Welcome! (Lisa/Peg)
Thank you for joining today’s Webinar that will describe the **fourth round** of the SUNY Innovative Instruction Technology Grant Program!

This webinar is being recorded and will be posted on the IITG Application Website, we will also post the Powerpoint with the notes.
If you’re connected today by telephone vs. a headset and you need to take another call, please **hang up** from this webinar and dial back in - please do NOT put the **webinar on HOLD**.

I’m going to move through these slides quickly to leave plenty of time for questions. We’ll cover all the bases – particularly where the IITG program has some important distinctions from other types of programs and some important compliance rules.
Here’s the rundown of what we’ll be covering this morning.

Hopefully everyone has had a chance to review the RFP in advance, which details the information that I’m going to touch on this morning, and provides as well as some examples of how to choose your desired funding tier.

We’ll start with program background, how to access and submit an online application, then we’ll go through application section and describe elements of a strong proposal.

This will be followed by an overview of the review process and highlights of what to expect if your proposal is funded.

Understanding the **post award process** is important because some of the program expectations for how project outcomes are shared **may impact your budget planning** – for example, conference and travel support.

IITGs are funded through University-wide funds vs. Research Foundation grants. Since this program is available to faculty and staff at both state operated and community colleges – there are some distinctions on how state-managed funds are regulated that everyone needs to be aware of up front.
By way of background, the IITG program was launched in 2012 as part of the Chancellor’s Power of SUNY strategic plan. The RFP was developed by members of the SUNY Faculty Advisory Council on Teaching and Technology.

IITG’s have proven to be very effective in foster cross-campus collaborations and are now playing an important role in supporting Open SUNY by funding campus-based innovations that can supported and scaled more broadly throughout the system.

These collective efforts created the foundation for the launch of the SUNY Learning Commons, Open SUNY and new instructional research opportunities to support teaching and learning.

The goal is to provide seed funds to foster innovation that can be tested and shared across departments and multiple campuses. Proposals that demonstrated value in disciplined-based content with measurable impact received very positive reviews last year. Proposals that were perceived to have value limited to a single campus without a plan to share or scale the results were not highly ranked.
I wanted to share up front the award statistics.
When we launched the program, 117 proposals were submitted for just under 3 million of funding requests.
48 projects were ultimately funded across the three funding tiers.
A little more than 40% received funding.
Round Two Award Stats

• Innovative Instruction Technology Grants
  
  **Round Two:** 93 proposals (Est. 2.3 M requests)
  
  • (26) Tier 3 (60K) – 8 Awarded (36%)
  • (39) Tier 2 (20K) – 16 Awarded (40%)
  • (28) Tier 1 (10K) – 9 Awarded (32%)
  
  **Total Projects:** 33  
  **Total Funds Awarded:** $800,000  (35%)

  15 Project Renewal Requests – 6 Awarded

  **By Campus Sector:**
  
  • CC – 77,200  Comp – 272,400  Doc-other: 12,200
  • Tech 59,500  U Ctr – 378,300

Last year,
93 proposals for a total funds request of $2,325,031 is broken out as follows:
(28) Tier 1 (up to 10K) total request $232,127 (2 projects previously funded)
(39) Tier 2 (Up to 20K) total request $716,577 (5 projects previously funded)
(26) Tier 3 (Up to 60K) total request $1,376,327 (8 projects previously funded)
Less requests, but quality of proposals continues to go up.

IIRC placed strong emphasis on awarding projects that “moved the dial” on innovation.

### Round Three Award Stats

- **Innovative Instruction Technology Grants**
  - **Round Three**: 63 proposals ($1.6M in requests)
    - (18) Tier 3 (60K) – 8 Awarded (44%)
    - (22) Tier 2 (20K) – 7 Awarded (32%)
    - (23) Tier 1 (10K) – 10 Awarded (43%)
  - **Total Projects**: 25  **Total Funds Awarded**: $632,290  **(40%)**
  - 5 Renewals Funded

**By Campus Sector:**
- CC – 74,420  Comp – 217,270  Doc-other: N/A
- Tech 79,000  U Ctr – 261,600
Round one was all about “give us good ideas”
Round two narrowed the call to innovations that shared learning announcements
Round three, specifically the center section in bold, clearly aligned all projects in support of Open SUNY

And now
Round four continues that trend with greater emphasis on the themes you may have heard in the Chancellor’s State of the University address.

The Provost is suggesting here that there is great value in starting to leverage content that’s already out there, but can be combined in more efficient and effective ways in support of learning.

An example of this is Coursera is migrating to an “on demand” delivery platform, so content can be modularized and made available for different purposes across curriculums. Now that SUNY has some experience with how to produce MOOCs, the funding scope has been narrowed to support MOOCs that create an “on ramp” to an existing program, or MOOCs that can be used more like textbooks or supplemental material or for flipped applications.

In summary: projects that support access to higher education, degree completion and support student success are all highly valued.
All full time SUNY faculty/staff are eligible to apply for an IITG. Adjunct faculty can participate, as long they are partnered with a full time staff member and have letters of support from their home department to ensure project completion.

Multiple proposals from a campus or individuals are welcome – but I’ll pass along a word of caution from previous that the effort can be more time consuming than anticipated.

A quick word about FACT2 Reps. There are formal lines of communication between SUNY and campus administration, but it’s a bigger challenge for the Office of the SUNY Provost to receive communication about grassroots concerns from faculty and staff, and that’s where the Faculty Advisory Council on Teaching and Technology plays an important role..

If you don’t know who your campus rep is, you’re encouraged to click on the hyperlink in the RFP to identify and reach out to them. There is no requirement for a campus rep to “sign off” or review a proposal that’s being submitted. But it’s a courtesy that may be helpful to you because Campus Reps are often aware of SUNY-wide resources that may benefit your proposal.
Because these grants are funded through University wide funds distribution, they follow state budget cycle timelines.

The goal is to ensure awards are announced prior to the CIT Conference held late in May, so PI’s have a chance to plan and coordinate over the summer before the funds are released in the fall.

Once the awards are announcements, agreements signed, state account numbers will be assigned on a project basis. Be aware that funds are not deposited into those accounts until ALL University Wide program funds are released in the fall, usually September. If your project requires expenditures prior to this, you’ll need to make arrangements on your campus for “backstop” or “forward fund” a portion of the grant for expenditures.

If you’re used to working on the RF side of the house, this will strike you as unusual – and we’re aware of that. We’ll work with you to make sure everyone has an understanding of the state funds process, because we learned a lot of administrative lessons on the first two rounds.
If you’re seeking Renewal:
  • Must document progress against original objectives
  • Structure and process for moving forward must be clearly articulated
  • Budget narrative & spreadsheet must justify the need
  • Narrative must include how the project outcomes will be sustainable in the future.

May want to consider waiting for the 2016 round to further develop a current project.

If you are seeking project renewal funds – there are some additional things to consider in the RFP. This is particularly true if you’re seeking renewal funds for a round two project that has not yet posted outcomes.

(Walk through bullets)
Any questions before I walk through the online application?
Here’s the entire application process in a nutshell (quick walk through):

1. Review Announcement & RFP
2. Create an online account, select funding tier.
3. Download & print application questions
4. Create **draft** (character & file size limits)
5. Download/complete/upload budget worksheet
6. Review & **submit** proposal when complete
Any questions before I walk through the online application?

I apologize for the fuzziness of the screen shots –
All the materials you need are on the Application Section of the IITG website

Start on the Project Application Website Link
You can either logon with your previous account credentials, or create a new account.

If you created an account in the past, but forgot your password, just click on the “Forgot your Password” link and the system will send your password to the email address on record in the system.
When creating a new account, please fill out the fields. An asterisk indicates a required field.
Once you provide a password, it will take you to the application page where you select a funding tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 ITG Tier 1 Round 3 Application</td>
<td>up to $10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Supports professional development workshops or symposia up to $5,000. 
- Workshops that include substantial development of materials, resources or outcomes that extend beyond a one-time meeting or event, and include small proof-of-concept objectives are eligible for funding up to $10,000. 
- Campus or external in-kind resources are strongly encouraged in the budget, but not required to be eligible for funding. |
| 2015 ITG Tier 2 Round 3 Application | Up to $20,000 with 25% match requirement |  
- Supports development of a new innovation or process as a proof of concept. 
- 25% of the funds requested must be matched in-kind by the campus or from an external funding source. |
| 2015 ITG Tier 3 Round 3 Application | up to $80,000 with 33% match requirement |  
- Supports development of a new innovation or process as a proof of concept. 
- 32% of the funds requested must be matched in-kind by the campus or from an external funding source. |
At the top left notice the PDF download option – click on this, and you can download and save a print version of all the instructions and questions. The fields call for a title, abstract, the amount requested. If it’s a renewal, we ask that you provide the amount that was previously funded. Obviously you won’t be able to fill these fields out until you’ve completed the budget worksheet – and the number entered here MUST match your budget worksheet.

I know it seems odd that the requested funds fields are near the top of the form; without getting into a lot of technical detail, it’s how the online form combines information from multiple databases. Just skip over any questions you’re not ready to answer, and save as draft until you come back and fill it in later once your budget estimates are complete.
On a number of campuses, we've found a sponsored programs person fills out the application on behalf of the faculty or staff member that will serve as the principal investigator – so even if it's repetitive, please fill in all the fields.
I mentioned that you can upload all responses as documents, but on some questions – you have the option of just dropping in text answers.

For the biographical sketch, most faculty will want just upload a CV. A short version is best if you're one of those folks with a 20 page CV. Staff often choose to upload a resume, or just provide some brief text about their role, the responsibilities coupled to that role, and any high level details such as past presentations made that may be relevant to the project.

The purpose here is to provide evidence to the reviewers that you have the background to successfully execute the proposed project.
You have the opportunity to list Co-PI's, and some projects have had key stakeholders in the form of vendor partnerships or work with agencies external to the campus, and this is where you would indicate who those people are. The bullet points provide some guidance for the type of information you may want to include here.

If you have multiple CO-PI's or collaborators, just combine the information into a single document prior to upload – high level details are fine, such as a paragraph describing each collaborator's title, role and function on the team is fine.
Campus endorsement is important.
This certifies that you’re not committing resources on behalf of your campus without advance consultation – this is particularly important if you’re piloting a technology solution that might be considered experimental by your campus technology folks.

For example – on the first round, a project was awarded that specified a certain type of mobile device on an IOS that was not supported on campus. Fortunately, the project was able to continue by selecting a different device that was compatible with the campus network, but the misunderstanding could have been avoided with better consultation.

Endorsements can be in the form of an uploaded a letter of support from the Chief Academic Officer or other executive level campus leader - or at minimum, by using the text box to certify that the proposal has been discussed with your senior leadership and that they will support the resource commitment. At the University Center level, it may make more sense to have your Dean or Department Chair sign off on the resource commitment – we leave that decision to you.

You have the option to upload a total of three letter of support. If you have additional letters, please combine them into a single document in advance.

A word of caution here – please do not take any short cuts. If you receive an award and you’re not able to effectively deliver on your proposal due to lack of proper
This may not make a lot of sense now, but it’s critical later on from a program perspective.

We need you to identify a theme that your work falls within in order to organize and disseminate findings and potentially match your work with other funding opportunities in the future. If you’re not entirely sure of a theme, select what seems to make the most sense and we can work to refine categories in the future.
You also can choose to align your project with more than one theme, but if you’ve got good, clear alignment in the first pull down menu choice, that’s all that’s necessary. There are two more options if your project fits into more than one theme.
One major change that the Innovative Instruction Research Council made for evaluating projects was incorporate three learning objectives. These need to be crisp, concise, clear statements. Save your narrative to expand on details and use this section to provide three clear outcomes your project will support.
Your project narrative is a document that is uploaded. This was requested by previous applicants who wanted the opportunity to upload a document that can include charts, graphs and other data to explain the project.

The timeline box give you the option of uploading a file, or just providing some text that provides some bullet points for how your project will follow a timeline. It need not be overly detailed, but it’s an opportunity to demonstrate to the reviewers that you’ve thought out stages and alignment of resources.
The budget section is in two parts.
First – upload a brief document that describes the budget narrative in detail.
Second – upload the completed excel spreadsheet from the template provided on the Provost’s website.
Before I show you detail on the excel spreadsheet however, notice that there’s an administrative support section.

Please enter a contact name for someone at your local department level who is familiar with State purchasing requests, along with their email address. If you receive an award, we will keep this contact name on file in case we need to work through any administrative issues. More importantly, these fields provide evidence to the reviewers that you’ve identified a local "go to" person should procurement questions arise.

Policies vary by campus. Some campuses require all grants be processed through a local sponsored programs office, even though this grant is managed through state funds. It's important that you identify who you can turn to for policy and procedural questions to support project funds.
The budget worksheet is available in the application materials
Here’s the top portion of the form that describes personnel expenses.
Here’s the bottom half of the form that includes the OTPS expenses
The bottom line in green describes the total funding request. This is the number you’re going to transfer back to the top of the application form.

The yellow bottom line is the amount of the campus match that’s required depending on the tier.
A Tier 2 project that funds up to 20,000 must include a campus match of up to 25%
But that’s 25% of the total request – so if your project requires 15,000, you’ll be matching 25% of that request or a minimum of $3,750 in in-kind campus support.

You can include conference presentations in your budget. This includes CIT presentations, but please keep in mind that SUNY works hard to keep those expenses to a minimum.
While we’re talking about campus matches and administrative and budget questions – this is a good time to plug the FAQ section of the website.
Please check the FAQ section first if you have a question about the Application, Budget or Administrative processes – we think we’ve got most of the common questions and issues covered, but we’re happy to receive feedback and update more information on these pages – just let us know!
Reviewers will want to know how you intend to measure project objectives and learning outcomes. It’s helpful to separate student learning from technology effectiveness – the two often get combined and confused. If you’re using a new technology, determine how you’ll describe whether it’s an effective solution – is the solution in fact, “technology in service of pedagogy?” If a particular technology is anticipated to boost student learning outcomes, how will you measure that?

Much like Middle States, this grant doesn’t tell you what to measure, it expects that you’ll describe what you’re looking for and how you’ll measure it. But whatever your approach, keep in mind how much time is available to measure and report in the grant cycle. The reviewers understand the aggressive nature of the timeline, so be realistic about your assessment expectations.

Finally – if you ever intend to publish your results – which is an option that most of you will want to preserve, be sure to work with your campus IRB officers to seek an expedited review BEFORE you collect any data. Please be sure to comply with all the regulations, and remember it takes time for these reviews – This is why we recommend you begin work on that aspect as soon as you receive an award, or perhaps even while you’re preparing a proposal.
One of the conditions for the grants is for you to choose a Creative Commons license to share your work in the SUNY Learning Commons. There is a link embedded for you to learn more about the CC process.

In addition to openly sharing your project outcomes, you’ll be required to file a mid-year report – but the reviewers will want to know more about how you plan to actually document and share your results. Will you be videotaping segments and posting them on YouTube? Will you be creating a report? Will the report have any unique features? Do you plan on presenting your results at non-SUNY conferences to share a solution within your discipline? The communication plan is a paragraph or two to describe your commitment to sharing your outcomes with your peers.

And finally, with a drumroll – at the bottom of this section, notice the “save as draft” button and “submit form.” Although the system will automatically save a version as you work on it – it’s a good idea to “save a draft” if you’re working on it for a while. Once you’ve uploaded all your documents, and you’re ready to submit the final version – just click on “submit form” and you’re done!
Review Process

Reviewers: SUNY Distinguished Professors, FACT² Council and Campus Reps, SUNY Provost Staff – and You!

1. Managed through the online IITG system
2. Use Likert scales for each section
3. Add additional comments for scoring rationale

All scores are tabulated, ranked and escalated for secondary review to the IIRC and Provost Staff.

- Re-ranked following Provost Staff review
- Provost makes funding decisions.
- Provost may initiate brief negotiations prior to funding announcements.

The applicants last round asked for more details on how the proposals are reviewed. Each proposal is reviewed at least 3 times. The reviewers see all the application information, identity is not stripped from the proposal – however, the reviewers are blind to each other. Obviously we don’t assign reviews where there is an obvious conflict of interest, and we work with the reviewers to enable them to identify and swap out reviews if they identify a conflict.

You and your colleagues are welcome to serve as a reviewer. Just click on the “Become a Reviewer” button on the IITG site. We hope to build out a bigger pool of reviewers to better match thematic interests with reviewer expertise in order to increase the quality of the feedback.

It is a two stage review. A peer review enables each reviewer to assign a score based on a rubric that mirrors the RFP. The scores are then ranked and escalated to the Office of the Provost for a secondary review. A new Innovative Instruction Research Council is being formed as part of Open SUNY, and it is anticipated that the Provost will be seeking nominations for this council in time to assist the Provost Staff with final IITG recommendations.
The Awards process is timeline and what to expect is outlined here.
After decisions are made, agreements are signed, and account numbers are assigned.
All funds MUST be expended within the state fiscal year boundaries.
You are able to make budget revisions post award, but need to request permission if a revision exceeds 20% of the total funding request within the OTPS or PSR category. All awards are subject to audit.

Also – please be very cautious if you budget any type of participation incentive. You can’t give away laptops or iPads or engage in random games of chance with State taxpayer funds. If a vendor supplies these items in-kind, that’s fine.

Some of our awardees provide travel to CIT or CPD points as an incentive. If you have questions about incentives

Assumption for Processing PO’s & Sub-Contracts:
• Handled through normal departmental process
• PI (or designee) keeps track of budget
• PI responsible to alert IITG Administration if a budget revision exceeds 20% of OTPS or PSR.
• Random IITG audits are conducted. Please keep good records (including revisions rationale).
• Be careful with incentives of any kind with State $.
IITG administration is available to help throughout the application and award process.
These deliverables are all outlined in the RFP and have been touched on already, but the last bullet makes a point in reminding everyone to document their project, and don’t forget to take pictures along the way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IITG 2015 Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must effectively share process and outcomes SUNY-wide:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PI Communication and support managed through an IITG SUNY Learning Commons Community of Practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative Commons license required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must present at CIT (varies by award tier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-project reports <strong>required</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final report must be posted in SLC to enable others to replicate process &amp; build upon findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document your process, remember to take pictures at meetings, events, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IITG administration team is here to help. Please use the email alias so if I’m traveling or unavailable others will be monitoring your email to assist with any questions that arise.

Monthly updates are provided, which you are responsible for forwarding to your collaborators.
Questions?

IITGrants@suny.edu

Thank You!