

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TEACHING GRANTS COMMITTEE

I. Date: March 16, 1988

To: Conner Atkeson, Chair of the Faculty

From: Dr. Bonnie W. Duldt
Chair, Teaching Grants Committee

II. Membership of the Committee

Ex-Officio:

Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs or an appointed representative, Myra Cain

Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement, or an appointed representative, Emily Kane

Mike Bassman
Meta Downes
Bonnie Duldt, Chair
Don Guest
Kathleen Kennedy
Doug Kruger
Hollie Mathews, Vice Chair
Charles Schwartz
Charles Snow
Don Spence
Paul Varlashkin, Secretary
Sandra Wurth-Hough

III. Committee meetings:

8/19/88 Organizational meeting
Members absent: none

9/14/88 Met to finalize forms and discuss policies.
Members absent: Don Guest and Don Spence

2/15/88 Met to discuss proposals and policies.
Members absent: Mike Bassman and Holly Mathews

2/22/88 Continued discussion of proposals and policies.
Members absent: Mike Bassman

2/29/88 Completed selection and other business.
Members absent: Mike Bassman, Meta Downs, and Holly Mathews.

Note: Orientation meetings: 11/2/87 and 11/5/87, with Research Grants Committee Chair, the Teaching Grants Chair presented orientation workshops for faculty.

- IV. Date of reports to the Faculty Senate during the year.
None.
- V. Specific instructions, if any, given to the committee by the Faculty Senate, other than those found in the committee's Constitutional charge: None.
- VI. A brief statement of committee organization, subcommittees, research activities, etc.: None other than outlined in the committee's Constitutional charge.
- VII. List of committee accomplishments including recommendations made to agencies other than the Faculty Senate.
1. The committee reviewed and selected teaching grant proposals to recommend to the Vice Chancellor for academic funding.
 - a. Maria Malby and Myron Gluck, "Computer Aided Instruction (CAI) Learning Modules for Russian Language Study," for \$770.50.
 - b. Charles Ziehr, "Geographic Information Systems (GIS): Geography's Newest Technology with Multidisciplinary Applicability," for \$1,326.15.
 - c. Maryellen McSweeney & Dorothy L. Merrow, "An Instructional Package of Paper-and-Pencil & Computer Materials on Data Processing," for \$1,002.00.
 - d. Sylvene Spickerman & Sylvia Brown, "Use of Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument to Increase the Student's Repertoire of Conflict Management Styles," for \$430.00.
 - e. Gary C. Smith, "Video Technology in Environmental Health," for \$960.00.

And for summer stipends:

- a. Kathleen Kennedy, "Development of a New Biotechnology Methods Course."
- b. William R. Hoots, Jr., "Time Standards in Industry."
- c. Jeannie Golden, "Graduate Internship in Assessment of Families Who Have Children With Mental, Behavioral, and/or Emotional Handicaps."
- d. Edith M. Rand, "Proposal to Develop Concept-Based Modules in Organic Chemistry for Supplemental Use in Introductory Chemistry Courses."
- e. Carmine P. F. Scavo, "Incorporating Video Techniques into Current Course Syllabi."
- f. Nancy L. Spalding, "The Political Economy of Development in the Modern World."

2. Some suggestions for revision of the grant proposal application form were noted to be considered by the membership of this committee next year. These are as follows:
 - a. Emphasize the three page limitation for narrative.
The only attachment acceptable would be a brochure giving details of a program or presentation.
 - b. Request information about the faculty member already having release time to develop a course. Request a listing of the courses the applicant taught the last three semesters.
 - c. Proposal needs to be disqualified if the project is an administrative assignment, such as developing a program handbook or recruitment materials.
 - d. Decide whether to continue accepting second and third year proposals from the same faculty member or to disqualify previous year's recipients...for academic year only or for summer stipends also.
 - e. Consider the element of cost effectiveness in the evaluation criteria of proposals.
 - f. Need to add an evaluation item #5 about the "impact" of the proposal in terms of effect upon teaching; this is to be differentiated from "need."
3. Some suggestions for revision of the proposal review process were also noted to be considered by the membership of this committee next year. These suggestions would tend to provide a more equitable distribution of the tasks, increase involvement of all members, and facilitate the forward movement of the review process group discussions do. These are as follows:
 - a. Before beginning the review process, the committee needs to have information about:
 - 1) the funds available for the teaching grant awards so that the committee can be aware of limitations and possibilities;
 - 2) the status of funded proposals of previous years; and
 - 3) a report listing all proposals previously funded by the committee.
 - b. That individual members of the committee be assigned the role of "presenter" for a fair share of the proposals. This role would involve the following:
 - 1) becoming exceptionally familiar with the assigned proposals;
 - 2) during the committee meeting, making an appropriate motion to open discussion of the proposal;
 - 3) after the second, to initiate the discussion by briefly reviewing the proposal, amplifying and clarifying as necessary during the discussion; and

4) upon completion of the committee's work,
provide written and verbal feedback to the
faculty who submitted the assigned
proposals.

- c. That all members continue being responsible for reviewing and scoring all proposals.
- d. That the Chair continue to analyze the committee members' scoring of all proposals and to prepare spreadsheets for communicating this analysis at the initial review meeting.
- e. That the Chair write letters to faculty whose proposals are recommended for funding, thanking them for participating, reporting the committee's recommendations, and providing feedback about the ranking of their proposals.

VIII. Citation of the resolution numbers of Senate resolutions that originated with the committee.
None.

XI. Proposals and/or business to be carried over to next year:
(None so far)

X. Evaluation of the Committee:
A. Structure: satisfactory.
B. Duties: satisfactory.
C. Functions: satisfactory.
D. Personnel: satisfactory.

XI. Suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the committee:
None.

Signed: Chair

Bonnie W. Dault

Secretary

Paul Varkarukin