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Welcome
AGENDA

• Welcome
• Faculty and Staff Introductions and Acknowledgements
• Dean’s Remarks
• Policy Council
• Round Table Presentations
  – Presenters from various departments and programs will lead 15-minute discussions about a practice they utilize to build the capacity of their candidates to ensure that diverse populations feel accepted, valued and respected.
• Research Committee
  – Research Committee members will share information about the criteria used to evaluate and recommend proposals for the University Grants Program.
Faculty and Staff Introductions and Acknowledgements
NEW FACULTY & STAFF
Saul Maldonado
Assistant Professor, Dual Language and English Learner Education
Janette Dorricott (right)
Lecturer, Dual Language and English Learner Education
Adam Frost (center)
Lecturer, Dual Language and English Learner Education
Svenna Pederson (left)
Lecturer, Dual Language and English Learner Education
Christopher Brum
Assistant Professor, Special Education
Jessica Suhrheinrich
Assistant Professor, Special Education
Katie Sciurba
Assistant Professor, Division of Education – Imperial Valley Campus
Patricia Cardozo
Liberal Studies Assistant Coordinator, School of Teacher Education
Edgar Beas
Credential Admissions Coordinator, Office of Student Services
Vicki Fielden
Liberal Studies Advisor, Office of Student Services
Antonio Valero
Graduate Assistant, Office of Student Services
Faculty Promotions
Frank Harris, III
Professor, Administration, Rehabilitation & Postsecondary Education
Sascha Longstreth
Associate Professor, Child & Family Development
NEW FACULTY ROLES
COMMENTS FROM THE ASSOCIATE DEAN

• New timeline for scheduling courses
• Coordinating problems with Graduate Division, CES and other University offices
Rafaela Santa Cruz
Interim Director, School of Teacher Education
J. Luke Wood
Director, SDSU/CGU Joint Ph.D. Program in Education
Emily Schell
Executive Director, California International Studies Project
Dean’s Remarks
We Are Strengthening Programs

• ASL Courses:
  – We are offering ASL 1, 2 and 3.
  – Completing all three ASL courses will meet the foreign language requirement.
We Are Building Resources

Congratulations to the following faculty who acquired contracts and grants worth over $20 million in 2015-16!

- Cristina Alfaro
- Nadine Bezuk
- Andre Branch
- Charles Degenneffe
- Jose Estrada
- Douglas Fisher
- Anne Graves
- Tonika Green
- Laura Hall
- Nan Hampton
- Frank Harris
- Patricia Hatch
- Joseph Johnson
- Bonnie Kraemer

- Marjorie Olney
- Cynthia Park
- Ian Pumpian
- Shulamit Ritblatt
- Carol Robinson-Zanartu
- Rafaela Santa Cruz
- Caren Sax
- Rachel H. Schlagel
- Emily Schell
- Jessica Suhrheinrich
- Brent Taylor
- Yasemin Turan-Qian
- Marissa Vasquez Urias
- Luke Wood
We Are Building Resources

• This year is starting big with new grant awards. For example:

• Jessica Suhrheinrich, a new faculty member in SPED received a K01 Mentored Research Scientist Career Development Award from the National Institute of Mental Health ($171,000 per year).

• Doug Fisher and the EDL Department are finalists for a $5 million award to Improve University Principal Preparation Programs from the Wallace Foundation.

• Felisha Herrera Villarreal, in ARPE, won a new NSF Grant.

• Luke Wood, in ARPE, won a new NSF Grant.
We Are Building Resources

• Consider applying for the GREW (Grants and Research Enterprise Writing) Fellowship Program. Applications are due on September 30, 2016.

• Don’t be afraid to apply! Most applicants are not funded on the first try. Often winners have applied previously, lost, learned from the feedback they received, and re-applied.
IMPROVING FUTURE FUND (IFF)

- [http://go.sdsu.edu/education/iff](http://go.sdsu.edu/education/iff)
- Deadline: October 31, 2016
- Email application to Alyssa Ancheta at aancheta@mail.sdsu.edu.
- Open Q&A session (drop-in) with proposers on September 16, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. in EBA 342.
WE ARE BUILDING RESOURCES THANKS TO OUR MANY COE DONORS!

- Megan Beardsley
- Wendy Bracken
- Marilee Bresciani Ludvik
- Frank Harris, III
- Colette Ingraham
- Joseph Johnson, Jr.
- Lisa Lamb
- Lisa McCully
- Melissa Soto
- Mark Tucker
- Cynthia Uline
- Manny Uribe
- Marissa Vasquez Urias
- Luke Wood
In support of your best ideas, continue to encourage donors to consider:

– One-time gifts
– Pledges with multiple gifts over time
– Planned gifts

Additionally, SDSU employees can arrange payroll deductions for gifts.
WE ARE BUILDING RESOURCES

• Remember that gifts can be dedicated to specific programs, departments, scholarship funds, or to our Improving Futures Fund.

• Help us identify department/program events where we might invite potential donors to visit and see the great things you are doing!
We Are Building Resources

Fall Enrollment in FTES

- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016

Fall Enrollment in FTES
Roundtable Presentations
Research Committee
San Diego State University

University Grants Program (UGP)
The University Grants Program (UGP) is funded through the Provost’s Office, the SDSU Research Foundation and the Adams Humanities Endowment.

The purpose of the UGP is to support scholarly research; assist faculty at lower ranks meet qualifications for RTP; permit faculty to bring advanced projects to conclusion; and facilitate development of a research program that may be competitive for extramural funding.

(http://newscenter.sdsu.edu/researchaffairs/ugp.aspx)
COE UGP Committee

2015-16 COE Research Committee:

- **ELD**
  Cheryl James-Ward (Committee Chair)

- **ARPE**
  Marilee Bresciani

- **CFD**
  Thomas Roberts

- **CSP**
  Katina Lambros

- **DLE**
  Sera Hernandez

- **SPED**
  Bonnie Kraemer

- **STE**
  Cristian Aquino-Sterling
University Grants Program – Process Overview

**Late Aug** - Call for proposal to SDSU faculty

**Late Sept** - UGP Applications due to Dean’s office **DUE DATE September 26th** (new online submission process within InfoReady system, link on Division of Research Affairs website/UGP)

**Late Oct** - COE review committee reviews and provides Dean with rated and ranked applications

**Late Oct** – Dean forwards recommendations to DRA. DRA forwards applications to University Grants and Lectureships Committee (UGLC)

**Late Nov** – UGLC provides DRA with recommendations for funding

**Mid Dec** – Notifications to all UGP applicants of award decisions

**Jan** – Award period begins
Application Packet Components

❖ Applicant Information
❖ Acknowledgement of Compliance Approval Requirement
❖ Abstract (150 word max)
❖ Project Description (3 page max including references)
❖ Experience and Qualifications (1 page max)
❖ Budget Request Form (not to exceed $10,000)
❖ Itemized Budget Justification (1 page max)
❖ Agreement of Expenditures of Funds
Required Proposal Criteria: Quality of Proposal

❖ Relevance or merit of the proposal to field of study

❖ Appropriateness of the design and methodology

❖ Appropriateness of scope and budget

❖ Expertise of the applicant in the area of investigation

❖ Likelihood of executing the plan within 18-month funding period
Outcome

❖ Probability of leading to refereed publications (other scholarly activities)
❖ Likelihood of enhancing the probability of retention, tenure, and promotion
❖ Nature of student involvement.
❖ Likelihood of obtaining future extramural funding.
Relevance and Merit of the Proposal

Categories that should be addressed:

❖ Significance of the research topic or problem
❖ Literature to date supporting need for project
❖ Well articulated research question(s)
❖ Potential impact of the proposed project
Appropriateness of Design & Methodology

Categories that should be addressed:

❖ Participants/Setting/Recruitment

❖ Independent/Dependent Variables (including interventions, assessments, evaluation instruments)

❖ Procedures

❖ Research Design

❖ Data Analysis
Appropriateness of Scope and Budget

Budget Request Form:

❖ Indicate items needed to complete your research project (form is included in the application packet)

❖ Provide a detailed justification of each requested item and how activity/item is related to project
Applicant Expertise & Qualifications

Provide a BRIEF description (1 page max) of relevant experience related to proposal topic.
Execution of Plan Within Funding Period

Show how the study will be completed in the 18-month time frame:

❖ Provide a detailed and practical timeline for study
❖ A visual (chart) of planned activities by month
The Review Process

❖ Not blind
❖ Each proposal is reviewed by all members of COE Research Committee
❖ Independently rated and ranked
❖ Excel ranking spreadsheet
❖ Consensus ranking via meeting and discussion
❖ Rankings to the Dean
❖ Highest ranked proposals to university selection committee
❖ Feedback summary forms back to applicants
Newly Developed Rubric for COE UGP
College of Education  
University Grants Program (UGP) Rating Rubric for AY 2016-2017

Applicant’s Name:  

Reviewer’s Name:  

Instructions: The criteria for review appear below. As you read each proposal, RATE it on each of the criteria using the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Weighted Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance or Merit of the Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>__ x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Statement of the problem and related literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Potential impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Educational problem is stated in clear &amp; convincing manner; provides current information &amp; appropriate literature illustrating need for study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Potential impact is well demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Problem is stated in clear manner; provides some supporting literature illustrating need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Potential impact is stated although could be more clear &amp; convincing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Statement of problem is poorly articulated; lack of information or appropriate literature cited AND/OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Potential impact of study is not stated or addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has features similar to 2-point statement, WITH one or more sections that are weak or missing altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__ x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the Design &amp; Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Research question(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Methods section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Research questions/objectives are very clear, comprehensive, logical, and measurable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Methods are highly detailed and appropriate to research questions (i.e, includes participant recruitment plan, outcome measures, research design, &amp; data analysis plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness of the Scope and Budget</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>__ x 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget is appropriate (includes budget &amp; budget narrative), line items are well-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall budget is appropriate (includes budget &amp; narrative), however some line items are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget is limited or vague (missing either budget or budget narrative); it is unclear how the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget is not described and does not show how the project will fund stated objectives/activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expertise of the Applicant in the Area of Investigation</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>__ x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong evidence of scholarly activity; clear connection to research agenda &amp; proposed project.</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly activity related to research agenda &amp; proposed project.</td>
<td>Evidence of scholarly activity, however, not clearly related to research agenda &amp; proposed project (AND rationale for new area of investigation is missing)</td>
<td>Little evidence of scholarly activity OR no clear relationship to proposed project with few details listed.</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of Executing the Plan within the Funding Period</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>__ x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline is clearly defined (includes dates/months)</td>
<td>Timeline is reasonably defined, SOME activities are</td>
<td>Timeline included, but not clearly defined or not well related</td>
<td>Timeline unclear and unfeasible</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational impact of the proposal on SDSU students and the nature of student involvement in research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of enhancing the probabilities of retention, tenure and promotion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of obtaining future funding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of leading to refereed publications, exhibitions, or performances</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking of this proposal (1-) #______** (Ranking for each proposal should be different; NO ties.)
University Grant Program (UGP)
College Research Committee Rating/Ranking Sheet
(To be completed by the College Research Committee)

Applicant Name (Last, First):

College:

Project Title:

A cover letter from the College Dean may be appended to summarize comments for ranking applicants.

Using a 1-5 point scale, this proposal is rated: ______

1 = Poor  2 = Fair  3 = Good  4 = Excellent  5 = Outstanding

On the basis of relative merit for funding, this proposal is ranked ______ out of 6*

*Note: Consecutively rank all applications, giving a different rank number to each application.

Justification for rating (200 word limit): This justification should include the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. A copy of this review/justification may be requested by the applicant upon conclusion of the review process.

Note: All Unit 3 members are eligible to apply for UGP funding. Please note that while both the college review committee and the University Grants and Lectureship Committee rate applications based on merit, final funding decisions may encompass other factors including the number of awards received by the applicant in recent years and the relative distribution of awards across colleges.

College Committee Recommended? Yes _______ No _______

Dean Recommended? Yes _______ No _______

College Dean’s Signature
2016-17 UGP COE Awardees

❖ Herrera Villarreal, Felisha (ARPE)
❖ Lazarevic, Vanja (CFD)
❖ Rieth, Sarah (CFD)
❖ Schaack, Diana (SPED)
Questions
Have a Successful Semester!