

Utah System of Higher Education
UTAH ELECTRONIC COLLEGE CONSORTIUM
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
FY0708/January 2007

The Utah Electronic College's mission is to ensure that all Utah citizens, regardless of geographic location or work and life commitments, can earn a certificate or degree at a distance. In support of this mission, the UEC Curriculum Development RFP encourages development of quality technology delivered programs throughout the Utah System of Higher Education. The specific goals are:

- Develop scalable, sustainable technology delivered classes, certificate or degree programs that fill gaps in the distance delivered curriculum currently available to Utah students, or that serve new or existing audiences in new ways.
- Encourage collaboration and sharing of best practices among USHE institutions.
- Leverage existing institutional resources with system and external resources.
- Encourage faculty exploration in the use of technology in teaching and learning.

This funding effort supports distance delivered courses versus hybrid courses. Preference is given to proposals that capitalize on existing infrastructure, include matching funds, involve collaboration between departments and colleges, and include a thorough needs assessment and cost/benefit analysis showing the potential for the proposed course or program to become self-sustaining. Preference among proposals may also be given to collaborative projects involving two or more USHE institutions.

Acceptable Proposals

The RFP invites proposals that expand Utahns' access to higher education through technology delivered courses, and certificate or degree programs; revise existing technology delivered offerings to enhance quality or serve new audiences; or advance standards of best practice within the USHE. In addition to the general themes of distance education curriculum development, the USHE Academic Affairs staff has identified four priorities for FY0708:

Priority 1 – Develop an online certificate or degree readily available to all Utah citizens. There are 700 online undergraduate classes within the system but only 38 online certificate or degree programs (see UEC catalog). With such a significant number of classes, there may be a number of certificate and degree options that might be made available if a small number of additional online classes were developed. There may also be programs that could begin development with a group of foundational classes. The UEC encourages USHE institutions to compare student demand for specific programs with current offerings and identify courses that might allow the institution to offer a complete program online.

Priority 2 – Use technology delivered instruction to better prepare students for college success. Can students become better prepared for college rigor online, on television, over IPVideo? Must academic preparation activities be synchronous and/or face-to-face to ensure success? The UEC encourages institutions to explore using technology to provide new opportunities to prepare students.

Priority 3 – Develop courses or a new certificate or degree program that responds to state workforce needs. USHE graduates strengthen the state's workforce. Matching workforce needs with post-secondary training and education programs is an ongoing process. USHE institutions are encouraged to work with local business leaders and state agencies to identify emerging local, regional, or statewide workforce training and education needs. Proposals responding to this priority should include letters of support from business, industry, and agency partners.

Priority 4 – Explore economies (and challenges) made possible by learning management systems. As our system institutions become more invested in complex learning management systems (LMS), we face new issues: sharing content assets among faculty in a single department, a college, even across institutions; migrating courses from one version of an LMS to the next; developing policies for organizing large volumes of files; developing LMS content for delivery on mobile devices such as PDAs and cellular phones. The UEC encourages projects that explore these issues.

Eligible Applicants/Developers

All USHE colleges and universities are eligible to apply. At the institution's discretion, the principal developer(s) may be faculty, distance education administrator, or other campus entity. The signatures of department chair, dean, and chief academic officer, required on the cover page, serve as institutional endorsement of the rigor and scope of the curriculum to be developed and of the developer's abilities to complete the project.

Nature of Support

This RFP funds up to \$10,000 for development of an individual course, research project, or workshop. Funding for certificate and degree programs involving multiple courses will be considered in part based on this figure multiplied by the number of classes or credits to be developed. Collaborative projects involving more than one institution may request funds in excess of this benchmark to account for additional partnership costs such as travel.

Proposals can request support in the following areas:

- Faculty release time (excluding benefits budgeted by the state).
- Student production assistants' compensation, including fringe benefits.
- Faculty or staff software or equipment training, including registration and minimal travel associated with that training given it can be shown the activity is required for the project.
- Purchases of peripherals, journals, and/or specialty software to be used directly for the project. If these items are included in the proposals, contact the appropriate campus purchasing office for state contract pricing to be included in the budget. Also, list the project director's or staff's qualifications to use these items.
- Travel expenditures within collaborative program projects related to planning and oversight meetings.

Funds may not be used for:

- Overhead.
- Significant expenditures for travel, hardware, networking or communication resources.
- Complete authoring packages such as WebCT or other software packages already available through an institutional or USHE contract.
- Marketing or conference presentation expenses. The RFP is restricted to development activities.

Funding

The total of funds available for this curriculum development initiative is up to \$250,000. Some proposals may receive partial support to allow for maximum distribution to meritorious proposals. For successful proposals, 75% of the approved budget will be transferred to the sponsoring institutions July 1, 2007. The remaining funds will be transferred upon completion of the project and submission of a final report. For courses and programs, successful completion also requires the course to be offered for enrollment. The duration of the funding is 12 months for individual courses, studies, or workshops, and 24 months for program development. Unspent monies will revert to the RFP fund. Support is granted one time only.

Deadlines

Proposals must be submitted to the USHE office by 5 p.m. March 16, 2007. Notification of award decisions will be mailed April 16, 2007.

Review Process

Proposals will be reviewed by staff in the USHE office or their designees. Specific evaluation criteria are found at the end of this document.

Assignment of Intellectual Property Rights

The USHE encourages and upholds the ownership rights associated with the preparation and publication of copyrightable works from faculty teaching, research, and scholarly and artistic endeavors. In general, projects developed with grant support are considered “works for hire.” As a result, the copyright for the work belongs to the sponsoring institution(s). Faculty developer’s rights are governed by the institution’s policies on intellectual property and ownership. Multi-institution projects should include a letter of understanding from each participating institution that addresses the ownership interests of each institution in the project. Each letter of understanding should be signed by the chief academic officers and be included as an appendix to the proposal.

End-of-Project Report

Award recipients are required to submit a final report after the completion of the project. The report will include anecdotal description of the development process, a two-year schedule for course or program delivery, student feedback on the experience taking the course, if applicable, faculty response to a study or development activity, and a final expense report. Details on this report are included at the end of this packet.

Proposal Format

The total length of a proposal should not exceed nine typed double spaced pages in 10- or 12-point type, one inch margins. With the exception of the aforementioned appendices, additional pages will not be reviewed. Electronic submission of the proposal, including a cover page without signatures, is required. The cover page with signatures affixed may be mailed; electronic copy is preferred. MS Word, WordPerfect, or .pdf formats are preferred.

Submission Guidelines

All proposals must be transmitted together through the office of the chief academic officer.

1. Send electronic copies of proposals to cgrua@utahsbr.edu .
2. Mail original cover pages with signatures affixed to:
Cynthia Grua
Director, Utah Electronic College Consortium
Utah State Board of Regents
Regent Building, The Gateway
60 S 400 W
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284

Proposal Guidelines

Each proposal should include the following:

Cover Page (see attached form) — one page — include signatures from sponsoring department chairs, deans, and CAOs. All signatures must be affixed to the original cover page or proposal will be disqualified.

Budget Request (see attached form) — one page — list all expenses associated with the project including in kind contributions and matching funds. NOTE: No indirect costs (benefits, overhead) will be funded.

Course Data (see attached form) — one page — describe all classes to be developed under the project.

NOTE: These three forms are MS Word forms. Type into the first text field, then TAB to the next field. Fields like the Project Abstract will expand as you write, up to a designated limit (1000 characters for the abstract, 300 characters for other descriptive items). When finished, “Save As” 0708_Institution Name _Project Name_Cover.doc. You cannot modify the forms. You can write into the form over multiple sessions.

Project Description — three pages — present a description of the products of the development process, including the purpose of the course, program, or study, the mode(s) of delivery to be used, and the audience(s) that will benefit. Include an historical perspective: delivery and enrollment data for both campus and distance sections. How will this new course better serve existing audiences or attract new ones? How will a study or workshop impact faculty or students?

Significance — one page — describe the project’s relationship to strategic institutional goals and/or its contribution to USHE priorities. How does the course or program articulate with other USHE institutions? How does the course contribute to a technology delivered certificate or degree? How will a workshop advance USHE best practices?

Institutional Commitment — one page — describe the institution’s support of the proposed course or program, including participation of various campus units and in-kind or matching contributions. Which semesters will the institution offer developed classes? What are projected enrollments? What is the institution’s plan for ongoing maintenance and enhancement of the course or program?

Faculty Developer/Support Staff Profiles — one page — provide a biographical profile of faculty developer(s) and key support staff. Include academic degrees, employment history, curriculum development experience, and experience with distance education.

Appendices

Intellectual Property/Ownership Letters of Understanding — For multi-institution projects, include a letter from all participating institutions that addresses the ownership interest of each. Developers and chief academic officers should sign the letters.

Special Contractual Agreements — If external contractors are involved in the project, or if multiple institutions are involved, attach an agreement confirming various roles and responsibilities signed by all relevant participants.

Evaluation Criteria

Course and program proposals will be evaluated based on:

Impact — The proposed course or program fills a gap in curriculum currently available at a distance. The need for the course is established by enrollment patterns or other indicators. The schedule for offering the course or program speaks to this demand.

Institutional Endorsement/Effective Leveraging of Existing Department and Campus Resources — The project involves institutional resources such as the distance education unit, media creation units, or faculty center for teaching excellence. The responsibilities of participants are clearly defined. All units have participated in the proposal process. Ownership issues are addressed.

Reasonable and Appropriate Budget – There is a rationale for expenditures. Expenditure levels seem appropriate for the number of students who will be impacted by the course or program.

Implementation – Timelines for project development and delivery to students seem reasonable. A plan to manage and update the course or program over time is included.

Effective and/or Innovative Use of Technology — Proposed technologies seem appropriate for the curriculum. The development team's technical experience seems appropriate to complete the project.

Experience of Developers – The developer(s) have experience with the technologies to be used, have some experience teaching at a distance, and have a superior overall profile for teaching.

Multi-Institutional Collaboration (if applicable) — The responsibilities for all participants are clearly defined; all institutions have been involved in developing and approving the proposal. The project meets a need for each institution involved.

Workshop and study proposals will be evaluated based on:

Impact — Outcomes will positively impact faculty or students.

Institutional Endorsement/Effective Leveraging of Existing Department and Campus Resources — The project involves institutional resources such as the distance education unit, media creation units, or faculty center for teaching excellence. The responsibilities of different units and institutions are clearly defined. All units have participated in the proposal process.

Reasonable and Appropriate Budget – There is a clear rationale for expenditures. Expenditures seem appropriate for the number of workshop participants or the number of individuals to be included in the study.

Implementation – The proposal sets forth reasonable timelines for project development and delivery. A plan to offer the workshop or conduct the study and distribute findings is included.

Experience of Developers – The developer(s) have experience with the technologies to be used, have some experience teaching or providing student services at a distance, and have a superior overall profile for teaching.

Multi-Institutional Collaboration (if applicable) — The responsibilities for all participants are clearly defined, and all institutions have been involved in developing and approving the proposal. The project meets a need for each institution involved.

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT FY0708 Recipients

DUE July 31, 2007

This document outlines the scope of the final evaluation report for a UEC-sponsored development project. It is provided as advance information on the reporting requirements of UEC-sponsored projects. The evaluation document should be no more than seven pages long as outlined below (single-spaced/attachments excluded). Reports must be provided in electronic format, MS Word, WP, or pdf preferred. The narrative portion of the document and artifacts of the final product (items 1 through 5 below) will be posted on the UEC and USHE websites.

Final evaluation reports must be received before the 25% balance of funding is disbursed. The report must be received within one month of the end date of the contract.

Your efforts to develop a technology delivered course or related project are greatly appreciated by USHE, your institution, and Utah students. The assessment of the development experience will greatly benefit future RFP awardees. We look forward to your comments.

Final Evaluation Specifications

1. Description of the finished project – course, course component, study (up to one page);
2. Narrative of the development process (up to 2 pages);
3. Summary of student feedback on the course, if students have already taken the course, or a summary of a study's findings (up to 2 pages);
4. List of recommendations for future development activities or future research activities including support the state system or individual institution might provide (up to 2 pages);
5. Attachment A: Copy of the finished project (URL with password, video, CD, text of study);
6. Attachment B: Schedule for the coming year listing when the course will be offered, including anticipated enrollments, if a course or course component was produced, or a description of efforts that will be made to publish study findings to USHE institutions and other higher education entities;
7. Attachment C: Budget worksheet with both original projected and actual expenditures listed. NOTE: Monies must be spent according to the original budget proposal. Unspent monies must be returned to the UEC. Developers may not propose to spend unspent monies on additional activities not outlined in the original budget proposal.