

Procedures for Administering
"Quality Improvement" Grants for 1984-85*

Guidelines

For the purposes of this grant program, the term "faculty development" includes but is not limited to these kinds of activities:

- . Support for curriculum development or course planning within authorized programs of study
- . Support for research, including publication, or support for research toward terminal degrees on the part of faculty already employed.
- . Appropriate travel for faculty (e.g., to professional meetings)
- . Workshops or symposia (e.g., on effective teaching)

Proposals which target specific areas of study (e.g., English, engineering), rather than the entire faculty, are expected and encouraged. Institutions are strongly urged to submit proposals designed to enhance programs which are strong; or designed to bring deficient areas up to a more acceptable level.

Proposals which involve more than one institutions are permitted and encouraged.

In general, each institution or campus may submit only one proposal, except that institutions involved in multi-campus proposals may submit a second proposal for activities restricted to its campus.

Proposals may not include requests to fund any new permanent positions.

*Approved by the Commission on Higher Education, 5/3/84.

Format for Proposals

Proposals shall be submitted by the chief executive officer of the institution to the executive director of the Commission. Each proposal shall include at least the following:

- . Cover page, identifying the institution, date submitted, program coordinator
- . A summary of the proposal, describing briefly the activities proposed, the outcomes expected, the evaluation procedure, and a tabular summary of the proposed budget
- . Details of the proposal including at least:
 - . Statement of purposes and objectives
 - . Description of proposed activities, relating each to purposes and objectives
 - . Description of relationship of proposed activities to current and continuing faculty development program
 - . Budget details showing how the requested funds are to be spent and for what purposes
 - . Description of anticipated outcomes and the process by which activities will be evaluated in terms of those outcomes

Time Lines

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| March 21, 1984 | - Guidelines Considered by ACAP |
| April 23 | - Guidelines Considered by CAA |
| May 3 | - Guidelines Considered by CHE |
| May 10 | - Formal RFP's issued |
| July 1 | - Proposals due |

(July)	- Proposals reviewed by staff and CAA
August 27	- Awards made by CHE
Feb. 1, 1985	- Interim spending report due
April 1	- Brief progress report due
July 1	- Final report and evaluation due

A table showing the maximum amount which could be awarded to each institution under the terms of the proviso is attached.

MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE AWARDS
GRANTS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, FY 1984-85
(1% of Normal State Appropriation for FY 83-84,
Rounded to Nearest Hundred)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Maximum (Thousands)</u>
<u>Senior Colleges and Universities</u>	
The Citadel	\$ 98.0
Clemson U.	460.5
College of Charleston	123.6
Francis Marion	65.9
Lander	47.1
MUSC (excl. Hosp.)	648.4
S.C. State	135.8
USC-Cola. (incl. Sch. of Med.)	879.4
USC-Aiken	37.1
USC-Coastal	50.1
USC-Spartanburg	52.2
Winthrop	130.9
(Subtotal, Sr. Colls. & U's)	2,729.0
 <u>Two-Year Campuses, USC</u>	
USC-Beaufort	8.2
USC-Lancaster	13.7
USC-Salkehatchie	8.4
USC-Sumter	17.5
USC-Union	5.7
(Subtotal, Two-Year Campuses)	53.5
 <u>Technical Colleges</u>	
Aiken	\$ 18.0
Beaufort	20.2
Chesterfield-Marlboro	11.8
Denmark	18.1
Florence- Darlington	36.3
Greenville	80.6
Horry-Georgetown	19.6
Midlands	79.6
Orangeburg-Calhoun	23.0
Piedmont	30.0
Spartanburg	29.0
Sumter	25.0
Tri-County	37.1
Trident	76.5
Williamsburg	11.3
York	27.2
(Subtotal, Technical Colleges)	543.3
 Grand Total	 \$3,325.8
Total to Award	2,000.0