# **Faculty Development Program**

## **APPENDIX J: INDIVIDUALLY PLANNED PROGRAM Evaluation Form**

#### PLEASE RETURN THIS EVALUATION WITHIN 48 HOURS OR SOONER TO:

Faculty Development Administrator, Dempsey 335

Proposal Number:	Name of Evaluator:	
-		

#### Eligibility and Conditions

- All continuing UW Oshkosh faculty and academic staff holding full- or at least half-time academic year appointments
- Faculty or academic staff on annual (12-month) appointments are not eligible for CAS support.
- Given the individualized nature of each project, proposers are strongly encouraged to discuss their plans with department/unit chairs, colleagues, or Faculty Development Board members prior to submission of application.
- Funded projects may be assigned special conditions of award.

#### **Exclusions**

 Anyone with a past-due project is not eligible to apply for or receive additional support from the Faculty Development Program until the past-due status is removed

### Budget

- Funds may be requested for CAS, reassigned time, and/or auxiliary funds in support of a project.
- Auxiliary funds may be requested for student assistance, equipment, books, computer software or other items for which the use-life extends beyond the project period as long as no single item exceeds \$500.

#### Proposal Requests

Proposals in this option are expected to vary in form and content to allow flexibility in the specific project to be pursued by the faculty/academic staff member. It is essential that the proposal clearly explain in detail the value, rigor, validity, and importance of the proposed program. At a minimum, the proposal should effectively address the following evaluation criteria:

1.	<b>INTEGRATION WITH PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM:</b> Has the proposer explained how the program is an integral part of a larger, long-term program of professional study? Minor, limited or incremental projects will not be supported.	Yes	No
2.	<b>PRIOR WORK:</b> Is evidence provided that substantive prior work has already been completed? Evidence may include bibliographies, prior papers, shows or exhibits, or other evidence of concentrated planning serving to focus the proposed IPP tasks.	Yes	No
3.	RELATION OF ACTIVITIES TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Have the specific activities which will be undertaken during the proposed IPP been clearly stated? Do the specific activities relate to the professional abilities which will be enhanced or developed? These should be related to activities which have occurred prior to the IPP, and which will occur following the completion of the IPP. Has the proposer explained how the IPP fits into his/her total professional objectives?	Yes	No

Last updated: 2/13/14 Page 1 of 2

# **Faculty Development Program**

4.	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT: Has the proposer explained why the specific professional development environment was chosen? If applicable, what other environments were considered?		Yes		No	
5.	5. <b>TANGIBLE OUTCOME(S):</b> Are specific, <u>tangible</u> outcomes identified? Do those proposed outcomes relate to the professional development activities evaluated under criteria 1 and 3? How will that product(s) will be communicated to others, both for evaluation of project completion and for potential benefit and learning from the experience of the proposer		Yes		No	
6.	i. TIME LINE: Has a clear timeline for performing the IPP been described or included?		Yes		No	
7.	7. <b>BUDGET:</b> Is the CAS amount requested commensurate with the scope of work described? If auxiliary funds are requested, are those funds essential to achieving the stated IPP goals? If auxiliary funds are requested, does the proposal narrative contain an "Auxiliary Funds Justification" section?		Yes		No	
Committee Member Recommendation:						
Committee Member Written Comments:						