

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Teagle Initiative in Value Added Assessment

Goal: To help develop and take full advantage of systematic means of assessing the educational outcomes achieved in liberal education.

Means: We expect that organizations applying for these grants will have distinctive strengths and will have thought carefully about what they can do best. We are especially interested in applicants' assessment of the distinctive strength they bring to this issue. Since the Foundation wants careful planning to shape all proposals it considers, it is prepared to make planning grants, usually between \$25,000 and \$50,000, for strong proposals in this area. If such planning has already taken place, it will consider a few implementation grants in the low six-figure range.

Hypothetical Example: A planning process undertaken by a consortium has found that among its constituents the major constraint in fully utilizing available instruments of assessment is at the course level. Instructors need to find better ways to use what can be learned from such assessment in the redesign of individual courses. The consortium proposes a series of summer workshops where faculty can work together on this issue.

Guidelines: In two or three pages the proposal should indicate the way the grant would result in better assessments of the value added in some aspect of liberal education, and the specific steps that need to be taken. It should also explain how the proposed project will ultimately improve the education of undergraduate students in the liberal arts. We recognize that well designed assessments also have PR value, but that is not the primary objective of these grants. We want to know how student learning will be improved.

A good proposal will also specify some "metric," that is some specific indicator that can be used once the grant is over to help determine its effectiveness. (By "metric" we do not mean an elaborate evaluation but one or more straightforward indicators, preferably quantitative, which would point to the success of the project. A metric for the hypothetical example above might, for instance, be the number of participants in the program who actually redesigned one or more courses as a result of the workshop.

Reports: The Foundation requires narrative and budget progress reports at the end of each year and pays installments of each multi year grant only when a satisfactory progress report has been received. The final report, due on the completion of the project, should be an honest assessment of what was learned during the project with a view to helping the foundation be more effective in the next phase of its grant making. Examples and conclusions that might profitably be disseminated over the Foundation's web site or by other means will be very welcome.

Budgets: A one or two page budget showing the principal expense categories should be sufficiently detailed.

Budget should be based on 1 July – 30 June operating years. These grants will not normally extend beyond two calendar years.

The budget should specify whether it is for planning or implementation. Planning grants will average around \$25,000 and normally be completed within a single year; a \$300,000 implementation grant paid over two years would be a large one at this stage of the Foundation's operation.

The grant may be used for all direct, but no indirect, costs of the approved program, including airfare, accommodations, meals, office expenses, research materials and assistance, and per diems or modest honoraria, where appropriate.

Timeline:

September 1, 2004: Proposals due

November 2004: Teagle Board action

December 2004: Notification

June 30, 2006: Completion of all projects and final report submitted to Teagle Foundation.