Flinders University

Applying for ALTC Grants

June 2, 2010

Associate Professor Peter Hutchings
Acknowledgement of country

With respect, I would like to acknowledge the Kaurna people, the traditional custodians of the land on which we are meeting,
And their Elders, past and present.
Grants Scheme Overview

• Three Grants Programs
  – Competitive Grants ($3.5m)
  – Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching ($3m)
  – Priority Projects ($4.9m)
Grants Scheme — Priorities

• Assessment, standards and reporting (PP)
• Curriculum renewal (PP)
• Innovation in learning and teaching, including in relation to the role of new technologies (CG)
• Internationalisation (PP)
• Leadership capacity building for learning and teaching (LP)
• Research and development focussing on issues of emerging and continuing importance (CG)
• Strategic approaches to learning and teaching that address the increasing diversity of the student body (CG)
• Teaching and Learning spaces (PP)
Decision-making and governance processes

- Relevant Committees and Standing Committees:
  - Competitive Grants Standing Committee
  - Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program Standing Committee
  - Priority Projects Standing Committee

- Standing Committees meet three times a year

- Standing Committees have oversight of the management of the Grants Schemes, and receive regular reports on completed projects or fellowships, and on any other matters of significance related to the progress of funded activities
Decision-making and governance processes

• All grant proposals are externally assessed by at least two assessors — assessors for all programs meet to discuss their evaluations and make joint recommendations

• Assessments form the basis of recommendations to Standing Committees of the ALTC Board — an Assessment Report summarizing the assessment process and the assessor’s comments is provided to the relevant Standing Committee

• Standing Committees review recommendations and make final decisions
GRANTS SCHEME — Competitive Grants

• The priority Development of robust methods of identifying and rewarding excellence in teaching (excluding awards schemes) has been deleted.

The funding priorities for 2010 are:

• Priority One: Research and development focusing on issues of emerging and continuing importance

• Priority Two: Strategic approaches to learning and teaching that address the increasing diversity of the student body

• Priority Three: Innovation in learning and teaching, particularly in relation to the role of new technologies

Closing dates for proposals

GRANTS SCHEME — Leadership Projects

The Program priorities are unchanged from 2009. The duration and funding range of some priorities have changed.

• Priority one: institutional leadership to enhance learning and teaching through leadership capacity-building at the institutional level. Funding range: $150,000 to $220,000
  • Project duration: up to 2 years

• Priority two: disciplinary and cross-disciplinary leadership to enhance learning and teaching through leadership capacity-building in discipline structures, communities of practice and cross-disciplinary networks. Funding range: $80,000 to $220,000
  • Project duration: up to 2 years
GRANTS SCHEME — Leadership Projects

• Priority three: consolidating leadership by building on the outcomes of projects funded in earlier years under the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program. Funding range: $80,000 to $150,000

• Project duration: up to 1.5 years

• Two general calls for project proposals will occur in 2010. The ALTC reserves the right to ask for a proposal to be modified and/or re-submitted for decision.

Closing dates for proposals

• Round 1: 18 March 2010.

• Round 2: 1 July 2010.
GRANTS SCHEME — Leadership Projects

Leadership Program Guidelines

• The criterion Project Outcomes and Rationale has been expanded in each Priority and applications should demonstrate:

  — How are leadership and leadership capacity building defined for the purposes of the project?

  — What are the proposed leadership outcomes (achievements) of the project?
GRANTS SCHEME — Priority Projects

• The priority Peer review for promotion has been deleted.

The funding priorities for 2010, Round 1 (9 April 2010) are:

• academic standards, assessment practices and reporting
• curriculum renewal
• teaching and learning spaces

The additional priority for 2010, Round 2 (29 July 2010) is:

• Internationalisation

• All priorities may be applied for in Round 2.
GRANTS SCHEME OVERVIEW

• High level of interest 2005-2009: 1157 applications; 201 projects funded as of 2009 (17% cumulative success rate).

• Collaboration: 92% joint projects involving at least one other partner (2009 projects) and (increasingly) international partners.

• Dissemination: improving, but still a challenge.

• Project Management – developing expertise, personnel issues.

• Participation: sector-wide, significant across range of institution by size (exception: smaller institutions)
Grants Scheme participation 2005-2009 by institution grouped by size*

* Based upon actual Equivalent Full Time Student Load 2007 (DEEWR)

Projects funded as of Dec.’09

Number of Projects (as lead or partner)
## Grant statistics — Competitive, Leadership, Priority

### Applications by EOI & proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Success rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant statistics — Competitive, Leadership, Priority

Total grant funding approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount ($ 000)</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td>7,972</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>10,255</td>
<td>37,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grant statistics — Competitive Grants

## Applications by EOI & proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI's</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Success rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant statistics — Leadership for Excellence

Applications by EOI & proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI's</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant statistics — Priority Projects

Applications by EOI & proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI's</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2005–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pilot applications in assessment
## Grants Scheme — projects by priority 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CG1</td>
<td>R&amp;D focusing on issues of emerging and continuing importance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG2</td>
<td>Strategic approaches to L&amp;T addressing the increasing diversity of the student body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG3</td>
<td>Innovation in L&amp;T, particularly in relation to the role of new technologies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Institutional leadership to enhance L&amp;T through leadership capacity-building</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Disciplinary and cross-disciplinary leadership to enhance L&amp;T</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Consolidating leadership by building on the outcomes of Leadership projects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1</td>
<td>Academic standards, assessment practices and reporting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2</td>
<td>Curriculum renewal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP3</td>
<td>Teaching and learning spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP4</td>
<td>Peer review for promotion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SINGLE INSTITUTION PROJECTS

The principles for funding single institution projects:

• Case studies of an issue, an idea or approach of importance to the higher education sector

• The work proposed should be able to be applied within other institutions

• The project includes a comprehensive and convincing strategy to ensure outcomes and project materials take into account different institutional contexts and are able to be applied in those different contexts

• A comprehensive plan for dissemination to the relevant audiences – sharing needs to be imbedded in the conduct of the project
Technology projects: Design specifications

Applications which propose technological developments should submit a one page design brief, addressing the following issues:

– User interface and useability issues;
– a brief site map or story boards (if the proposal includes website design);
– user scenario;

Or,

– the functionality, sustainability and scalability of what is being proposed;
– the technical expertise available to the project team; and
– availability of required technology/infrastructure.

• Applications proposing software development should aim to develop open-source software.
Operational guidelines

- The quality and timeliness of the project leader’s previous ALTC work may be taken into account when considering applications for funding.

- Under normal circumstances, applications involving a project leader whose final report is overdue or not of a satisfactory standard at the time of close of applications will not be accepted. The Chair of the Standing Committee has the discretion to rule on this matter. (Note this adds to the current statement that prevents leadership of more than two projects or one fellowship and one project.)

- Should a project leader need to withdraw from the project, written notification should be provided to the ALTC with information on how the project will continue to be supported by the lead institution.
Operational guidelines

- **Collaborations, Partnerships and Other Roles**

  - All nominated project team members should be in agreement with the proposal at the time of submission. If it comes to the attention of ALTC that nominated team members are not aware of the application, the proposal will be deemed ineligible for that funding round.

  - Formal collaborations or partnerships are acknowledged in documentation regarding the project. Collaborating institution/s will contribute substantially to the project, usually through a project team member. Where partners are not represented on the project team, a clear rationale should be included in the proposal to explain this absence. To acknowledge this commitment, project proposals must be endorsed in writing by the PVC/DVC (Academic), or equivalent, of all collaborating/partner institutions before submission.
Grants writing
Project Outcomes and Rationale

• Clearly articulated outcomes and a clear argument demonstrating how the project will address one of the program priorities and contribute to the enhancement of learning and teaching in higher education
Grants Criteria

Approach

• A strong theoretical framework

• A set of strategies which is considered, coherent and appropriate to the outcomes the project is designed to achieve

• An approach that is in general alignment with the commitments of the ALTC

• Plans for the dissemination/embedding of the successful strategies and outcomes that are integrated within the project design
Grants Criteria

Value/Need for Project

• Potential usefulness of the project and its outcomes to any of the following:
  • the sector as a whole
  • particular kinds of organisations within the sector
  • the development of national approaches or policies related to learning and teaching in higher education

• Ways in which the project both utilises and advances existing national and international knowledge relevant to the program priority or priorities

• If appropriate to the project, strategies to assess the scalability and sustainability of the model or process proposed
Grants Criteria

Project Management and Budget

• A thorough approach to project management, and

• Budget justification appropriate to the project outcomes and importance.

Additional criterion

• Capacity of project team to deliver on proposed outcomes
Competitive Grants — general comments

• The overall quality of applications was rated medium or good by 18 of the 20 assessors.

• Among the applications were good, innovative ideas that address areas of real importance to the sector and build on existing work. There appears to be greater appreciation of the need for innovation that is sustainable and for outcomes that are portable across the sector.

• There were useful research methods articulated and well-justified implications for teaching and learning.

• Evaluation is built into many applications (in a way it was not a few years ago) and many have embedded and highly effective approaches to dissemination.

• The concept of evaluation has been interpreted differently by applicants. Some applications failed to distinguish between evaluation of the project outcomes or deliverables (when required as an integral project component) and actual project evaluation.
Competitive Grants — general comments, cont.

• A weakness of some applications is a reliance on outcomes that demonstrate scholarship rather than change in strategy, teacher behaviour or expectations about the role of the student in assuming greater responsibility for learning.

• Many proposals include preliminary literature reviews and sector consultations that should be carried out in the phase of establishing the viability or need for the project – that is, before the proposal is submitted.

• Some applications are too broad (and thus unlikely to produce a targeted outcome that could be taken up and embedded in practice) or are actually two projects in one (and typically too large and too thinly spread to do full justice to either).

• In many cases, dissemination was narrowly focused and involvement of other institutions was limited. There was little recognition that many projects could, with some planning, be developed to allow more generic use across disciplines and the sector.
Leadership— general comments

• There is good continuing interest in embedding leadership improvements across the sector, as well as some refreshing new approaches.

• Communication and collaboration between universities in teaching and learning is high and this is reflected in the applications reviewed.

• There was a range of leadership topics and focus.

• Most applications have a strong discipline–based understanding of pedagogy needs. A few applications have a good understanding of leadership and how to develop it.

• The weaknesses identified in applications included:
  — The leadership dimension was often not the front and centre of some proposals. There are some worthy projects but others barely had a mention of leadership capacity development.
  
  — Lack of focus on how leadership per se would be developed. There is more of a curriculum approach than a leadership-enhancing approach in the applications.
Leadership — general comments, cont.

- The weaknesses identified in applications included:
  - Some poor reading and/or application of program guidelines to project construction.
  - Budget justification was poor in some of the applications, especially for the big budget items.
  - There is a clear lack of evaluation during and after projects.
  - The applications need to define leadership and leadership capacity building for the purposes of the project and indicate the leadership outcomes of the project.
Priority Projects — general comments

• Many applications were well written and some are innovative and cutting edge (e.g. Web 2.0 assessment).

• Applications are often cross-disciplinary in their relevance and the strong cross-institutional collaboration is one of the strengths.

• Many applications addressed issues of emerging importance within the sector and identified clear needs within the institutions with the ambition of achieving better outcomes for staff and students in teaching and learning.

• Some applications build on prior ALTC work and the continuity is one of the strengths.

• Most applications are based on sound theory and show engagement with the body of knowledge in the area. While there is some evidence of considerable preliminary work or pilot studies by communities, there often appeared to be limited preliminary investigation demonstrated in literature reviews of small pilot studies. E.g. few applications made explicit reference to curriculum design and re-development or research.

• There were numerous applications with interesting concepts but which are not well presented or are poorly integrated with the body of knowledge.

AUSTRALIAN LEARNING AND TEACHING COUNCIL
Priority Projects — general comments, cont.

• In the weaker applications, the weaknesses identified in applications included:

  — Poor budget justifications

  — Clear evaluation plans, particularly in engaging stakeholders

  — A lack of detail about:

    • how outcomes would be achieved;

    • how collaborating partners would work together and what these roles would be;

    • how large project teams would be led and managed to ensure outcomes were achieved and focus was maintained; and

    • how the proposed outcomes have wide applicability.

  — A lack of engagement with key ideas and theoretical concepts
Project design

- The project design should demonstrate a clear relationship with the proposed outcome and so should the allocation of resources.

- Collaboration is difficult and requires resources to support the collaboration itself – ensure you don’t underestimate the need for this resourcing, the need for face-to-face and working systematically through responsibilities.

- Check that you have addressed all the criteria.

- Write in simple English – avoid jargon.
Project design

• Make sure you know the literature and what else is happening in the area of your project and demonstrate how your project will add to what is already available

• Signal – build on work undertaken. Unlikely projects which ignore current or completed projects will get funding. Explore the relationships and explain the contribution over and above work undertaken.

• Gain the sponsorship of those who can promote the resources/change/findings and provide evidence for this.
HOW TO APPLY

Online Applications

2009 Applications have closed.

Applications to the 2010 Grants Scheme:

- Competitive Grants Program
- Priority Projects Program
- Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program

should be made via the ALTC’s online grants application system.

Applications through the online system consist of:

- the Application Form
- the proposal
- associated attachments

Refer to the individual program guidelines for specific information on the preparation of proposals.

The Grants Scheme Online Application Instructions to assist in completing the form are available to download.

Budgets are required for full proposals and should be submitted in the format provided.

The budget instructions and budget templates are available to download.

Grants & Projects

Overview

Funding Available
- Competitive Grants
- Leadership Program
- Priority Projects
- Investigation Projects

How to Apply

Managing Your Project
List of Projects
Promoting Excellence Initiative

Guidelines

Updated October 2009

Investigation Projects: Dissemination of ALTC Project Outcomes 2009
Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program 2010
Competitive Grants Program 2010
Priority Projects Program 2010
Changes to Grants Scheme 2010
Grant writing checklist

• Who would be interested in the outcomes of your project? How do you know?

• What is known about the area and what resources are available?

• How important is your proposed project for:
  • my institution
  • discipline
  • other institutions
  • sector?

• What and who is needed to effect the change proposed or carry forward actions to respond to the research finding?

• Is there a known need/demand for the resource/change?
Thinking about a grant through the ALTC Grants Scheme

Problem / issue for development
• How is it important for the advancement of L&T in higher education?

Knowledge of area
• Work being undertaken
• Findings of studies

Specific aspect of the problem / issue to be addressed

Outcome to be achieved
• What change do we want to effect?

Interested parties

Relevance / importance of outcome to your institution & other institutions
• Significance to sector / discipline / groups of institutions?
• Evidence to support claims?

Evidence of value of strength to your institution and other institutions

Aligning with ALTC priorities
CG1: R&D focusing on issues of emerging and continuing importance
CG2: Strategic approaches to L&T addressing the increasing diversity of the student body
CG3: Innovation in L&T, particularly in relation to the role of new technologies
L1: Institutional leadership to enhance L&T through leadership capacity-building
L2: Disciplinary and cross-disciplinary leadership to enhance L&T
L3: Consolidating leadership by building on the outcomes of Leadership projects
PP1: Academic standards, assessment practices and reporting
PP2: Curriculum renewal
PP3: Teaching and learning spaces
PP4: Internationalisation (Round 2, 2010)
MANAGING YOUR PROJECT

A number of resources are available to assist project holders in planning, implementing, reporting and evaluating their ALTC funded project and for disseminating outcomes.

Project Management Information

The project management information will assist project holders manage their project. It includes important information regarding Interim and Final Project Reporting requirements, instructions for the preparation of text resources and publicly accessible project websites, as well as guidelines for correct acknowledgement and recognition of the ALTC’s funding in all written project material.

The paper Operational learnings of ALTC project holders synthesises challenges and lessons learned in the day-to-day operations of the program and the reported experiences of grants scheme project teams. By highlighting the challenges and lessons learned, it is hoped that existing and new project holders may become more aware of potential pitfalls and also be better placed to take up opportunities that may arise.

Occasional papers are under development to resource project teams. The first resource, on Communication Strategies, provides useful reflection for all team members in the planning and execution of their project.
Useful resources

• How to Apply — http://www.altc.edu.au/grants-how-to-apply

• http://www.altc.edu.au/managing-your-project


• Assessment reports on previous funding rounds

• Program guidelines and summaries

• What’s happening in Leadership, Science, etc.
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