



SECTION III

Description

The Teaching Component's primary objective is to improve proposers' teaching effectiveness. Projects are expected to:

- present substantial **new** professional challenges to proposers (e.g., pedagogical issues, or knowledge or skills acquisition),
- relate directly to current or planned UW Oshkosh courses and programs,
- include substantial activities beyond normal professional responsibilities, and
- produce tangible evidence of professional development (e.g., preparation of new teaching materials, teaching methods, courses, or sub-programs; conference papers and publications).

Procedures

1. Faculty Development Board issues a request for proposals approximately two months prior to the submission deadline. Typically, there are two cycles.
2. Proposers are encouraged to discuss plans with department/unit chairs, Teaching Component grant recipients, Faculty Development Board Teaching Committee, or colleagues.
3. Faculty and academic staff then submit proposals to department/unit chair(s) and/or dean(s) for signatures (represents a commitment of resources and facilities). Workload and scheduling must also be approved.
4. Dean's office forwards proposals to Faculty Development Board.

Here is the proposal review process:

1. Faculty Development Board Chair and the Director of Grants and Faculty Development make panelist assignments to three members of the Teaching Panel.
2. Teaching Committee examines assignments to ensure fairness.
3. Panelists perform independent double-blind evaluation.
4. Evaluations are consolidated and proposals are rank ordered to facilitate discussion.
5. Teaching Committee members review each proposal.
6. Numeric rating scores and reviewer comments are presented and discussed by the Teaching Committee.
7. Teaching Committee members closely study the panelists' reviews to ensure fair evaluation (the committee may reject the evaluation of one or more panelists) and develop recommendations for proposals.
8. Faculty Development Board reviews recommendations and considers policy issues when making proposal recommendations to the Provost and Vice Chancellor.
9. Provost and Vice Chancellor reviews proposals and recommendations and makes a decision about each proposal.
10. Proposer receives notice of the Provost and Vice Chancellor's decision, which may include special conditions of an award.
11. Proposer and panelists receive summaries of panelists' scores and comments.

Eligibility

All continuing UW Oshkosh faculty and teaching academic staff holding full- or part-time academic year appointments are eligible. Faculty or academic staff on annual appointments are not eligible for CAS (Compensation for Additional Service) support. Recipients of Faculty Development Program support must forgo or return the previously approved support if they will not be continuing for one regular semester following the completion of the supported project.

Individuals, departments or several departments (or other groups addressing an issue of common concern) may submit proposals.

Proposers whose final reports have not yet been evaluated by the Faculty Development Board or whose projects have been deferred are eligible for future CAS and/or auxiliary funding. Proposers whose projects are past due are not eligible for consideration. Refer to General Information (Section II) for details. Call ext. 3215 if you have questions regarding a project's status.

Awards for **projects involving human subjects** are contingent upon approval from the UW Oshkosh Institutional Review Board. For **projects using animals**, an award is contingent upon approval from the UW Oshkosh Animal Use and Care Committee. Contact the College of Letters and Science to obtain information and application forms.

Prereading Service

Information sessions and a prereading service are available. To request a prereading, submit one copy of the proposal draft (typed, single-spaced) to the Faculty Development Office at least three weeks prior to the submission deadline. An experienced reviewer will critique the draft. While this does not guarantee subsequent approval, reviewer comments may help improve the final version.

Proposals

1. Submit **six stapled copies of the proposal, including two copies with a cover sheet**, to your department/unit chair and dean. The cover sheet is available in Appendix C, from the Faculty Development Office, or on-line at: <http://www.uwosh.edu/grants>.
2. Double-blind review: Because the review process is double blind (neither the proposer nor panelist knows the others identity), proposals and other materials must be written in a manner that maintains anonymity. Proposers must ensure that neither their name nor any other identifying information appears in the proposal and/or other materials. The review process will end if a proposal or other materials reveals the proposer's identity in any way. In such cases, the proposal will be returned to the proposer at the end of the cycle without a recommendation for funding. When necessary (for example, when citing one's self, in support letters, etc.) the word "author" should be inserted in place of the proposer's name.
3. Proposals must include:
 - a. an abstract,
 - b. a proposal narrative,
 - c. a budget (include CAS/reassigned time request and auxiliary support; i.e., supplies/materials, student assistance, etc.) and justification for each item, and
 - d. a letter of support from the unit head (only if a commitment of resources is needed).

Abstract – A one-page summary of proposal.

Proposal Narrative – Five to eight sequentially numbered pages describing your project (single-spaced, no smaller than 12-point type). The proposal should be **understandable to those outside of the**

discipline. A proposal may require additional sections, but proposals are evaluated (1-10) on each of the following content items, including writing quality (see Teaching Proposal Evaluation Form later in this section).

- a) **Development Opportunity/Problem.** Define and explain the importance of the teaching opportunity/problem. Demonstrate proposer familiarity with the literature and the proposer's current relevant activities.
- b) **Objectives of the Proposed Project.** Specify project objectives for each proposer. Identify the specific skill, knowledge, or ability to be acquired or developed by each proposer. Tell how project objectives support the professional development.
- c) **Professional Development.** Discuss how the proposed activities will lead to significant professional development. Complete a self-assessment of each proposer's strengths and weaknesses. Explain how this project is related to other professional development efforts (completed or planned).
- d) **Importance of Project to Department/Unit.** Explain how the project is related to current or planned department/unit or college curriculum. If relevant, include a letter from the department/unit chair and/or dean explaining how the proposal relates to an existing or planned curriculum, explaining the need for this project, and indicating a commitment to make resources and facilities available. **This letter must not identify the proposer(s).**
- e) **Importance of Project to Students.** Explain the near-future impact of the project on UW Oshkosh students (number of students impacted is not a consideration) and how the project will improve instruction.
- f) **Activities and Timeline.** Demonstrate that the activities and timeline are appropriate and that all required items (e.g., equipment, supplies, software, consultants, library resources) are accessible. Provide a detailed timeline for project activities. If people are to be interviewed or observed, provide evidence that permission has been obtained (i.e., attach support letters or e-mails). Describe what problems might occur and how the proposer(s) will address them.

Article, manuscript, creative, or translation writing are supportable when tied directly to the creative or analytical processes. The writing must be justified methodologically, tied to professional development, and justified as part of the creative process.

- g) **Evaluation.** Describe the criteria by which proposers will determine project completion. Also include tangible outcomes for each proposer (e.g., teaching materials, bibliographies, procedures, conference papers, publications, or a proposal for external funding). Explain how new knowledge, skills or abilities will be demonstrated. If a reporting date other than February following receipt of the award is required, identify and justify the reporting date.
- h) **Above Load.** Explain why the proposed activities are substantially beyond the proposer's normal professional responsibilities. Delineate part-of-load and supported activities. Show that an exceptional case exists to allow funding for the following "part-of-load" activities, for example:
 - review/revision of course materials,
 - evaluation of books, software, equipment, etc. for potential use in teaching,
 - study of books, journals, and other media to stay current in proposer's field, and
 - preparing course and program proposals or preparing to teach a new course in an area of proposer's current expertise.

- i) **Clear and Concise Writing.** The majority of the **panelists will be from outside the proposer's subject field.** Therefore, avoid technical jargon and define terms/concepts. Proofread for organization, grammar, readability, clarity of objectives, sufficiency of details, length of proposal and legibility. Panelists are instructed to "grade low" rather than to "give the benefit-of-the-doubt" when they cannot understand crucial ideas.

Budget Requests and Justification

- a) **CAS/Reassigned time/Auxiliary Funds.** Faculty and teaching academic staff may request CAS, reassigned time (a maximum reduction in teaching load of three credits per semester), and/or auxiliary funds in support of a project. The proposal must state the level of CAS and/or reassigned time for each individual. The maximum amount of CAS that can be requested at any time across all components cannot exceed 15% of the proposer's salary.

Salary support up to 15 percent per proposer may be awarded if **a clear and convincing case is made to justify that level of CAS support.** CAS requests for several proposers must justify multiple participants, and identify activities and expected professional development for each proposer.

The nature of certain projects may justify the extension of CAS and auxiliary support for more than one year. In the approval of multi-year projects, a funding commitment of CAS and auxiliary support is made for the initial year. Funding beyond the initial year is contingent upon the submission of an annual progress report to the Faculty Development Office and the approval of that report by the Teaching Committee. In cases where extended CAS support is requested, proposal writers must include a justification for this request in terms of project requirements within the proposal narrative and must also include a timeline for completing specific project activities and submitting an annual progress report.

Proposal writing, literature searches, and report writing are not eligible for CAS support. If CAS or auxiliary support is approved at an amount less than requested because the level of support was not adequately justified, the proposer may accept or decline the award or complete the project at the approved amount. The grant recipient cannot negotiate for lesser project outcomes because the Board has approved a lesser amount.

If auxiliary funds are requested, the proposal narrative must contain an "Auxiliary Funds Justification" section. The Faculty Development Board will not provide funding for items more than \$500, including equipment, books, computer software (for special software purchases, see Special Auxiliary Budget Software Initiative, Appendix G), or other items for which the use-life extends beyond the project period. Requests will be considered for items less than \$500 and supplies or services that are consumed in the activities of the project. Computer literature searches indexing, page charges and maintenance of university owned equipment will not normally be supported as an auxiliary expense.

- b) **Travel.** Support for out-of-state or out-of-country travel must be justified. If projects require travel in consecutive years, justify the objectives and outcomes for each year.
- c) **Student Support.** If requested, justify the number of student hours (hourly wages that exceed the minimum wage must also be justified). Student job descriptions and hourly wages are subject to approval by the Student Financial Aid Office.

Final Report

A project is assigned an evaluation date when approved for funding. A final project report is due on or before this evaluation date and should include:

- a summary of project objectives and activities,
- evidence of tangible products produced,
- an abstract of not more than 250 words on the final report abstract form provided by the Faculty Development Office (also available on-line),
- a self-analysis of the professional development achieved by each grant recipient,
- details of how the proposed project objectives were achieved, or
- an explanation of why proposed outcomes were not achieved (the project may be deferred or declared past due).

See General Information (Section II) for more information about types of support, report due dates, project evaluation procedures, project report deferral and past-due projects or contact the Faculty Development Office (ext. 3215).

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN OSHKOSH - FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Teaching Proposal Evaluation Form

Proposal Number: _____ Name of Reviewer: _____

Rate Criteria 1-8 using the following scale. Do not leave a blank.
 1-2 Poor. Minimal potential. 7-8 Very good. Fundable in present form.
 3-4 Fair. Has deficiencies that should be addressed. 9-10 Nearly perfect. (Use sparingly.)
 5-6 Good. Workable idea. Has minor deficiencies.

NOTE: Your input is critical to a valid and constructive evaluation process. Please remember that the proposal, not the proposer, is being evaluated. While the proposer is not expected to address **all** considerations listed under the broad categories (below), the proposer is responsible for providing an adequate explanation for each category. Panelists should provide constructive suggestions to improve the proposal. Recognize that activities, methodologies, and objectives will differ significantly across academic disciplines. When reviews are completed, they are compiled and reviewed by a Teaching Committee member who acts as the proposal's proponent. The Board's position is that a proposal shall be funded whenever feasible. A proposal must receive a positive evaluation on items 9 and 10 from a majority of the Teaching Panelists to be eligible for funding.

HAS THE PROPOSER:	RATING
1. ...explained the development OPPORTUNITY/PROBLEM? Is the professional development opportunity clearly defined and justified? Is the importance of the opportunity/problem explained? Has the proposer demonstrated familiarity with the literature and current activities related to the project?	
2. ...identified OBJECTIVES of the project? Are the project objectives clearly specified for each proposer? Is the precise skill, knowledge, or ability to be acquired by each proposer clearly specified? Do the objectives clearly relate to the professional development opportunity/problem previously identified?	
3. ...explained PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT that will occur? Will the proposed activities lead to significant professional development? Has each proposer completed a self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses? Has the relationship of this project to other professional development efforts (completed or planned) been described?	
4. ...explained IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT TO DEPARTMENT/UNIT? Is the relationship of the proposed project to current or planned department/unit or college curriculum explained? Are letters from the department/unit chair and/or dean convincing that the need for the proposed project exists? If relevant, have the Chairs and/or Deans indicated their commitment to make resources and facilities available?	
5. ...explained IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT TO STUDENTS? Will the proposed project impact UW Oshkosh students in the near future? Will the project result in improved instruction? (The number of students affected is not necessarily a consideration.)	
6. ...established ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINE? Are the activities appropriate to accomplish the stated objectives and outcomes? Are the activities appropriate for the requested support? (Article, manuscript, creative, or translation writing are supportable when tied directly to the creative or analytical processes. The writing must be justified methodologically, tied to professional development, and justified as part of the creative process.) Is the timeline realistic? Are all the required items (e.g., equipment, supplies, software, consultants, library resources) available or planned for? If people are to be interviewed or observed, has their permission/acceptance or agency/institution permission/acceptance (as relevant) been obtained? Have problems been anticipated and alternatives planned for?	
7. ...presented EVALUATION CRITERIA? Are adequate criteria proposed to judge successful completion of the project? In addition to a final report, have tangible outcomes been identified? Examples of outcomes may include: new teaching materials, bibliographies, procedures, conference papers or publications, proposals for external funds. Has the proposer explained how new knowledge, skills or abilities will be demonstrated?	
8. ...presented ABOVE LOAD rationale? Did proposer(s) explain why the proposed activities are substantially beyond normal professional responsibilities? Were both activities that will be performed as part-of-load and activities for which support is requested delineated?	
9. ...presented a CLEAR AND CONCISELY WRITTEN proposal? Are the principal ideas understandable to those outside of the discipline? Has technical jargon been avoided? Have terms/concepts been defined where appropriate? Considerations may include organization, grammar, readability, clarity of objectives, sufficiency of details, length of proposal, proofreading and legibility. Panelists are expected to grade low rather than "give-the-benefit-of-the-doubt" in proposals where principal ideas are not understandable.	
Total	

Proposal Number: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

10. Budget and Justification

- | | | | |
|---|-----|----|----------------|
| • Is the total CAS/reassigned time support (for each proposer) requested appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested supplies/expenses/auxiliary budget appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested travel budget appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |
| • Is requested student assistance support appropriate and justified? | Yes | No | Not Applicable |

11. Provide rationale for your response to question 10. (Rationale is required.)

12. If this proposal requests funding under Special Teaching Initiative, have the Terms of Success been fully identified and are they appropriate? **Yes No Not Applicable**

13. If this proposal requests funding under Special Teaching Initiative, provide rationale for your response to question 12.

PANELIST'S COMMENTS (REQUIRED):

A good review is useful to the proposer and helps the Committee to make decisions when disparate reviews are received. Panelists are responsible for the professionalism of their feedback to the proposers. Please be considerate with your written comments, yet maintain the high standards for quality associated with the Faculty Development Program. Negative feedback is to be accompanied by constructive suggestions. Please enter specific comments (related to your ratings in categories 1-9) identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed project. Remember that you are evaluating the proposal and **not** the proposer. (Continue on a separate page, if necessary.)