addressed? What is the basic idea, problem, or rationale for the research question that is the focus of the proposal? Support your statement with citations from research and reliable sources.

II. Significance (to your field and to your work at UF)
What is the significance of this problem or need to your field? What is the significance of this project to your teaching philosophy and/or creative production/research agenda as a faculty member at the University of Findlay?

III. Connection to the Big 8 and Sustained Significance
How specifically does the project align with the University's strategic goals (Big 8)? What sustained significance will the project have for the University beyond the initial funding period?
- Equip students for meaningful lives and productive careers
- Improve academic programs continuously through rigorous assessment
- Grow targeted enrollment
- Enable exceptional student learning
- Develop the whole person through individual attention
- Embrace professional, cultural and intellectual diversity
- Provide experiential learning in every program
- Build best-in-class strategic resources

IV. Activities and Methods
What activities will you implement to achieve your outcomes? What is the research methodology you are going to use? Explain why these are the most effective methodologies or best practices, using outside evidence to support as appropriate. What, if any, preliminary work has been done for the project by applicant(s) and/or by other individuals?

V. Outcomes
What are the specific, measurable, and observable outcomes you hope to achieve? What scholarly product(s) do you anticipate would come from this project? What is the likelihood of a substantial result from the grant (usable product, public attention that can impact public policy, external funding, etc.)?

VI. Timeline
Provide a realistic and comprehensive timeline of major project activities.

VII. Evaluation
How will you measure whether or not you have achieved the outcomes described above?

VIII. Impact Statement
How will this project affect existing University infrastructure? Impacts to address include, but are not limited to, the following. If there is no impact, explain.
   a. What physical spaces are needed for this project? Will facilities need to make changes to existing campus spaces?
   b. Will equipment purchased need to be maintained by someone other than the grant recipient(s)?
   c. What kinds of ITS support or resources would be required?
   d. Would licenses or subscriptions need to be sustained beyond the grant period?
   e. Will Shafer Library need to purchase additional resources?
   f. How might the proposed project affect support staff?
   g. Would resources or support be required from programs or departments not writing the grant proposal?
   h. What are the implications of these requirements?

A Completed Proposal Review Memorandum must be submitted from each department/area/center affected by the proposal. Note: Approval from affected areas does not guarantee funding. However, funding cannot be awarded without approval.

IX. Budget Justification
Your budget should support with numbers the methods and activities you describe above. The budget should be reasonable for both the effort and the anticipated results. Explain how and why specific expenditures are necessary for the proposed activity. Explain how you are arriving at your costs. **A specific breakdown of expenses associated with the project must be included with supporting documentation of costs.** Appropriate documentation may include: screen shots with vendor and price information, vendor quotes, PDF of catalog pages, screen shots of travel cost estimates (e.g. flight cost, car rental, hotel rates, food per diem, Google map to show mileage), screen shots documenting costs associated with research (e.g. library or transcription fees) or creative production (e.g. stage rental or production costs).

Provide a detailed explanation of other sources of funding. If requesting seed money for an external grant, identify the source of the external funding. If your total estimated project expenditures exceed $10,000, document additional sources of funding.

X. For Emerging Faculty Grant Applicants only
How specifically does the proposed project contribute to your long-term professional trajectory? How does it advance your professional growth and/or impact your professional identity?

2019-2020 ETS Grant Proposal Review MEMORANDUM

FROM:

SUBJECT: Review of ETS grant proposal by affected Department/Area/Center

PROPOSAL TITLE:

Directions: All proposals must include a completed Proposal Review Memorandum. Select one of the following.

 N/A Briefly explain.

OR

The affected Department/Area/Center

has reviewed proposal

and (at least one of the following must be checked)

 Department/center/area has no concerns.

 Issues of concern have been resolved satisfactorily. List below all areas of concern addressed and resolution.

 Issues of concern have been raised but not resolved. Briefly describe below concern(s).

All relevant signatures and dates required:

Proposal Sponsors   Date

Chair/Director of Affected Department/Area/Center   Date

Adapted from UF Curriculum Review Memorandum

University of Findlay — 2019-2020 ETS Grant Evaluation Rubric

Criterion	Description	Excellent (3 points)	Good (2 points)	Fair (1 points)	Poor (0 points)
Statement of Problem or Need	**Applicant explained the problem and/or need being addressed.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant explained the basic idea or rational for the project's central research question, providing citations from research and reliable sources.	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Significance	**Applicant explained the project's**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete,	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate	Vague and non-specific. Criteria	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide

		Specific and comprehensive	General, but sufficient	Vague and non-specific	Does not meet the criteria
	significance to applicant's field.	detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant explained the project's significance to applicant's teaching philosophy and/or creative production/research agenda as a faculty member at the University of Findlay.	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Connection to the Big 8 and Sustained Significance	**Applicant explained the project's alignment to the University's strategic goals (Big 8).**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.

					weaknesses.
	Applicant explained the project's sustained impact to the UF community beyond the initial funding period.	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Activities and Methods	**Applicant described research methodology, indicating appropriateness of methodology to achieving desired outcomes.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant described activities to be implemented, indicating appropriateness of those activities to achieving desired	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the

	outcomes and describing any relevant preliminary work.	developed ideas.	remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Outcomes	**Applicant provided measurable and observable outcomes to be achieved.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant identified scholarly products that would result from project, including likely substantial results (peer-reviewed publication, creative work, usable product, public attention that can impact public policy, external funding,	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.

	etc.)				
Timeline	**Applicant provided a realistic and comprehensive timeline of major project activities.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Evaluation	**Applicant explained how achievement of outcomes will be measured.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
Impact Statement	**Applicant explained how the project will affect existing University infrastructure, including but not limited to physical**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the

	spaces and IT resources and/or how the project would affect other UF programs or departments and implications of impact. Appropriate Proposal Review Memorandum included.	developed ideas. Appropriate Proposal Review Memorandum included.	remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses. Appropriate Proposal Review Memorandum included.	strategies. Lacks focus and detail. Appropriate Proposal Review Memorandum not included or incomplete.	criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria. Appropriate Proposal Review Memorandum not included or incomplete.
Budget Justification	**Applicant provided breakdown of project expenses with supporting documentation.**	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant explained why expenditures are necessary for proposed activity.	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the

		developed ideas.	remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.
	Applicant identified and explained additional sources of funding (internal and external).	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Proposal presents well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.	General, but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses.	Vague and non-specific. Criteria minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.	Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; or simply restates the criteria.

Total points:

Comments: