The Provost Learning Innovation Grants (PLIG) program was developed to broaden and enrich the learning experience of RIT students by funding faculty-initiated projects that enhance student learning. RIT has offered the PLIG program for more than 10 years, and 189 faculty projects have received funding during that time. The launch of the Innovative Learning Institute (ILI), and its charge to create a nexus of research and timely experimentation with emerging teaching and learning technologies and practices, led to an evaluation of PLIG and a revitalization of the program to:

- Better support dissemination of individual faculty learning to the wider faculty population
- Provide funding for the implementation of successful pilot projects
- Integrate funding with institute priorities
- Support the scholarship of teaching

I. PLIG TYPES

EXPLORATION GRANTS

These grants provide seed funds for faculty to investigate an innovative mode or model of teaching and learning in terms of its potential to positively impact student outcomes and the student experience at RIT. These are funds for "proof of concept" investigations into the development, adaptation, or application of a new or different teaching approach, practice, or procedure. Exploration grants may range from $3,000-$5,000.

Examples of the use for Exploration grant funds include:

- Course release (reasonable, actual replacement costs for faculty members removed from teaching)
- Development of new technology-based learning tools and/or environments
- Technologies or equipment required by the project that are not normally provided by the department/college
- Resources for research design and consultation, data collection and aggregation, instrument development and/or purchase, secure data storage, data analysis, and report generation
- Travel to support research activity and/or meet with potential funding sources
Applications will be evaluated according the following criteria:

- Utility (solves a defined problem, has potential to benefit many courses/faculty)
- Creativity (is a novel approach or application, represents a new paradigm)
- Efficacy (uses an evidence-based approach, impact to student learning and/or the student experience can be demonstrated)

For more information, refer to the “Evaluation” section of this document.

Special consideration will be given for applications that:

- Have a defined opportunity for external dissemination, such as an academic journal or professional conference
- Have potential for application in more than one discipline

Demonstrate a new use/application of a model, system, or technology already in use at RIT

IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS

These grants provide funds for faculty to implement an innovative mode or model of teaching and learning, which has been shown to positively impact student outcomes and the student experience at RIT. Funding will be used to expand exploration with a wider group of faculty/courses, or to complete larger scale development, or to support transfer of the innovative mode or model of teaching and learning for use by other faculty/courses. Implementation grants may range from $5,000-$50,000.

Examples of the use for Implementation grant funds include:

- Course release (reasonable, actual replacement costs for faculty members removed from teaching)
- Technologies or equipment required by the project that are not normally provided by the department/college
- Resources for development of new technology-based learning tools and/or environments to support wider implementation
- Travel to support research activity and/or meet with potential funding sources

Applications will be evaluated according the following criteria:

- Utility (solves a defined problem, has potential to benefit many courses/faculty)
- Creativity (is a novel approach or application, represents a new paradigm)
- Efficacy (uses an evidence-based approach, impact to student learning and/or the student experience can be demonstrated)
- Feasibility (realistic in the current environment, achievable given current constraints)
- Risk (presents an acceptable level of risk, high probability of producing desirable outcomes)
- Resistance (has champions within RIT, not likely to be met with extreme resistance)

For more information, refer to the “Evaluation” section of this document.

Special consideration will be given for applications that:

- Involve cross-disciplinary implementation

Have secured or have the potential to secure matching funds (including course release) or grants.
FOCUS GRANTS

These grants provide funds for faculty to develop or apply an innovative mode or model of teaching and learning that directly supports an RIT priority. The focus area for 2013-14 academic year is:

- Applying a flipped classroom model to (re)designing all or part of a course

These are funds for the development, adaptation, or application of a new or different teaching approach, practice, or procedure in the priority area of focus. Focus grants may range from $1,000-$5,000.

Examples of the use for Focus grant funds include:

- Course release (reasonable, actual replacement costs for faculty members removed from teaching)
- Travel directly related to the project design and/or implementation
- Purchase of resources for project not normally provided by the department/college

Applications will be evaluated according the following criteria:

- Utility (solves a defined problem, has potential to benefit many courses/faculty)
- Creativity (is a novel approach or application, represents a new paradigm)
- Efficacy (uses an evidence-based approach, impact to student learning and/or the student experience can be demonstrated)

For more information, refer to the “Evaluation” section of this document.

Special consideration will be given for applications that:

Demonstrate a new use or application of a model, system, or technology already in use at RIT

II. PLIG SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue call for applications</td>
<td>September 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications due</td>
<td>November 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions announced</td>
<td>December 6, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(initial funds dispersed*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First deliverables due (additional funds dispersed)</td>
<td>No later than June 20, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final deliverables due (remaining funds dispersed)</td>
<td>No later than August 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funds will be distributed to the awardee's RIT PLIG account

III. ELIGIBILITY

Full time lecturers, tenure-track, and tenured faculty are eligible to apply for PLIG grants.
### IV. EVALUATION

Applications for PLIG funds are evaluated using the below Innovative Teaching and Learning Rubric.

**DEFINITION**

The Innovative Learning Institute is committed to working with RIT faculty to explore, develop, pilot and disseminate innovative modes and models of teaching and learning. To ensure that we allocate university resources to practices that have promise for or demonstrate innovation, we have developed a definition of and rubric for evaluation of teaching and learning practices. The definition and rubric are based on best-practices at leading universities including Duke University, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Wisconsin, Madison and Penn State University.

Definition of innovative teaching and learning practices at RIT:

> “Any teaching strategy, approach, technique, or tool that is used, or used in a new way, to produce quantifiable gain for student outcomes or the student experience, and can be implemented widely at RIT.”

The following grid illustrates the relationship between quantifiable gain (impact) and implementation (scale).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Creative Practice or Tool</th>
<th>Innovative practice or tools</th>
<th>Unproven practice or tool</th>
<th>Trendy practice or tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Any teaching strategy, approach, technique, or tool that represents a quantifiable gain for student learning or the student experience but cannot be implemented widely at RIT.</td>
<td>Any teaching strategy, approach, technique, or tool that has demonstrated quantifiable gain for students and can be implemented widely at RIT.</td>
<td>Any teaching strategy, approach, technique, or tool that has not demonstrated a quantifiable gain for student learning or the student experience and cannot be implemented widely at RIT.</td>
<td>Any widely implemented teaching strategy, approach, technique, or tool that does not represent a quantifiable gain for student learning or the student experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For example, there is evidence that complex simulations improve student learning, but they are so time consuming and expensive to program that they cannot be widely implemented.</td>
<td>For example, Classroom Assessment techniques (a type of formative evaluation) have been shown to positively impact student learning and can be widely implemented.</td>
<td>For example, use of tablets in the classroom has not yet been proven to positively impact student learning or the student experience and cannot yet be widely implemented at RIT due to costs and student access challenges.</td>
<td>For example, Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs) have become widely used in higher education, but have not yet been shown to positively impact student outcomes or the student experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCALE**

High Low
Many teaching and learning practices and tools, with modification, can fit the definition of innovative. The following grid outlines just a few ways creative, unproven, or trendy practices and tools can be made more innovative.
**EVALUATION RUBRIC**

As practices and tools are proposed for TLS support, the definition of innovation and a number of criteria will be used for evaluation. Practices and tools that fall closer to the mid-range are more likely to be supported. The range of support provided through TLS will be designed to “move” the practice or tool into the high range in terms of the criteria and therefore impact and scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Mid-Range Score</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td>Does not solve a problem or creates more problems than it solves</td>
<td>Solves a problem and presents minor new problems</td>
<td>Solves a problem while avoiding new problems Will benefit a significant number of courses/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will benefit one or a limited number of courses/faculty</td>
<td>Will benefit a reasonable number of courses/faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>Standard approach</td>
<td>Incremental improvement or new practice or tool</td>
<td>Breakthrough approach or new paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>No evidence approach will work or evidence approach will not work</td>
<td>Some evidence solution/approach will work</td>
<td>Strong evidence approach will work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>Unfeasible/unrealistic</td>
<td>Reasonably feasible/realistic</td>
<td>High feasible/realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td>Unacceptable level of risk or high probability of failure</td>
<td>Moderate level of risk or likely to produce desirable outcomes</td>
<td>Acceptable level of risk or highly likely to produce desirable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resistance</strong></td>
<td>High resistance/minimal acceptance</td>
<td>Some resistance/moderate acceptance</td>
<td>Minimal resistance/wide acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only applies to the Implementation Grant

**Utility**
- Solves a defined problem
- Has potential to benefit many courses/faculty

**Creativity**
- Is a novel approach or application
- Represents a new paradigm

**Efficacy**
- Uses an evidence-based approach
- Impact to student learning and/or the student experience can be demonstrated

**Feasibility**
- Realistic in the current environment
- Achievable given current constraints

**Risk**
- Presents an acceptable level of risk
- High probability of producing desirable outcomes

**Resistance**
- Has champions within RIT
- Not likely to be met with extreme resistance
V. REVIEW TEAM

The application review team includes staff members from the RIT community dependent on the specific nature of the goals outlined in the call for proposals.

Neil Hair (Chair), COB, Interim Director of ILI, 5-6322, nfhbbu@rit.edu

Chris Booth, ITS, 5-7392, cfbits@rit.edu
Paul Craig, COS, 5-6145, pac8612@rit.edu
Beth DeBartolo, COE, 5-2152, eademe@rit.edu
John Edlund, COLA, 5-7475, jeegsh@rit.edu
Mike Floeser, GCCIS, 5-7031, mjfics@rit.edu
Ann Hager, NTID, 5-6880, amhnbt@rit.edu
Thomas Lightfoot, CIAS, 5-2657, trfad@rit.edu
Mike Slifka, CAST, 5-5160, mjsmet1@rit.edu
Faculty Representative, IETC

VI. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

Please email plig@rit.edu with any questions or comments you may have.