Proposals for Faculty Development in Teaching Innovation, Pedagogy, and Assessment, Fall 2014  
(Apply if you want to pursue travel or projects by June 30, 2015.)

This committee will do a call for proposals during Spring 2015.  
(If you want to pursue travel or projects after June 30, 2015 you will have the opportunity to submit a proposal during the spring semester.)

DUE DATE: Friday, October 31, 2014, by 3:00 p.m.
PLEASE NOTE THAT SUBMITTED PROPOSALS REQUIRE SIGNATURES OF CHAIRS, (AND/OR) PROGRAM DIRECTORS, AND DEANS.

The College administration has set aside faculty development money to be disbursed to faculty who submit quality proposals to enhance their development as teachers and innovators. While the established Faculty Development Grants Committee for Research and Scholarship emphasizes personal scholarship intended for external professional dissemination, the Faculty Development Grants Committee for Teaching Innovation, Pedagogy and Assessment (FD/TIPA) emphasizes activities that will primarily result in innovations intended for dissemination to the Fort Lewis College community.

The intent of this money is to initiate projects that result in a sustainable, long-term change to a program or to the long-term professional development of a faculty member with respect to teaching innovation, pedagogy, and/or assessment. This fund is not intended to be the source of continuous or on-going funding for any project or activity. Proposals for one-time events or activities that do not have a longer-term development impact will not be funded.

The types of activities that will be considered by the committee include development activities that will lead to the creation of new goals and objectives (intended outcomes), methodology, and/or assessments in a course or program currently being taught or created. The proposal may include a plan to develop one or more of these three areas of instruction. Sample ideas are listed at the end of this document.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposals will be grouped into two major funding categories. Level I will be activities that require funding of less than $1500. Level II activities will be those that have a budget greater than $1500. Proposal requests will be considered from all permanent faculty. If you have any questions about your eligibility, please contact Cheryl Betka in Dr. Morris' office at 247-7314.

Level I Proposals (requesting less than $1000, or up to $1500 if the Level I proposal includes airfare):  
The proposal must be no more than one single-sided page, not including the biographical sketch of the author.

Level II Proposals (requesting more than $1000, or $1500 if the Level II proposal includes airfare):  
The proposal must be no more than three single-sided pages, not including the biographical sketch of the author.

Proposals of either level should include the sections outlined below. Failure to follow the proposal format will automatically exclude a proposal from consideration.

Proposal Summary: a brief description (less than 200 words) of the purpose of the activity, the methods to be used, and the expected outcomes.
**Project Description and Significance:** The main body of the proposal should be a clear statement of the work to be undertaken and should include information regarding:

1. Which area of development is being proposed: Goals and Objectives, Methodology, Assessment;
2. The current state of the faculty member's activities in this area and how his/her development will be enhanced or changed by the proposed activity;
3. The general plan for the work to be undertaken, including the broad design of the activities to be undertaken, and a timeline for these activities;
4. Any broader impacts of the proposed activity;
5. Expected outcomes from the proposed activity and how those outcomes will be identified, assessed, and presented to the appropriate FLC audience.

**Budget and Justification:** The proposal may request funds for supplies and materials, travel, or other items. The budget request should be accompanied by a budget justification, outlining the costs, uses, and overall justification for each item requested.

Specialized computer hardware or software will be considered IF the request has been discussed and approved by the Computer Center (such approval should be documented within the proposal).

Funding requests will be evaluated in terms of their necessity in performing the proposed work. The FD/TIPA committee encourages projects that address college-wide initiatives in the areas of Living/Learning Communities, Education for Global Citizenship, Learning Communities, Community Based Learning and Research, or Teaching Empowerment Teams. While all requests will be considered, proposal authors are asked to evaluate their funding request in light of the total budget. Activities requiring large budgets will need to have broad and significant impacts to be considered.

All proposals should include the signature of the departmental chair and appropriate Dean, endorsing the proposed activities (only one copy of the submitted proposal needs to have original signatures).

**Biographical Sketch:** This should include a one page, current *curriculum vita* that emphasizes the author's work in the area of proposed development to date.

---

**SEVEN COPIES OF THE PROPOSAL SHOULD BE RECEIVED BY PAUL BOOTH, ART & DESIGN DEPARTMENT, ART HALL-ROOM 153, NO LATER THAN 3 P.M., FRIDAY, October 31, 2014.**

**Review Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated on the intellectual and creative merit of the proposed activities and how those activities will contribute to the individual's development. Again, the committee encourages projects that address college-wide initiatives in the areas of Living/Learning Communities, Education for Global Citizenship, Learning Communities, Community Based Learning and Research, or Teaching Empowerment Teams. New and original efforts are highly desirable, however, the individual must be able to make a case for their ability to conduct and complete the proposed activity. Activities with broad impacts are highly desirable. Some form of measurable outcome must be demonstrated in all proposals and competitive proposals will have particularly interesting mechanisms for showcasing the proposed outcomes to the Fort Lewis College community. Funds requested must be justifiable and contribute in a significant way to the completion of the activity proposed.
Unfunded Proposal Reviews
Brief reviews for each unfunded proposal will be provided by the committee indicating how a proposal might be improved for submission in future funding cycles.

Expectations of Funded Activities
Once funded the committee expects monies be used as planned. The awards committee must be notified of any changes to the proposed activities once funding has been awarded.

All authors receiving funds for a proposal MUST submit an electronic copy of the report by June 30, 2015 to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the chair of this committee by the same date. The report should include information regarding progress to date on the proposed activities, date(s) of the presentation (and audience) and qualitative or quantitative assessment information. Please remember that disseminating your work to an appropriate campus audience via a public seminar, brown-bag lunch, etc., is an important part of these activities. This committee should be notified of these events in order that some of the committee members may attend. Failure to submit the progress or final report and to make an appropriate presentation will automatically exclude the author from future funding. Because the budget needs to be reconciled for future awards, monies awarded must be spent by the June 30, 2015 deadline or will be forfeited.

Questions
Questions about any portion of the proposal process, from the feasibility of an activity to budgeting, can be directed toward any member of the awards committee.

Paul Booth (Art, Chair)
Chiara Cannella (Teacher Education)
Bill Collins (Chemistry)
Ken Hunt (School of Business Administration)
Michael Martin (History)
Steve Stovall (School of Business Administration)
Eric Huggins (School of Business Administration; ex officio)

Some hypothetical examples follow each area description. The examples of possible funding approval activities are not meant to be exhaustive. Some examples of requested items might include: travel to conferences that is consistent with the intent of this program, travel to other campuses, costs for bringing an expert to campus which have course/program developmental impact, appropriate technology, and books or other materials. If in doubt as to whether the project is appropriate under these guidelines, please discuss it with any member of the committee.

Goals and Objectives (Intended Outcomes): The development of a conceptual framework in which the instructor wants to consider new or different purposes for a course.

- ACC 436 - Auditing Theory & Practice - This course currently takes a balance-sheet approach to an audit, whereby specific auditing techniques are emphasized which help the student identify errors or omissions in specific balance sheet accounts. An instructor may want to change the focus of the course to examine the internal control review of a company. This procedure has been given greater emphasis by the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and has become a much greater part of the public accounting industry. This change of focus would change the learning outcomes. The grant might cover travel to a conference for participating faculty, etc.
• HIST 342 – West Africa – This course seems to be focusing on the effects of outside influences on the culture of the region (slave trade, Islam, colonization, others). Is there another way to approach the study of West Africa? To examine its leaders and how they came to power? To understand current structures and policies of contemporary West African governments; or, other new ways at looking at this course that a scholar might consider. The grant might cover travel to a conference for participating faculty or to defray the costs of bringing an expert to campus to assist in program, course, or assessment development.

**Methodology:** The development of new instructional strategies in areas such as sequencing of topics, delivery of information, media and materials used, group inquiry strategies and individualized instruction, alternative instructional approaches for students with disabilities. A team teaching approach might also be included under this category.

• Chem 151 - Fund of Chem II - Recent advances in science education have led to new ways of delivering the introductory chemistry sequence. Student response technology (“clickers”), as well as online preparation assignments will be researched and implemented in this course, with most of the work taking place over the summer. The grant will pay for technology hardware and travel to a workshop on these topics. New methods in Chem 151, a presentation to interested science faculty, help to other chemistry faculty on the same subjects, or to faculty from any discipline interested in using this technology will be measurable outcomes of the grant.

• Introductory Physics Sequence & Student Math Preparation - The physics and engineering department consistently faces difficulty in attracting and holding interested students because the mathematics required for the introductory physics sequence is Calculus I or higher. Because physics & engineering are very hierarchical degrees, students who come in under-prepared or who stumble in their coursework often have difficulty finishing their degree in four years. As part of trying to address this issue the department will bring in an expert on physics programs to hold discussions with the faculty. The grant will cover travel, lodging, food and an honorarium for the expert, as well as food for a luncheon meeting with the expert and faculty members.

**Assessment:** The development of ways to evaluate whether the intended learning outcomes of the course or program have been met. While testing and student evaluations remain popular assessment instruments, an instructor may want to develop a survey for program graduates or a post-test given to students a year after taking the course. A variety of assessment approaches could be explored: written or oral reports, portfolio assessment, poster sessions, students instructing other students in course concepts, or practical application in field settings.

• Learning Community assessment - Learning communities are developed primarily for incoming freshmen to take courses together as a group (3-4 courses total, e.g., HON 223: Human History and the Liberal Arts, ANTH 151: Survey of Anthropology, and, HIST 160: Survey of Western Civilization). This allows the students to bond as a community while taking the same classes and developing study habits together in an established, supportive group dynamic in their first semester of college. The instructors might develop a program of assessment that follows the students through to graduation to discover effectiveness of learning communities, how to improve the organization and teaching of them, or workshops for faculty on how to develop, teach, and implement unique and innovative learning communities and their assessment.