tESS workshop 15 February 2017

**Developing and using small pedagogic research projects as a basis for writing for journals and in books about learning and teaching**

**Activity: What makes a bid successful (and what will set off alarm bells for the reviewers)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Give them the money!** | **They must be kidding!** |
| Use of relevant literature in the field to underpin the planned research | We are basing our approach on the Higher Education Academy HEA ‘Marked improvement’ templates as a means of interrogating current assessment practice and then following a gap analysis, investigate how practical interventions can improve assessment at a school level.  HEA (2012) *A Marked Improvement: transforming assessment in higher education,*York: Higher Education Academy. (<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/assessment/A_Marked_Improvement.pdf> | Our project makes use of a range of relevant literature in the field including Bloom and Kolb |
| Good value for money | Our bid includes payment for  A. Project leader at SL level for half a day a week for three months £xxxx  B. Two doctoral students to collect and analyse data for a total of 12 days £xxx  Support for a national dissemination event for 80 delegates @£25 pp (delegates will contribute £35 to attend the event) to include hospitality and copies of the compendium of case studies. £2000  Consumables (printing, postage, etc.) £xxx  Contingencies £xxx  The university will match fund the project by not charging room hire for the event, supporting the engagement of project team members (other than A&B) , providing technological and admin support for the website and events and other items.  Outputs from the project will have impact on, we estimate, 200+ internal staff plus at least 500 others, since our team includes active members of SEDA and HEA networks. Team members also have the potential to ensure the project impacts internationally since their track records include prior experience of doing so (See CVs) | We require funding for buy-out of staff time for three members of staff half time for six weeks i.e. £xxxxxx |
| Clear plan for action, with milestones and timelines | X- 1 month Preliminary work to be undertaken by the team in advance of a funding decision  X Confirmation of funding received  X+ 1 month Research plan to be completed, ethical approval sought and received, staff release negotiated, data collection plan agreed, data collection started  X+2 months Data collection completed, analysis commenced  X+ 3 months Analysis completed and final planning for national event  X+4months, national event planned after research completed  X+6 months user survey issued and evaluation of project undertaken, with report back to funder | We guarantee we will undertake and complete the work within a four-month period. |
| Appropriate research plan/methodology | We will use grounded theory which gives us a pragmatic yet well theorised basis for our investigations (Corbin, J.M. and Strauss, A., 1990. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative sociology*, *13*(1), pp.3-21.) This will …….. | We will ask students what they think and then analyse the outputs |
| Clear deliverables | These will include:  A dedicated area of our team website, which has technological and academic support for regular updating;  Publications in informal and formal media including the university newsletter and pedagogic journals. Including Innovations in Education and Teaching International in which two of our team have had recent well-regarded articles published.  If funded, we have preliminary agreement that the initial findings will be presented at the university’s summer Teaching and Learning Conference which is normally attended by at least 200 internal staff plus 50 from partner colleges and up to 30 external delegates.  We have provisional agreement to host a #lthechat tweet chat on project completion. | We will disseminate our findings through articles in five star refereed journals and the university website |
| Track record of successful project completion | Our team include two National Teaching Fellows and three HEA Senior Fellows.  Five of our team have successfully run a project for the HEA on assessment management (2014-5).  Outputs from this project in hard copy (3000 copies) and as virtual learning resources (7.506 downloads) have been very well received.  The appended team CV shows a total of 20 pedagogic outputs on assessment in various media over the last eight years. | Our team comprises six highly regarded academics with strong research records in our field with more than 400 publications in the area of Environmental Science |
| Clear plan of action for the future/ Sustainability | Our team includes two doctoral students who will incorporate the findings of this research into their future investigations.  We have the full support of our PVC for Learning and Teaching, who has invited members of the team to join the university’s Assessment Task and Finish group (duration 18 months) and her agreement that, if funded, our research will directly feed into strategic developments. | The work will impact on university policy in the future |

**Writing successful teaching and learning project bids**

What were the key messages for you about maximising your chances of funding?

**How can you evaluate a pedagogic project?**

**Murray Saunders’ RUFDATA evaluation**

What are our Reasons and Purposes for evaluation?

What will be the uses of our evaluation? What will be the Foci for our evaluations?

What will be our Data and Evidence for our evaluations?

Who will be the Audience for our evaluations?

What will be the Timing for our evaluations?

Who should be the Agency conducting the evaluations?

Saunders, M., 2000. Beginning an evaluation with RUFDATA: theorizing a practical approach to evaluation planning. *Evaluation*, *6*(1), pp.7-21.

**Disseminating your project**

* Who is your prime dissemination audience? (institutional, other HEIs, national, International?)
* What is really exciting, innovative or helpful about what your project has discovered?
* Not just another website: what is going to draw people into clicking through to your findings?
* So what? What difference does your work make to anyone? How could it change practice?
* You can invite them to your conference but who will come: why would people want to spend time/money to come and listen to/work with you?
* Why should anyone bother to read your published outputs? Who else is going to find your results interesting?
* What is unique, special or useful about what you have discovered?

**Where do you want to disseminate your findings?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Benefits** | **Disadvantages** |
| **Refereed article in international journal** | **High prestige, potentially REF-able**  **Potentially broad readership** | **Very competitive domain, hard to get into, long wait to know if it will be published and see it in print published, not many actually read journal articles** |
| **Other type of journal e.g. an institutional T&L journal e.g. Greenwich or Napier** | **Relatively easy to get published, often welcome inputs from staff at other HEIs, relatively fast output** | **Less prestigious than high-rated journals** |
| **Book chapter in edited collection** | **Can be more readily accepted than a journal article, contacting your networks may help you locate upcoming publications which might welcome your work** | **Often long wait to see it published, lower status than elite journals** |
| **University magazine or website** | **Will demonstrate your impact internally, tend to be fast to publish, in most HEIs you are likely to get work accepted readily** | **Low external benefit, unlikely to make much impact on your CV** |
| **Times Higher or Guardian Education** | **Quick to get published, will give your project national/international profile. May pay cash** | **Less prestigious, tends to be ephemeral,** |
| **SEDA Paper/ *Educational Developments* or other less formal publication** | **SEDA are keen to support new authors to publish, often quick turnaround** | **Relatively low number of readers, probably not REF-able** |
| **Website** | **You are in control of production so can make outputs available fast and cheaply** | **Refreshing of websites is often neglected, so many websites around** |
| **Conference** | **Visible output, often enjoyable, effective showcase, can give you institutional visibility** | **Hard work to organise, risk of people not coming if free and financial risk if charged** |
| **Social media** | **No gatekeepers to stop you publishing, quick and easy to get out there, can have high impact if goes viral** | **Ephemeral, low status** |
| **Project compendium/ publication** | **You control publication and can make it visually interesting. Makes a good workshop resource** | **Circulation/availability can be limited. Costs fall to you once project ended. You may get left with boxes of materials if you go for paper versions** |