

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 2012 SUMMER GRANT APPLICATION

Purpose

Stetson University supports faculty development of tenured and tenure-track faculty through the award of summer grants. Projects supported by a summer grant must contribute to the University's mission of teaching, research, and artistic development. Summer grant funds are not normally awarded for course development unless the project has an application beyond the classroom, as, for example, an article on pedagogy. The Committee endeavors to provide modest additional funding for applications that indicate a necessity of travel and/or research expenses. *Summer grants are intended to support activities carried out in the summer months (May – August) immediately following the award.*

Procedure

One of the responsibilities of the Professional Development Committee is to establish a procedure for the submission and assessment of summer grant applications. The Committee evaluates summer grant applications, and provides its evaluations and recommendations to the Associate Provost, who makes the final decision on all the awards.

The Committee relies primarily on the material submitted by the applicant in evaluating the value of the proposed activities. Thus the burden rests with the applicant to document fully and clearly the value of the proposed project and the applicant's qualifications and prospects for achieving the project's objectives. The Committee also relies on the informed evaluation of department chairs and deans for information about the applicant's record and promise as a scholar, artist, or performer.

While there is no formal appeal process, applicants may bring their concerns to the Associate Provost who will forward the inquiry to the Committee. The Committee will then communicate the shortcomings or deficiencies in the applications to the Associate Provost. Unsuccessful applicants may also direct any questions or concerns to the Committee Chair.

The University requests that summer grant recipients acknowledge the support of the Stetson summer grant wherever appropriate.

Evaluation Factors

The Committee evaluates and ranks only **complete** applications by considering the following factors.

1. Scholarly Value: The value of the project within the discipline; its purpose and objectives; and the likelihood of significant results.
2. Project Scope: Description of the plan of activities to be undertaken for the project, including steps and/or methodology, and the suitability of the summer grant period for the project as described.

3. Value to the University: Evidence that the proposal will extend the applicant's expertise and bring professional recognition to the University or enrich classroom teaching or have a significant impact on the curriculum.
4. Applicant's Qualifications: That the applicant has the necessary credentials to undertake the project and the likelihood that the applicant will complete the project.
5. Overall Quality of the Application, including the clarity of expression.

A copy of the evaluation rubric is appended to the end of this document.

Restrictions

Grants will not be awarded to applicants who:

- a. Are requesting funding to work toward an advanced degree, or who will not have completed work on the advanced degree required of his/her position by the grant period;
- b. Have failed to make a written report to the Office of Academic Affairs about activities funded by previous summer grants or sabbatical leaves, or who have made unsubstantiated changes to such summer grants or sabbaticals;
- c. Have failed to **complete** all sections of the summer grant application.

No more than two full grants, or their equivalent, will be awarded consecutively. This means that a maximum of four summer half grants may be awarded consecutively.

Only one summer grant application a year will be considered. This applies to single as well as to co-authored proposals.

Faculty who are awarded either a half-year or full-year sabbatical are eligible for a summer grant for only one summer bordering the sabbatical year - either the summer before or the summer after the sabbatical year, but not both. Please note the qualification below, under part b ["Note"] of Application.

Applicants who are awarded a full grant may teach up to four weeks anytime over the summer (Summer Session A or B but *not both* A and B and *not* Summer Session C). Applicants who are awarded a half grant may teach up to eight weeks over the summer. Applicants may not engage in any other paid employment during the grant period.

Unless approved by the Associate Provost as part of the summer grant application, a tenured faculty member who is granted a summer grant will be required to commit, before the summer grant begins, to return to full-time teaching for at least one academic year (fall and spring) following the end of the summer grant period.

Application

Successful summer grant applications from the previous year are on reserve in the Library. Successful summer grant applications from this year's applicant pool will be posted in electronic format on a secure Library web page.

A **complete** Summer Grant Application must address **all** of the following items:

- a. The attached "Summer Grant Application Form;"
- b. A project title, followed by a narrative (not to exceed 1000 words) of the proposed summer activities according to the generally accepted canons of your discipline. Successful applicants usually address such topics as background, purpose, objectives, plan of activities, and anticipated results. The narrative should be written so that it can be understood by faculty from other disciplines;
Note: If the applicant plans also to apply for a **sabbatical**, *the scope and goals of the activities proposed in each application must be different*. It is acceptable for each application to address different parts of a larger project. Each application will be judged on its own merits.
- c. A narrative (not to exceed 250 words) of your qualifications – background and previous work related to your proposed summer grant activities– to undertake and complete the proposed project (a supporting letter of evaluation by a colleague with in-field expertise may be attached to the application);
- d. A statement (not to exceed 250 words) of what you believe will be the positive effects of the completed project for you and the University;
- e. A brief synopsis (not to exceed 250 words each) of the objectives and result(s) of all summer grants that you have received during the past five years, as well as a copy of the most recent Summer Grant Report;
- f. A statement disclosing any other financial support you have for doing the work proposed in this application or covering the period that includes the Summer of 2012. In addition to grants that have already been awarded, this includes any contracts, commissions, or agreements that guarantee a fixed or minimum payment for the completion of the work. Applicants should notify the chair of the Professional Development Committee if outside funding becomes available after the application has been submitted. Because of the limited pool of funds available for summer grants, faculty are encouraged to pursue outside funding, and are expected to utilize it when it is available; and
- g. Current curriculum vitae.

Co-Authored/Joint Proposals: Faculty who wish to work on a joint project are invited to apply. Each faculty member may request either a full or a half grant. The committee will evaluate the proposed contributions of the applicants separately, with the possible outcome that the committee may recommend different levels of funding for the applicants. When submitting applications for a joint project, the following modifications to the form of the application should be made.

1. A co-authored application may be submitted (with logical increases in the word limits), or separate applications may be written and submitted together as an application package. The materials should clearly distinguish what each applicant will contribute to the project.
2. Each applicant should fill out an individual "Summer Grant Application Form."
3. If the applicants are members of different departments, the application packet should be evaluated by the chairs of both departments.

SUBMISSION DEADLINES	<p style="text-align: center;">SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND CALENDAR FOR SUMMER GRANTS 2012</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Applicants, Department Chairs and Deans must abide by the published schedule.</p>
<p>All application materials must be received by the respective parties before 4:30 p.m. on:</p> <p>Monday, October 10</p>	<p><u>Applicant:</u></p> <p>1) Submit eleven (11) copies of your complete application to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs will forward two copies of the application to department chairs. (If applicant is a Department Chair, the Office of Academic Affairs will submit his/her application to the dean. The dean will write the detailed evaluation.) The remaining copies will be distributed to Professional Development Committee members. Successful applications will be posted in electronic format on a secure Library web page. <i>Please note that no electronic submissions will be accepted. Applications received in the Office of Academic Affairs after the due date will not be considered.</i></p> <p>2) Submit one (1) extra copy of the "Summer Grant Application Form" (cover sheet only) to the chair of the Professional Development Committee: Eric Kurlander, Unit 8344 or Room 304 Elizabeth Hall</p>
<p>Wednesday, October 19</p>	<p><u>Chair:</u></p> <p>Submit one (1) copy of the application to the dean with a written evaluation. The evaluation should candidly assess the scholarly value of the project, the scope of the project, and its value to the University. (Retain one copy of the application for your files.) The Committee relies heavily on the chair's candid evaluation of the proposal's strength and potential for success. It is the responsibility of the Chair or Dean to carefully evaluate the application as to its completeness and competitiveness.</p> <p><i>If found lacking or incomplete, constructive feedback should be delivered to the candidate in time to allow for minor changes.</i></p>
<p>Monday, November 7</p>	<p><u>Dean:</u></p> <p>Submit written comments to the Office of Academic Affairs. The comments should include an evaluation of the application and the chair's comments. If the applicant is a Department Chair, the Dean writes the detailed evaluation as described above. (Retain copy of each application)</p> <p><u>The Office of Academic Affairs</u> will distribute the applications to the members of the Professional Development Committee for consideration.</p>
<p>Monday, November 28</p>	<p><u>Professional Development Committee:</u></p> <p>Evaluation of applications: November 9 – November 28. Submit recommendations to the Associate Provost by November 28, 2011.</p>
<p>Monday, December 12</p>	<p><u>Associate Provost:</u></p> <p>Notifications to be sent no later than December 12, 2011.</p> <p><u>Academic Affairs:</u></p> <p>Applicants who are denied an award or offered a half grant when a full grant was requested will receive a summary of the Committee's evaluation of their proposal.</p>
<p>September 14</p>	<p><u>Successful Applicants:</u></p> <p>Must submit a report and evaluation of their summer activities to their Dean <u>and</u> to the Office of Academic Affairs by September 14, 2012. Summer grant final reports will be posted in electronic format on a secure Library web page.</p>

Applicant – Please note: Only complete applications will be considered.

KEEP THIS PAGE FOR FUTURE REFERENCE.

STETSON UNIVERSITY
2012 Summer Grant Application Form

Name: _____ Rank: _____

Department: _____ Number of years at Stetson: _____

Campus Box: _____ Extension: _____ E-Mail: _____

Title of Proposed Project: _____

Which of the following are you applying for (please check *only* one):

Full grant (approximately 8 weeks): _____

Half grant (approximately 4 weeks): _____

If applying for a full grant, would you be willing to modify your proposal and receive a half grant?

If you check "No," you will not be considered for a half grant.

Yes _____ No _____

Date of your last sabbatical leave: _____

Dates of summer grants you received during the last five years (list year and whether it was a full or half grant):

Do you understand that you must submit a report of your research and/or your activities to the Office of Academic Affairs by September 14, **2012**?

Yes _____ No _____

Do you expect to be engaged in other employment during the period of the proposed project? If your answer is yes, please explain on an attached sheet.

Yes _____ No _____

~~~~~

By signing below, I hereby affirm the answers provided above and also commit to return to full-time status for at least one academic year (Fall/Spring) following the end of the Summer Grant.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Professional Development Committee Evaluation of Summer Grant Proposals**

The Professional Development Committee evaluates summer grant proposals and makes a recommendation to the Associate Provost concerning which projects to fund. The Committee values all of the academic disciplines represented in the University and is committed to maintaining application guidelines and evaluation procedures that are reasonable and fair.

The Committee receives summer grant applications from faculty involved in a diverse array of research activities, artistic productions, and curricular development. The committee does not assign greater or lesser value to the activities or methods used by one discipline relative to another. Each application is judged primarily by the value of the proposed work within the context of the discipline. It is the **responsibility of the applicant** to write a proposal that can be understood by the Committee, describing the project and explaining its value.

Because of limited funding, summer grants are awarded on a competitive basis. Applicants who wish to be competitive must employ all of their skills as educators and experienced writers to ensure that their applications present clear and compelling arguments for the scholarly value of the project, its scope, and its value to the University. It is important that the application be organized in a way that makes it easy to find key information (the strategic use of topic headings and bulleted lists can be very effective).

### COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

The Committee consists of seven members of the faculty of which four are from the College of Arts and Sciences, representing each of the four Divisions of Arts and Sciences, one from Business, one from Music, and one from the Library.

### SUMMER GRANT AWARDS:

Each fall, the Administration notifies the Committee chair of the funds that will be available for summer grants. The Committee makes recommendations for the disbursement of those funds, dividing the sum between full grants and half grants. The relative number of full and half grants and the size of the awards varies from year to year as the Committee balances the desire to support as many worthy projects as possible against the desire to preserve the value of the awards at a meaningful level. Full grants of between \$4200 and \$4500 have been typical. As the name implies, the half grants traditionally carry half the award of a full grant. By federal law, these are taxable awards and the actual amount received will be reduced by federal tax withholding.

### EVALUATION PROCESS:

The members of the Professional Development Committee work together to understand the summer grant applications and strive to evaluate them in a fair and consistent manner. The Committee meets with the Associate Provost each fall for a review and discussion of its procedures. The Committee then meets to revise and fine tune the application guidelines and evaluation procedures.

The evaluation procedures are:

- I. Working individually, each Committee member reads and evaluates all of the proposals.
  - A. Applications that are found to be incomplete are automatically assigned to the bottom of the ranking.
  - B. In decreasing order of importance, the applications are evaluated on the basis of:
    1. Strength of argument given for the scholarly value of the project, judged within the context of the discipline.
    2. Clarity of the description of the scope of the project.
    3. Strength of the argument given for the value to the University.
    4. Applicant's qualifications to undertake the project and likelihood that it can be completed.
    5. Overall quality of the application
  - C. Each proposal is evaluated according to seven factors, each factor being given a score on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = most competitive). The mean score of these factors is then determined. For these factors, see **Summer Grant Application Evaluation Sheet**.
  - D. Committee members who are applying for a grant do not evaluate their own applications, and are not allowed to see either the letters of reference or the evaluations done by other Committee members that pertain to them.
- II. The Committee chair collects the numerical scores and uses them to generate a preliminary ranking of the applications.
  - A. The preliminary ranking lists the applications in descending order of their mean score.
  - B. Committee members who are applying for a grant are not informed of their ranking.
  - C. The Committee chair works with the Office of Academic Affairs to confirm that each applicant is eligible for a summer grant with regard to submission of earlier reports, previous grants, sabbatical leaves, appointment and rank.
- III. The Committee meets to discuss the applications, decide on a final ranking, and formulate its recommendations.
  - A. Each application is discussed.
    1. When an application has received a range of scores from different Committee members, the reasons for those scores are discussed. This is a key part of the evaluation process. It minimizes the risk of an application being given the wrong

ranking because one or two Committee members missed something in the application or had misconceptions about the discipline.

2. Committee members try to help each other to understand the differences in how different disciplines do research and develop curriculum. (Note: This does not relieve the applicant from the responsibility of writing an application that can be understood by reviewers from different disciplines.)
6. The discussion of each application is concluded by deciding whether it should be moved to a higher or lower position in the ranking. The Committee strives to reach a consensus about revisions to the ranking of the applications.
7. Committee members who are applying for a grant are not present when their applications are discussed, and are not informed of their final placement in the ranking.

B. Recommendations for awards are formulated.

1. In recent years, the number of good applications has increased to the point where they cannot all be funded, given the present budget, without drastically reducing the size of the awards.
2. Applications at the top of the revised ranking are recommended for awards at the level (full or half) requested.
3. Applications in the middle of the revised ranking are recommended for half awards.
4. Applications at the bottom of the revised ranking are not recommended for an award.
5. The Committee strives to reach a consensus about its recommendations for the awards.

IV. The Committee submits its final recommendations to the Associate Provost, who makes the final decision on the awards.

- A. Applicants will be notified by letter of the Associate Provost's decision.
- B. Applicants who are denied an award or who are offered a half grant when they requested a full grant may direct any questions or concerns to the Committee Chair.
- C. While there is no formal appeal process, applicants may express their concerns to the Associate Provost or their Dean.

The Committee distributes information about summer grants and other opportunities through **Faculty Professional Development Opportunities**, which is published annually by the Office of Academic Affairs. Copies of successful summer grant applications and final reports on summer grants will be posted in electronic format on a secure Library web page.

**Professional Development Committee  
Summer Grant Application Evaluation Sheet**

Scale used: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Good, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, 1 = Poor

**I. Scholarly Value.** **5 4 3 2 1**

A. Sufficient background provided so that project can be judged within the context of the discipline. 5 4 3 2 1

B. Purpose and objectives of project. 5 4 3 2 1

C. Description of anticipated results. 5 4 3 2 1

**II. Scope of Project.** **5 4 3 2 1**

A. Description of plan of activities, including steps and time required to accomplish objectives and/or methodology. 5 4 3 2 1

**III. Value to University.** **5 4 3 2 1**

A. Calls attention to University in wider academic or non-academic community and/or enriches classroom teaching or has a significant impact on the curriculum. 5 4 3 2 1

**IV. Qualifications and Quality** **5 4 3 2 1**

A. Narrative of qualifications, including applicant's background and previous related work if any. 5 4 3 2 1

B. Overall quality of application, including the clarity of expression. 5 4 3 2 1

**V. Can work reasonably be done in suggested time?** Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**VI. Was a description of the objectives and results from previous summer grants given in the application?** Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**Mean Score:** \_\_\_\_\_.