Southern Connecticut State University
Faculty Development Advisory Committee (FDAC)

Request for Proposals for Faculty Development Grants (FDG)

For the most up-to-date information, please visit
https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-development/grants/fund-grants

Table of Contents

General Provisions

This grant opportunity is open to all full- and part-time faculty. The FDAC invites and encourages proposals from all schools, departments, programs, affinity groups and individuals to "…enhance their ability to be productive and innovative professionals…" as specified in Article 9.6 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Affinity groups are defined as two or more faculty from different disciplines sharing a common interest. The Committee suggests that proposals submitted by a school, department, or program be reviewed and supported by its members. The Committee suggests that the dean(s) of the appropriate school(s) review submissions from affinity groups and individuals.

Sponsored activities are primarily provided for all full- and part-time faculty and may be open to other members of the University and the community at the discretion of the proposer.

While all schools, departments, programs, affinity groups, and individual faculty are eligible to apply, priority will be given to meritorious proposals from applicants who have not been granted awards during the last request for proposals. Prior funding does not guarantee future funding. Applicants should note that these grants are competitive and that funds are limited. FDAC members are eligible to apply. FDAC members who submit a Faculty Development and/or Curriculum-Related Activity Grant may continue to serve on the Committee but shall recuse themselves completely from the proposal review and budget allocation processes.

Performance Period

Faculty Development Grants will be awarded this year beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June 30, 2022. Requests for extensions may be granted when an extenuating circumstance significantly alters the timeline proposed for the project. Such requests are subject to the approval of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs within 30 days of the end of the grant period.

Criterion

The criterion for evaluating faculty development proposals is the potential of the proposed project to enhance the ability of the faculty, the primary audience, to be productive and innovative professionals. More specifically, proposals will be reviewed in accordance with the following standards: the potential to benefit groups of faculty and the potential to enhance instruction or creative activity. Evaluation of proposals is based on rigor and content first and amount of funding second. Proposers should request funding necessary to achieve successful outcomes. Additionally, funds are expected to expand opportunities for future funding, publications, teaching and scholarship.

Review Criteria

The Faculty Development Advisory Committee will use the following criteria to rate the quality and completeness of the proposals submitted:

1. <u>Significance</u>: Presentation of a well-focused and worthy purpose, per the Priorities named below.

2. <u>Work Plan</u>: An appropriate and feasible methodology and a plan of action that will result in the accomplishment of the objectives of the project. The plan should be appropriate to the nature of the proposal and should include a timeline. If funds are being requested to purchase equipment or materials, the proposal should describe the specific activities for which the equipment is needed.

3. <u>Budget Proposal</u>: Inclusion of a realistic budget of no more than $12,000 in direct costs that is clearly stated, justified and consistent with items 1 and 2 above.

Priorities

Faculty Development Grants should address programs that improve or develop faculty knowledge and skills in areas of teaching, advising, or creative activity.

1. Recommended programs and activities can include—but are not limited to—workshops, seminars, conferences, colloquia, and consultants that increase faculty members' skills and capacities in the following areas:
   - Improving teaching, advising, and/or mentoring, especially focused on retention, interdisciplinary courses, hybrid/online courses, writing-intensive courses, with culturally responsive pedagogy, and/or technology.
   - Enhancing and defining Southern's commitment to social justice, human diversity
   - Engaging in scholarly and creative activity, especially establishing and maintaining disciplinary or interdisciplinary scholarly and creative activity affinity groups.
   - Developing faculty capacities to serve in leaderships roles.
   - Offering single or multiple day trainings/conferences (e.g., University Forum, Teaching Academy, leadership workshops, Summer Tech).

2. In rare cases, proposals supporting individual attendance at off-campus institutes, special training programs, or consultation with outstanding experts unable to come to Southern will be considered by the committee if:
   - Presented by a department, program, or affinity group; and
   - The activity is an indispensable component of a development project for the group and is supported by a majority of the group.
   - It is expected that the awardee will formally share with other faculty–through workshops or presentations–the expertise gained as a result of the participation in the program of enhancement.

Review of the Proposals by the Faculty Development Advisory Committee

Faculty Development Grants are reviewed by FDAC, which is comprised of two members from each academic school, up to four at-large members, one member each from Library Services and Counseling Services, and one member from each of the following governance bodies: Faculty Senate, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Curriculum Forum, and SCSU-AAUP Chapter. The Director of Faculty Development is the Committee Chairperson. FDAC makes funding recommendations to the Provost.

Rules

The following rules apply to all proposals. A grant proposal must contain the following components and adhere to the following rules:

1. All proposals must be completed using the Kuali proposal system. No emailed documents will be accepted. Character limits for each answer field must be respected.
2. Only <u>one proposal per project</u> or activity (e.g. per conference, workshop series, training seminar) will be accepted and considered for funding. Only <u>one proposal per person</u> (e.g. proposed individually or jointly) will be accepted and considered for funding. If one person submits two proposals or two proposals are submitted for the same project, neither will be reviewed for funding.
3. Acknowledgement of the co-proposers is required. Once the application is submitted via the Kuali submission portal, an email notification will be sent to the co-proposers. Co-proposers must acknowledge receipt of the proposal via the Kuali Research platform.
4. Acknowledgement of the department chair(s) is required. Once the application is submitted via the Kuali submission portal and the co-proposers have acknowledged receipt of the proposal, a notification will be sent to the chairperson(s). The chairperson(s) must acknowledge receipt of the proposal.
5. All acknowledgements must be received within three business days of the application deadline. It is the principal proposer's responsibility to ensure acknowledgements are completed. It is strongly recommended that the main proposer alert his/her co-proposers and chairperson(s) of their roles and responsibilities in the submission process *before* submitting the proposal via Kuali Research.
6. Funded activities must be promoted by proposers. Contact Integrated Communication and Marketing directly to get events added to the university calendar. Consider using an email/social marketing campaign(s).
7. All promotion and event materials should contain the phrase, "This activity is funded by a Faculty Development Grant at Southern Connecticut State University."

Restrictions

1. Requested funds must be for the support of the aims stated above.
2. Approved awards are limited to a maximum of $12,000. Proposals submitted that request more than $12,000 will be returned without review. For joint proposals, it is necessary to describe the contribution of each member in detail. Up to $2,000 of the requested funds can be used to compensate project manager(s) with adequate justification. Requests for project manager compensation will only be considered for significant events. Examples of project manager compensation would include, but are not limited to, managing a well-promoted conference of a full day or longer with multiple speakers, panels, and related events designed for an audience of

50 or more, managing a well-promoted training seminar delivered over multiple dates for an audience of 25 or more.

3. Requested funds are <u>not</u> to be used for supply or equipment purchases except for materials integral to the project.

4. All honorariums are expected to come with concomitant justification: consultant/speaker names, credentials, qualifications, location, and any other associated fees. The suggested honoraria range is $99* to $2,500.

   a. *State employees (including but not limited to student workers, graduate assistants, university assistants, department secretaries, administrative faculty, full-time teaching faculty, and administrators) cannot be compensated for professional services rendered. <u>Any other State of Connecticut employee solicited as a consultant may not receive an honorarium that is more than $99.00</u>.

5. If this or a similar Faculty Development Grant activity has been funded and implemented previously, evaluation summaries along with final report from the previous year's/years' activities must be submitted to the Office of Faculty Development and the SPaR office *before* a new proposal submission.

Information to be Included in the Proposal

- A design to encourage maximum participation among members of the faculty
- A marketing and promotions plan. (Your department and/or Integrated Communication and Marketing may be able to help provide promotional support services for conferences, workshops, and seminars.)
- An itemized budget.
- A rationale for requesting Faculty Development Fund support.

Calendar for 2021-2022 Faculty Development

- January 11, 2021   Kuali Research submission portal opens
  (visit https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-development/grants/fund-grants)

- January 13 and 20, 2021   1:00 p.m. Q&A session for Kuali Research submission
                                               process, sponsored by SPaR (click here to register)

- February 1, 2021   4:00 p.m. deadline for submission of completed
                                               proposals via Kuali Research. Acknowledgements from co-
                                               proposers and chairperson(s) due within three business days.

- By May 1, 2021   Awards announced

- July 1, 2021   Grant activity cycle begins

- June 30, 2022   Grant activity cycle ends

- August 1, 2022   Final Report due

Submission Procedures

Proposals must be submitted via Kuali Research by 4pm on the due date (see the Calendar above). It is the responsibility of the applicant to submit the proposal on time and to ensure all acknowledgements by co-proposer(s) and chairperson(s). **Late proposals will not be accepted.** Individuals who have previously received awards under this program must have a report on the project with the below-mentioned materials to the Office of Faculty Development and SPaR in order to be considered for the current FDAC Grant award cycle.

Reporting Outcomes

Any funds awarded for this grant cycle must be expended by June 30, 2022. **Reports must be submitted via Kuali Research by August 1, 2022** and include:
- A one-page summary of project outcomes,
- Evaluation summary, and
- Attendance list(s).

These reports will be reviewed by the Faculty Development Advisory Committee.

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2021 Faculty Development Grant Proposal
Application Guidelines

- Applications must be submitted via the submission portal ([Kuali Research](#)) by 4 p.m. on February 1, 2021. Acknowledgements must be received within three business days of the deadline.
- The submission portal will open on January 11, 2021.
  - The link to the portal will be located on the website for the Office of Faculty Development (https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-development/grants/fund-grants). Please check this site often as it will have the most up-to-date information.
- Q&A sessions for help with the submission portal will be held by SPaR on January 13 and 20, 2021, at 1:00 p.m. (see calendar above). [Please click here to register](#).

In the application, proposers will need to provide:
- Contact information (including co-proposers and chairpersons)
- Project title
- Abstract (max 500 characters)
- Answers to the following questions
  - Faculty Development Goals and Description of Activity: What is being proposed; what are the goals; what is the rationale for the activity? Please present a brief timeline for the activity. If external consultants are proposed, please identify the criteria for their selection. (max 2,500 characters)
  - Evaluation of the proposed activity: How, specifically, will you determine the degree to which the project achieved its stated goals? (max 1,500 characters)
  - Target Faculty Participants: Describe the audience to which the proposed activity is directed. Describe the level of interest for this project demonstrated by the audience. The proposal should clearly reflect the potential benefit to the professional development of SCSU faculty, rather than its potential benefit to other groups. (max 850 characters)
  - Rationale for Faculty Development Fund Support: Describe why you consider the Faculty Development Fund the most appropriate source to support the proposed program. (max 850 characters)
- Budget with justifications
  - Include things like catering quote, room reservation(s); incidentals need to be detailed, explained, justified costs. Reminder: All honorariums are expected to come with concomitant justification: consultant/speaker names, credentials, qualifications, location, and any other associated fees. The suggested honoraria range is $99* to $2,500.
  - Note that CSCU employees (including but not limited to student workers, graduate assistants, university assistants, department secretaries, administrative faculty, full-time teaching faculty, and administrators) cannot be compensated for professional services rendered. Any other State of Connecticut employee solicited as a consultant may not receive an honorarium that is more than $99.00.

When applying for the grant, applicants will need to agree to the following:
- that all required paperwork such as honorarium requests, catering orders, etc. will be filed with the Office of Faculty Development/SPaR no later than four weeks prior to the scheduled event.
- that an attendance record and evaluation instrument are part of the reporting process.
- that this project will not be funded until the attendance, evaluation and expense information for a previous FDAC grant is filed with the Office of Faculty Development.

- that this project is intended to be of most benefit to full and part-time faculty and not guests also in attendance (e.g. students) as these are funds provided by the Collective Bargaining Agreement/AAUP.
- that the deadline to submit a report describing results/outcomes of my/our project to the Office of Faculty Development is due August 1, 2022.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GRANT CYCLE 2021-2022

Rubric

APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Criterion	Yes	No
Word count of completed proposal does not exceed character limits.		
There is only one project for this proposal or activity. (Not different people seeking funding for same project/activity)		
There is only one project proposed by this individual. (Not multiple projects nor listed multiple times on joint projects)		
Chairperson(s) has(ve) acknowledged the project/received notification.		
Budget does not exceed $12,000.		
Requests are not for equipment purchases.		
Budget does not include more than $2000 in faculty compensation for project management.		
All honorariums include detailed justification.		
If a similar Faculty Development Grant activity has been previously funded, evaluation summaries and final report from the previous activities accompany the proposal.		

Any "No" in the checklist above means that the proposal does not move past initial review.

Criterion	Exemplary	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Proposal is from applicant that did not receive grant during last cycle	Did not receive grant last cycle. (3)	Did receive grant last cycle. (1)	Information not available. (0)
Proposal benefits faculty at multiple levels	Audience is well described AND level of interest has been clearly demonstrated. (8)	Audience is described AND some evidence of interest has been presented. (4)	Audience is minimally described OR the level of interest has not been included. (0)
	Audience is school/college wide OR wider (campus-wide). (8)	Audience includes faculty beyond those directly involved in proposal. (4)	Audience is limited to proposer(s). (0)
Proposal seems likely to enhance instruction or creative activity	Potential benefit to the professional development of SCSU faculty, rather than its potential benefit to other groups has been included AND the likelihood of that benefit has been addressed. (10)	Potential benefit to the professional development of SCSU faculty, rather than its potential benefit to other groups has been presented. (5)	Potential benefit to the professional development of SCSU faculty, rather than its potential benefit to other groups in unclear. (0)
Priorities	Clearly addresses one or more of the priorities listed in the CFP. (4)	Addresses one or more of the priorities listed in the CFP but the description of the way the program addresses the priority may be superficial. (2)	Does not address one or more of the priorities listed in the CFP. (0)
Significance / Goal	Proposal is well-focused and provides clear goal. (8)	Proposal provides clear goal but may be unevenly focused on that goal. (4)	Proposal is either unfocused OR does not provide a clear goal. (0)
	Proposal provides clear and compelling evidence of a worthy purpose. (8)	Proposal provides some evidence of a worthy purpose. (4)	Proposal provides limited to no evidence of a worthy purpose. (0)

Work plan	Work plan provides clear evidence that the actions will achieve the stated goal. (3)	Work plan provides some evidence that the actions will achieve the stated goal. (1)	Work plan provides limited or no evidence that the actions will achieve the stated goal. (0)
	Work plan provides clear evidence that the plan can be accomplished. (3)	Work plan provides some evidence that the plan can be accomplished. (1)	Work plan provides little or no evidence that the plan can be accomplished. (0)
	Work plan provides a high level of detail describing the intended marketing and promotions plan. (3)	Work plan provides a sufficient level of detail describing the intended marketing and promotions plan. (1)	Work plan provides limited or no detail describing the intended marketing and promotions plan. (0)
	Work plan provides a high level of detail describing how the success of the grant will be evaluated. (3)	Work plan provides a sufficient level of detail describing how the success of the grant will be evaluated. (1)	Work plan provides limited or no detail describing how the success of the grant will be evaluated. (0)
	The timeline is both specific AND reasonable to achieve the goals of the project. (3)	The details of the timeline may be uneven, but the timeline is reasonable to achieve the goals of the project. (1)	The timeline is vague OR may not be reasonable to achieve the goals of the project. (0)

Budget	Budget is specific, it includes all proposed expenditures with description for each cost AND a clear justification for each cost (adequacy, appropriateness and importance). (5)	Budget is specific, it includes all proposed expenditures with description for each cost AND a justification for each cost (adequacy, appropriateness and importance) but the justification may be uneven in its level of detail. (2)	Budget is specific, it includes all proposed expenditures with description for each cost BUT the justification for each cost (adequacy, appropriateness and importance) lacks sufficient detail. (0)
	Clear rationale for why the Faculty Development Fund the most appropriate source to support the proposed program. (5)	Some rationale for why the Faculty Development Fund the most appropriate source to support the proposed program, but it may be unevenly described. (2)	Limited or no rationale for why the Faculty Development Fund the most appropriate source to support the proposed program. (0)
Total possible: 74			