

EDC Small Grants Program Application Form

Information and Instructions for Applicants

Deadline: Apply anytime. (Responses may be slower over holidays.)

Please follow the instructions below; they simplify the work of our reviews considerably. Thank you in advance.

Step 1

- Please read the guidelines carefully

Step 2

- Save your file as a Word document (doc or docx)
- Name it **your family name_14_smallgrant.doc**
for example, **borin_14_smallgrant.doc**

Step 3

Please adhere to these guidelines in preparing your application:

Form: Please use the form below in the order seen.

Fonts: Use Arial

Formatting: Do not include headers, footers, logos, appendices or any other material.

Identification: To ensure blind review, be sure to remove any 'hidden identifiers', such as the document author in 'properties' from your Word file and don't include information identifying your center or institution.

Overall: Don't attach additional documents or refer reviewers to websites or other information (we want to keep the process short and simple).

Step 4

Send to: borin@ryerson.ca

Paola Borin, EDC Vice Chair, Professional Development

Subject: **EDC Small Grant Application**

EDC Small Grants Application Form

1. Applicant information	
Principal applicant's Name	Mr. Albert Johnson Associate Director (Instructional Development)
Department/Unit and Institution/Organization	DELTS (Distance Education, Learning and Teaching Support) Memorial University
Mailing address (incl. street name and postal code)	G. A. Hickman Building Memorial University St. John's, NL A1B 3X8
Email address	albertj@mun.ca
Phone number	(709) 864-7697
Please provide the same information for each co-applicant.	Dr. Trudi Johnson, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, G. A. Hickman Building, Memorial University, St. John's, NL, A1B 3X8 Dr. Anna Hicks, Teaching Consultant, DELTS, Memorial University, G. A. Hickman Building, Memorial University, St. John's, NL, A1B 3X8
2. Title Short and informative!	In recognition of complexity: A comprehensive assessment inventory for university teaching
Intended outcomes - specific anticipated outcomes of the proposed project, including specific activities to be completed and an anticipated timeline. Projects are to be completed within one year of funding approval.	The purpose of this project is to create a comprehensive assessment inventory for university teaching. Using an interdisciplinary approach, the research team will carry out a meta-analysis of assessment research conducted in a number of areas in education and psychology. The assessment will inventory concepts such as teaching methodology; student engagement; relationships with students, other faculty and administrators, and content area; emotional engagement, teacher efficacy and the emotional impact of teaching on university instructors. The researchers will use STLHE's Ethical Principles in University Teaching as a framework for the assessment. The instrument will focus on support rather than evaluation, providing faculty and faculty developers with an inventory of teaching skills and aptitudes for the purpose of reflection and the development of an effective and efficient professional development plan for educators at the university level.
Timeline and activities: (eg. Jan. – contact collaborators)	April 2014 – gather the research team, start the literature review and the environmental scan (review of assessment activities currently underway in other universities) May to August 2014 – complete the literature review and environmental scan

	<p>September to December 2014 – analyze the findings of the literature review and environmental scan, create an assessment instrument and establish data collection methodologies</p> <p>December 2014 – projected completion and publishing of the report</p>
<p>Rationale – How does the project enhance the practice and/or scholarship of educational development at a local, provincial, national or international level? How does this project advance the EDC Living Professional Development Plan?</p>	<p>University teaching is a complex activity that is a culmination of many factors. Each instructional context brings with it its own set of unique variables. The assessment of university teaching, therefore, has to be comprehensive in scope and yet dynamic enough to adapt to the multitude of contexts in which teaching is carried out. Numerous studies have indicated that the assessment of teaching is a multifaceted activity that should utilize a number of data points in order to construct an accurate assessment of an educator’s practice.</p> <p>The purpose of this research is to conduct a meta-analysis of research on factors that are indicators of effective teaching and methods used to assess them. The purpose is to create a comprehensive and dynamic instrument or protocol that can be used to assess university teaching. The instrument will focus on support rather than evaluation, providing faculty and faculty developers with an inventory of teaching skills and aptitudes for the purpose of reflection and the development of an effective and efficient professional development plan for educators at the university level. The assessment will inventory concepts such as teaching methodology; student engagement; relationships with students, other faculty and administrators, and content area; emotional engagement, teacher efficacy and the emotional impact of teaching on university instructors. STLHE’s Ethical Principles in University Teaching will be used as a framework for the assessment.</p> <p>The team will investigate assessment strategies and instruments currently used by investigators in educational (e.g., student course evaluation questionnaires, student engagement inventories), sociological (e.g., workplace engagement inventories) and psychological (e.g., emotional engagement surveys, motivation inventories, teacher-efficacy questionnaires) research. The new inventory will include a number of data points and establish a protocol to weight these factors appropriately to provide a meaningful, research informed aggregate of data that indicates that can assess effective teaching.</p> <p>Establishing a systematic protocol to assess university teaching will be a significant breakthrough in a number of areas. A standard protocol to assess teaching would provide a stable framework to support research in teaching and learning. Also, a standard assessment protocol would have the potential for establishing a baseline of effective teaching that could impact university teaching provincially, nationally and internationally.</p>

	<p>This research advances the EDC Living Plan in a number of areas. First, the inventory will be made available as a resource to educational developers so that the protocol can evolve from practice. In an “open source” model, educational developers who use the inventory will be asked to share their experiences and suggest adaptations to the inventory for specific contexts. Second, the assessment inventory will have significant impact on the SoTL. Having a protocol that establishes a baseline of teaching will allow educational developers to benchmark and evaluate the effectiveness of specific strategies. Third, the development of the inventory supports valid, meaningful, and appropriate assessment of teaching and learning processes, practices and programs for the purpose of enhancement.</p> <p>The assessment of teaching at university, to be meaningful, must measure and apply appropriate weight to a complex array of interconnected variables. The purpose of this research is to develop a assessment protocol that is comprehensive and dynamic, making it applicable to a multitude of instructional context.</p>
<p>Scholarship - How is the project informed by relevant scholarly work?</p>	<p>This project is a meta-analysis of assessment research from a number of relevant areas. By using an interdisciplinary approach the research team will devise a comprehensive assessment inventory. We will consider research on the characteristics of effective teaching, educator and student engagement, student course evaluation analysis, motivation, emotional engagement in employment, teacher efficacy and a number of other factors.</p>
<p>References</p>	<p>Abrami, P.C., d’Apollonia, S. & Cohen, P.A. (1990). Validity of student ratings of instruction: What we know and what we do not. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 82(2), 219-231.</p> <p>Ahlfeldt, S., Mehta, S. & Sellnow, T. (2005). Measurement and analysis of student engagement in university classes where varying levels of PBL methods of instruction are in use. <i>Higher Education Research and Development</i>, 24(1), 5-20.</p> <p>Ang, R. (2005). Development and validation of the teacher-student relationship inventory using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, <i>Journal of Experimental Education</i>, 74(1), 55.</p> <p>Angelo, T.A. & Cross, K.P. (1993). <i>Classroom Assessment Techniques</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 13 – 23.</p>

- Arbuckle, J. & Williams, B.D. (2003). Students' Perceptions of Expressiveness: Age and Gender Effects on Teacher Evaluations. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 49(9-10), 507-516.
- Axelrod, P. (2008). Student perspectives on good teaching: What history reveals. *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education*, February 2008, 24-27. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from http://www.ocufa.on.ca/AM_Feb08/FEB08-P24.pdf
- Alexson, R.D. & Flick, A. (2011). Defining student engagement. *Change*, (Jan-Feb), 38-43.
- Beran, T., Violato, C., Kline, D. & Fridere, J. (2005). The utility of student ratings of instruction for students, faculty, and administrators: A "consequential validity" study. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 35(2), 49 – 59.
- Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 48-62.
- Chickering, A.W. & Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. Washington Center News.
- Clark, J. (1995). *Suggestions for Effective University Teaching*. Retrieved on April 24, 2007 from <http://io.uwinnipeg.ca/~clark/acad/teach/effteach.html>.
- Cohen, P.A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multi-section validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), 281–309.
- Coffey, M. & Gibbs, G. (2002). Measuring teachers' repertoire of teaching methods. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(4), 383-387.
- Cossier, M. (1998). Towards the design of a system of peer review of teaching for the advancement of the individual within the university. *Higher Education*, 35, 143-162.
- Cowan, J. (2014). Noteworthy matters for attention in reflective journal writing. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 15(1), 53-64.
- d'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P.C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1198-1208.
- Devlin, M. (2002). An improved questionnaire for gathering student perceptions of teaching and learning. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 21(3), 289-304.

- Delucchi, M. & Pelowski, S. (2000). The effect of instructor likeability and student perceptions of learning on overall ratings of teaching ability. *Radical Pedagogy*, 2(2). Retrieved October 24, 2007, from http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue2_2/delpel.html
- Delaney, J., Johnson, A., Johnson, T. & Treslan, D. (2010). *Students' perceptions of effective teaching in higher education*. St. John's, NL: Distance Education and Learning Technologies
- Ellett, C.D., Monsaas, J., Martin-Hansen, L. & Demir, A. (2012). Development and validation of a new measure of faculty assessment of reformed teaching and learning practices. *The Journal of General Education*, 61(4), 388-405.
- Entwistle, N., Skinner, D., Entwistle, D. & Orr, S. (2000). Conceptions and beliefs about "good teaching": An integration of contrasting research areas. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19(1), 5 – 26.
- Ertl, H., Wright, S. (2008). Reviewing the literature on the student learning experience in higher education. *London Review of Education*, 6(3), 195-210.
- Evans, T., & Nation, D. (2000). *Changing university teaching: Reflections on creating educational technologies*. London: Kogan Page.
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, (FSSE), Results for the University of Ottawa, 2006.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S.L., McDonough, M., Smith, M.K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H. & Wenderoth, M.P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. PNAS Retrieved from: www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas
- Friesen, E. (ed.) (2007). *A Handbook: Teaching at the University of Manitoba*.
- Grasha-Riechmann, *Teaching Style Survey*. Retrieved April 14, 2014, from <http://longleaf.net/teachingstyle.html>.
- Hart, S.R., Stewart, K. & Jimerson, S.R. (2011). The student engagement in schools questionnaire (SESQ) and the teacher engagement report form – New (TERF-N): Examining the preliminary evidence. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 15, 67-79.

- Hubball, H., Collins, J. & Pratt, D. (2005). Enhancing reflective teaching practices: Implications for faculty development programs. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 35(3), 57-81.
- Huybers, T. (2013). Student evaluation of teaching: the use of best-worst scaling. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), 496-513.
- Husbands, C.T. & Fosh, P. (1993). Students' evaluation of teaching in higher education: Experiences from four European countries and some implications of the practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(2), 95-115.
- Jackson, D.L., Teal, C.R., Raines, S.J., Nannsel, T.R., Force, R.C., and Burdsal, C.A. (1999). The dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(4), 580-596.
- Jennings, P.A. & Greenberg, M.T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491-525.
- Kahu, E.R. (2011). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758-773.
- Keller, J.W., Mattie, N., Vodanovich, S.J. & Piotrowski, C. (1991). Teaching effectiveness: Comparisons between traditional and nontraditional college students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 15(2), 177-184.
- Klassen, R.M., Yerdelen, S. & Durksen, T.L. (2013) Measuring Teacher engagement: Development of the Engaged Teachers Scale (ETS). *Frontline Learning Research*, 2, 33-52.
- Lindsay, R., Breen, R. & Jenkins, A. (2002). Academic research and teaching quality: The views of undergraduate and postgraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 309-27.
- Marsh, H. W. & Bailey, M. (1993). Multidimensional students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(1), 1-18.
- Marsh, H. W. & Hocevar, D. (1984). Factorial Invariance of Student Evaluation for College Teaching. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(2), 41-366.

- Marsh, H. W. & Hocevar, D. (1991). Students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: The stability of mean ratings of the same teachers over a 13-year period. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 7, 303-314.
- Marsh, H.W., and L. Roche, (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 217-251.
- Marsh, H.W. (2001). Distinguishing between good (useful) and bad workloads on students' evaluation of teaching. *American Educational Research Journal* 38(1): 183-212.
- Mazer, J.P. (2012). Associations among teacher communication behaviors, student interest, and engagement: A validity test. *Communication Education*, 62(1), 86-96.
- Meyer, D.K. & Turner, J.C. (2006). Re-conceptualizing emotion and motivation to learn in a classroom context. *Educational Psychology Review*, 18, 377-390.
- Meyer, J.H.F. & Eley, M.G. (2006). The approaches to teaching inventory: A critique of its development and applicability. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 633-649.
- Mostrom, A.M. & Blumberg, P. (2012). Does learning-centered teaching promote grade improvement? *Innovation in Higher Education*. DOI: 10.1007/510755-012-9216-1
- Murry, H., Gillese, E., Lennon, M., Mercer, P. & Robinson, M. (1996). *Ethical principles in university teaching*. Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Retrieved April 11, 2014, from <http://www.stlhe.ca/awards/3m-national-teaching-fellowships/initiatives/ethical-principles-in-university-teaching/>
- Nespar, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4).
- Pianta, R.C., Hamre, B.K. & Allen, J.P. (2012). Teacher-student relationships and engagement: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of classroom interactions. In S.L. Christenson, A.L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement*. Dordrecht, Netherlands:Springer.
- Piburn, M. & Sawada, D. (n.d). Reformed teaching observation protocol (RTOP): Reference Manual. *ACEPT Technical Report No. INOO-3*, Arizona Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers, 1-41.

- Rabow, J. (2006). *Excellent teaching in the excellent university: The search for voice among faculty and students*. Bethesda: Academica Press.
- Reid, L.F. (2012). Redesigning a large lecture course for student engagement: Process and outcomes. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 1-31.
- Ryan, J.M. & Harrison, P. (1995). The relationship between individual instructional characteristics and the overall assessment of teaching effectiveness across different instructional contexts. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(5), 577-594.
- Ramsden, P. (1991). A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: the course experience questionnaire, *Studies in Higher Education*, 16(2), 129-150.
- Salzberger-Wittenberg, I. (1983). *The Emotional Experience of Teaching and Learning*. H. Karnac.
- Shao, L. P., Anderson, Lorraine, P. & Newsome, M. (2007). Evaluating teaching effectiveness: Where we are and where we should be. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(3), 355-371.
- Shevlin, M., Banyard, P., Davies, M., Griffiths, M. (2000). The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: Love me, love my lectures? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(4), 397-405.
- Smallwood, B. CLASSE: Classroom survey of student engagement. The University of Alabama Academic Affairs.
- Smith, M.K., Jones, F.H.M., Gilbert, S.L. & Wieman, C.E. (2013). The classroom observation protocol for undergraduates STEM (COPUS): A new instrument to characterize university STEM classroom practices. *Life Sciences Education*, 12, 618-627.
- Taylor, L. & Parsons, J. (2011). Improving student engagement. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1), 1-33. Retrieved from: <http://cie.asu.edu/>
- Titworth, S., Quinlan, M.M., Mazer, J.P. (2010). Emotion in teaching and learning: Development and validation of the classroom emotions scale. *Communication Education*, 59(4), 431-452.

	<p>Tom, K.M. (2012). Measurement of teachers' social-emotional competence: development of the social-emotional competence teacher rating scale. Ph.D dissertation, June 2012, University of Oregon, Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences.</p> <p>University of British Columbia, Peer Review of Teaching Initiative, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology.</p> <p>Zepke, N., Leach, L. & Butler, P. (2013). Student engagement: students' and teachers' perceptions. <i>Higher Education Research and Development</i>, 33(2), 386-398.</p>	
<p>Dissemination – How will you share the results of your work with the EDC community?</p>	<p>We intend to make our work freely available through the Teaching and Learning Community website at Memorial, an open website at: http://teachingandlearning.mun.ca/. We will also apply to present at conferences and prepare articles for peer-reviewed journals.</p>	
<p>3. Budget: Funding cannot be provided for faculty/staff salaries of the grant's principal, nor any co-applicants; computer hardware or non-specialized software, or any parts of conference travel. See also budget guidelines below this form.</p>		
<p>Item (incl any applicable taxes)</p>	<p>Item</p>	<p>Cost</p>
<p>Salaries (e.g. graduate or undergraduate student research assistants). \$ per hour x # hours (use standard rates at the institution of the PA)</p>	<p>Graduate Student research Assistant at \$21.15 per hour (24 hours/week for 33 weeks)</p>	<p>\$16,750.80</p>
<p>Benefits at \$ per hour x # hours (use standard rates at the institution of the PA)</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>
<p>Honoraria (give details)</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>0.00</p>
<p>Materials, resources and</p>	<p>0.00</p>	<p>In-kind contribution from Faculty</p>

supplies		of Education and DELTS at Memorial University
Other (please specify)	0.00	0.00
Total Costs	0.00	\$16,750.81
Less matching funding obtained from other sources (e.g. Department/Dean)	0.00	\$15,750.81
Total requested from EDC Small Grant Program	0.00	\$1000.00

Budget Guidelines:

- Include all applicable taxes and other costs.
- Use rates of pay at the institution of the principal applicant.
- Benefits: this is the employer's portion of Income Tax, CPP and EI calculated as a percentage of the salary or honorarium. Though it is not paid to the person you hire, you pay for it and hence it needs to come out of your budget. Some job titles also require the addition of vacation pay; determine these rates in consultation with your Human Resources department.
- Given the size of this seed grant, it is expected to be **exempt from Institutional Overhead costs**.
- Funding cannot be provided for faculty/staff salaries of the principal nor any co-applicants; computer hardware or non-specialized software, or any parts of conference travel.

Please note:

1. Original receipts will be required for items such as materials.
2. Proposals that involve collection of data must conform to the research ethics policies in place at the institution of the Principal Applicant and all data collection sites. For further information, seek assistance from your Office of Research Services or equivalent.

4. References Cited

Give full references for all materials cited in the Rationale.

Peer Review of Proposals

Proposals will be “blind” peer-reviewed by three external reviewers who will forward their

recommendations to the Selection Committee who will use the stated review criteria to prioritize funding decisions. The Selection Committee will consist of a subcommittee of the Executive Committee. Principal Applicants will be notified of the successful grants as soon as possible.

Overall Review Criteria:

- **Relevance** - the value of the work proposed to the local and/or broader postsecondary educational development environment and to the EDC Living Plan
- **Awareness of related work, current and prior** – proposals should build on demonstrated awareness of similar programs and/or existing scholarly work.
- **Clarity of process and product** – clarity of each section of the proposal.
- **Feasibility** - the likelihood that the project can be completed in the time frame proposed and with the resources requested.
- **Collaboration** - across institutions is encouraged.

Reporting and accountability

Two brief reports are required.

1. **Interim report** - Deadline: Six months after receiving the grant

Half-way through the project the Primary Applicant will submit a brief (1-page) interim update to the VP professional development (which will be posted to the EDC website.)

2. **Final Report** – Deadline: **Upon project completion or one year following**

One month after completion of the project the Principal Applicant is required to submit a

- a. final budget,
- b. one-page report of the completed project,
- c. list of any publications, conference proceedings, workshops or other methods of dissemination completed to date or anticipated regarding this project.
- d. Any resources that may be available to the EDC community.

These reports will be added to the growing collection of EDC resources and will be posted to the EDC website.

Questions?

Contact Paola Borin, Vice Chair (Professional Development) by email borin@ryerson.ca or telephone 416-979-5000 X2629

