GUIDELINES GOVERNING
R. PATRICIA WALSH
GRANTS IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING
2011-2012

1. Proposals are limited to 4 double-spaced pages for the narrative. An additional page is allowed for the bibliography.

2. R. Patricia Walsh Grants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning are awarded only to full-time, tenured or tenure-track continuing faculty members. If a recipient fails to sign his or her contract with the university for the following academic year, the grant will automatically be revoked.

3. Work on the project must be completed during the summer of 2011, or during the 2011-2012 academic year. Awardees are expected to complete a final report to the Chair of the Committee on Excellence and the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, summarizing the outcomes of the project. Instructions for completing the final report will be e-mailed to award recipients. In addition, awardees will share their results with LMU faculty in an oral presentation given in The Center for Teaching Excellence. The report and presentation must be completed no later than September 15th, 2013.

4. Grants are awarded for the sum of $5000 per project. Eighty percent of the grant amount ($4000) will be awarded at the beginning of the grant period; the remaining 20% ($1000) will be awarded upon receipt of the final report and oral presentation of the project in the Center for Teaching Excellence. The faculty member relinquishes the final 20% of the grant stipend if the final report and oral presentation are not completed by the September 15th, 2013 deadline.

5. If the proposal has more than one author, the sum of $5000 will be divided equally among all applicants.

6. Grants are intended to support such projects as, but are not limited to:
   a. application of innovative instructional methods to be used in a course;
   b. exploration of new or different means of assessing learning in a course;
   c. development of team-teaching strategies within a course;
   d. integration of new technologies into a course, but only if they are part of broader pedagogical strategy;
   e. development of a new course, but only if the course contains significant pedagogical innovations.

7. Grants are normally not made for items such as computer software, web page design, or equipment. Monies for these items are available from other university sources.

8. Grants are not awarded for innovations within a program.

9. There are no restrictions on additional funding given to faculty for other projects during the grant period. However, faculty may not receive funding from other sources for the specific project proposed in the grant application to CTE.
10. Faculty may not receive funding from CTE grants for two consecutive years.

11. Reviews of the grant applications by the Committee on Excellence in Teaching will be blind. Names and departments of applicants will be removed before the proposals are evaluated by the committee. Thus, applicants should include their names only on the cover sheet of the proposal.

12. Proposals should contain language that is understandable to faculty colleagues in a wide variety of disciplines. Thus, the use of jargon should be avoided.

13. The committee assumes that the applicant is already familiar with the problem, technology, or innovation on which the project focuses. Thus, the proposal should be a specific formulation of a problem where the applicant has already researched the relevant background literature.

14. Proposals should carefully follow the “Outline of Project Description” contained in these documents.

15. Proposals received by the Director after the due date listed on the grant calendar page will not be considered for an award.

16. Copies of all of the forms needed for submitting a grant will also be on line on the CTE web site.

17. A selection of final reports of previously funded grants is available for perusal, and may be used as a guide. Please contact the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence for access to these.

18. Proposals are due to your Chair, Dean, and the Center for Teaching Excellence (Suite 3000) by January 28, 2011.
Dear Applicant:

The following timetable is provided to help you in preparing your application. You may want to use this as a checklist to ensure that all materials reach the appropriate offices at the designated times.

December 1, 2010  Letters inviting proposals are sent to all continuing, full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty.

January 28, 2011  A copy of the proposal is due to Center for Teaching Excellence, University Hall Suite 3000.

Other copies of the proposal, along with the appropriate evaluation form, are also due to your department Chair and Dean.

February 9, 2011  Chairs’ and Deans’ evaluations are due to the Center for Teaching Excellence, UHall Suite 3000.

February 28, 2011  Recipients of R. Patricia Walsh Grants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning are notified.

March 18, 2011  Faculty Acceptance Letters are Due to the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Mid-May, 2011  80% of grant is awarded, conditional upon Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) approval; if applicable.

The date for oral presentation of the completed project in the Center for Teaching Excellence is to be arranged in consultation with the Director.

The final written report is due to the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence when the oral presentation is given.

The final 20% of grant is awarded upon completion of the oral presentation and the written report before September 15th, 2013.
On separate sheets of paper, provide the project title and a narrative covering the following items. Proposals should contain language that is understandable to faculty and colleagues in a wide variety of disciplines. The narrative should not exceed four double-spaced pages. Use a 12 point font and approximately one inch margins. An additional bibliography page listing references/citations pertinent to the project may be added as a 5th page. Arrange the narrative using each of the headings listed below.

1. **Project Question(s):** Give a brief specific statement of the teaching issue or pedagogical innovation you plan to investigate. State the research question for your investigation.

2. **Background Research:** Summarize the relevant background literature in the area of the project. You should have thoroughly researched the scholarly teaching and learning literature on this topic.

3. **Learning Outcomes:** Describe your anticipated learning outcomes. They should be clearly delineated and appropriate.

4. **Methods:** Describe how you will conduct your investigation. Indicate the methods or techniques you plan to use as well as the data or evidence that you plan to collect to investigate your research question.

5. **Assessment:** Describe how you will assess the success of your project. Valid assessment requires more than anecdotal evidence. For example, simply stating that you will solicit students’ opinions of the innovation will usually not be considered an adequate assessment plan. The assessment plan should be clearly defined and significant.

6. **Calendar:** Describe your work plan and indicate the dates associated with the beginning, major parts of execution, and completion of the project. Ensure that the amount of work you are proposing to do fits appropriately into your projected timeline.

7. **Interest:** Clarify how the results of the project, and its presentation in CTE, will be of interest to other LMU faculty.

8. **Value:** Clarify how the project is significant enough to deserve funding, and how the results of the project could be disseminated outside of the LMU community.

**Project descriptions that do not meet the required format and length restrictions will not be considered for evaluation.**
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COVER PAGE
R. PATRICIA WALSH
GRANTS IN THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING
2011-2012

Please include a cover page on your proposal, using the following format:

Name:

Title of Project:

Department:

Academic Rank:

Campus Address:
   Building-
   Room Number-
   Mail Code-

Campus Phone:

Email Address:

Name of Chair Evaluating the Proposal:

Name of Dean Evaluating the Proposal:

Projected Date for Start of Project:

Projected Date for Completion of Project:

Projected Date for Presentation of the Project in the Center for Teaching Excellence:

Do not include your name on any of the other materials in your application packet except the “Conditions pertaining to R. Patricia Walsh Grants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” signature page. The proposals will be submitted to a blind review by the Committee on Excellence in Teaching.
Dear Applicant,

Please read carefully the following items. Your application cannot be considered unless all appropriate signatures are completed.

I. I understand that the funding of a R. Patricia Walsh Grant in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for 2011-2012 requires that I have signed and returned a valid contract for full-time teaching at LMU for the 2011-2012 academic year.

Signature ___________________________

II. I agree to allow the Center for Teaching Excellence to publish my final report in some format after consultation between the Director of CTE and myself.

Signature ___________________________

III. If this project uses human subjects, I agree to submit the proposal, if accepted, to the Human Subject Review Board, and to give a copy of the approval to the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence. I understand that this proposal will not be funded until the Director of the CTE has received the requested HSRB approval.

Signature ___________________________

IV. I agree to obtain written permission from any student whose work will be publicly disseminated (for example posted on the internet).

Signature ___________________________

V. I understand that if I do not complete the final report and CTE presentation before September 15th, 2013, I relinquish the final 20 percent of the grant stipend.

Signature ___________________________
This form is due by Monday, February 9, 2011 to Nick Mattos, Administrative Coordinator, Center for Teaching Excellence, University Hall Suite 3000. There is no need to return the proposal to CTE.

The Committee on Excellence in Teaching would appreciate your evaluation of the course development project proposed by ___________________________.

It is important that you give a numerical rating for each item so that the committee can fairly evaluate the proposal.

1. Project Question: Has the applicant defined the teaching issue and an appropriate research question?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has not defined the teaching issue or stated a research question.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue but has not stated a research question.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue but the stated research question is not appropriate.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue and a research question, but there are some concerns with the question.</td>
<td>Applicant has clearly defined the teaching issue and an appropriate research question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2. Background Research: Has the applicant researched the scholarly teaching aspect of the grant topic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has not performed background research on the discipline or the teaching aspect.</td>
<td>Applicant appears to have researched the discipline but not the teaching aspect.</td>
<td>Applicant appears to have done a cursory research on the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
<td>Applicant has done a good job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
<td>Applicant has done a thorough job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
3. Learning Outcomes: Are expected learning outcomes clearly delineated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes are not presented.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are unclearly stated.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are clearly stated but do not seem appropriate for the research question.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are clearly stated but there are some concerns with them.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes are clearly defined and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

4. Methods: Is the methodology of the project clearly stated and appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant does not state any methodology.</td>
<td>Methodology is not appropriate or methodological detail is lacking.</td>
<td>Methodology is barely appropriate or methodological details are vague.</td>
<td>Methodology is appropriate and methodological detail is clear.</td>
<td>Methodology is very appropriate and methodological detail is very clearly worked out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

5. Assessment: Is there a significant assessment plan presented for the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment plan is not presented.</td>
<td>An assessment plan is clearly presented but it is not appropriate for the research question.</td>
<td>An assessment plan is clearly presented but there are some concerns with the plan.</td>
<td>An assessment plan is clearly presented and appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
6. Substance: Is this project substantial enough to warrant a SoTL grant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is not substantial enough to warrant SoTL grant.</td>
<td>Project is somewhat substantial.</td>
<td>Project is substantial enough to warrant SoTL grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

7. Calendar: Does it seem plausible that the project will be completed in the projected time frame?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is not likely to be completed in proposed time.</td>
<td>Project might be completed in proposed time.</td>
<td>Project will almost definitely be completed in the proposed time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

8. Interest: Will presentation of the project help other LMU faculty to improve their teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic would be of minimal interest to others besides the applicant.</td>
<td>Topic would be of some interest to multiple disciplines at LMU.</td>
<td>Topic would be extremely interesting to multiple disciplines at LMU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
9. Value: Will this project add significantly to the SoTL body of knowledge?

| Work is not likely to be published or presented outside of LMU. | Proposed work is not likely to be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal. | Proposed work might be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal. | Proposed work would probably be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal. | The proposed work has a strong chance of being accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal. |

Comment:

10. Global rating: Overall, how would you rate the quality of the proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Critical to fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
Dean’s Evaluation  
R. Patricia Walsh  
Grants in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning  
2011-2012

This form is due by Monday, February 9, 2011 to Nick Mattos, Administrative Coordinator, Center for Teaching Excellence, University Hall Suite 3000. There is no need to return the proposal to CTE.

The Committee on Excellence in Teaching would appreciate your evaluation of the course development project proposed by ___________________________.

It is important that you give a numerical rating for each item so that the committee can fairly evaluate the proposal.

1. Project Question: Has the applicant defined the teaching issue and an appropriate research question?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has not defined the teaching issue or stated a research question.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue but has not stated a research question.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue but the stated research question is not appropriate.</td>
<td>Applicant has defined the teaching issue and a research question, but there are some concerns with the question.</td>
<td>Applicant has clearly defined the teaching issue and an appropriate research question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

2. Background Research: Has the applicant researched the scholarly teaching aspect of the grant topic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant has not performed background research on the discipline or the teaching aspect.</td>
<td>Applicant appears to have researched the discipline but not the teaching aspect.</td>
<td>Applicant appears to have done a cursory research on the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
<td>Applicant has done a good job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
<td>Applicant has done a thorough job of researching the teaching aspect of the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
3. Learning Outcomes: Are expected learning outcomes clearly delineated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcomes are not presented.</th>
<th>Learning outcomes are unclearly stated.</th>
<th>Learning outcomes are clearly stated but do not seem appropriate for the research question.</th>
<th>Learning outcomes are clearly stated but there are some concerns with them.</th>
<th>Learning outcomes are clearly defined and appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

4. Methods: Is the methodology of the project clearly stated and appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant does not state any methodology.</th>
<th>Methodology is not appropriate or methodological detail is lacking.</th>
<th>Methodology is barely appropriate or methodological details are vague.</th>
<th>Methodology is appropriate and methodological detail is clear.</th>
<th>Methodology is very appropriate and methodological detail is very clearly worked out.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:

5. Assessment: Is there a significant assessment plan presented for the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An assessment plan is not presented.</th>
<th>An assessment plan is clearly presented but it is not appropriate for the research question.</th>
<th>An assessment plan is clearly presented but there are some concerns with the plan.</th>
<th>An assessment plan is clearly presented and appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment:
6. Substance: Is this project substantial enough to warrant a SoTL grant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is not substantial enough to warrant SoTL grant.</td>
<td>Project is somewhat substantial.</td>
<td>Project is substantial enough to warrant SoTL grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

7. Calendar: Does it seem plausible that the project will be completed in the projected time frame?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is not likely to be completed in proposed time.</td>
<td>Project might be completed in proposed time.</td>
<td>Project will almost definitely be completed in the proposed time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

8. Interest: Will presentation of the project help other LMU faculty to improve their teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic would be of minimal interest to others besides the applicant.</td>
<td>Topic would be of some interest to multiple disciplines at LMU.</td>
<td>Topic would be extremely interesting to multiple disciplines at LMU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
9. **Value: Will this project add significantly to the SoTL body of knowledge?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work is not likely to be published or presented outside of LMU.</td>
<td>Proposed work is not likely to be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal.</td>
<td>Proposed work might be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal.</td>
<td>Proposed work would probably be accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal.</td>
<td>The proposed work has a strong chance of being accepted for publication in a scholarly teaching journal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

10. **Global rating: Overall, how would you rate the quality of the proposal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical to fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: