

# LEARN BY DOING SCHOLAR AWARD 2020

## Cal Poly's Award Recognizing Scholarship on Learn by Doing Pedagogy

**Deadline for submission:** Wednesday, March 11, 2020, 5 p.m.

Applicants will be notified of decisions in mid-Spring Quarter 2020.

Winners will be publicly recognized during Fall Convocation 2020.

**Questions?** Please contact Jeanine Scaramozzino, Learn by Doing Scholar Award Committee Chair, at [jscaramo@calpoly.edu](mailto:jscaramo@calpoly.edu).

### About the Awards

The Cal Poly Learn by Doing Awards were established to recognize faculty members who demonstrate excellence in the scholarship of teaching and advancement of Learn by Doing pedagogy. The awards acknowledge scholarly research that goes beyond descriptive examples of Learn by Doing projects and recognize how faculty are directly contributing to the pedagogical understanding and practice of Learn by Doing. Each year, two awards are presented, with a cash prize of \$2000 for the career award (typically 6+ years focused on pedagogical scholarship) and \$1000 for the emerging career award (typically 1-5 years focused on pedagogical scholarship).

Faculty self-nominate for the award. Individual and team (collaborative) applications are welcome for both awards. Team applications may include Cal Poly students and non-Cal Poly researchers. The Learn by Doing Scholar Award applications are reviewed by one tenured faculty member from each college and the library.

The Learn by Doing Scholar Awards were established in 2014 and are financially supported by the Library Dean's Advisory Council.

### Applicant Eligibility

The primary applicant must be a current, active member of the Cal Poly faculty (i.e. member of collective bargaining unit 3) and must be active at Cal Poly for at least one quarter during the academic year in which they apply (for example, faculty who are on leave for an entire academic year will not be eligible for that year).

Faculty members at all ranks are eligible as long they have completed at least three years of full-time service or its equivalent at Cal Poly. Faculty members who have previously won either award as an individual or a team are not eligible to apply.

### Review Criteria

Applications must be focused on scholarly inquiry into Learn by Doing practices that goes beyond mere descriptive examples of Learn by Doing.

The successful applications will present a compelling definition of Learn by Doing and clear evidence as to how the scholarship contributes to the understanding and practice of Learn by Doing. More generally, successful applications will demonstrate quality and intellectual merit, creativity, clear methodology, and meet all application requirements. All applications must be submitted using the online application form.

For full details on application and scoring please see next page.

## Proposal

Please complete the online form which includes the following information:

- Title of the research project
- Primary faculty applicant name
- Primary faculty email
- Primary faculty department, center, and/or institute affiliation
- Primary faculty rank (lecturer/tenure-track/tenured)
- Primary faculty hire date
- Additional collaborator(s) name, email, department/affiliation
- Career or emerging career application
- Individual researcher or collaborative team application
- Acknowledgment that the applicant(s) understand and have agreed to the deposit of one exemplar RSCA (research, scholarship, and creative activities) product into Cal Poly's Institutional Repository Digital Commons (<https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/>).
- If applicable, how will funds be distributed among team members if they are granted the award?\*

*\*Note: Monies will not be distributed until applicant(s) sign the Digital Commons Contributor agreement and submit an exemplar RSCA product to [digitalcommons@calpoly.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@calpoly.edu). Payments are processed through the faculty service payment form AP131 and are subject to eligibility of that specific payment process and are subject to taxation. Monies cannot be transferred to professional development or research funds. Monies can only be distributed to current, active faculty member(s) at time of award; FERP and retired faculty, students, staff, MPPs, and individuals from outside the university are not eligible to receive monies. For further clarification please contact Academic Personnel.*

Please provide a maximum 1000-word proposal (approximately 3 pages) including:

- A clear definition of Learn by Doing
- A description of the project that includes methodology, objectives, theoretical justification, and significance of the project
- A compelling case based on this definition for how your scholarship informs the value of Learn by Doing approaches to pedagogy
- Evidence of broader impacts or statement of expected impact of the scholarship. This may include downloads, citations, altmetrics, reviews, and presentations, as well a continuation of grant funding, or reproduction or extension of research.
- Evidence of external review or validation (e.g. peer review; receipt of grant funding)

Additional materials

- ONE primary or exemplar publication or RSCA (research, scholarship, and creative activities) product
- A biographical sketch and/or curriculum vitae (CV) applicants(s) not to exceed 3 pages in length per person

## Proposal Scoring Criteria

Required Elements	
• Quality of LBD Definition (0-3 points)	
• Intellectual Merit (0-3 points)	
• Significance (0-3 points)	
• Broader Impacts (0-3 points)	
• External Validation (0-3 points)	

Optional Elements	
• Interdisciplinary team (0-1 point)	
• Applicable across multiple domains? (0-1 point)	
• RSCA (research, scholarship, and creative activities) product has been cited and/or actively used by others (0-1 point)	
• Student(s) actively participated in the sharing of the research (ex. presentation at a state, national, international or professional conference, co-author on peer-reviewed paper) (0-1 point)	
• Students actively involved in the research process (0-1 point)	

## Scoring Definitions

**Quality of LBD Definition:** Was the definition of LBD pedagogy clearly defined?

- 0 = Vague definition is provided.
- 1 = Poor definition is provided.
- 2 = Clear definition is provided.
- 3 = Excellent definition is provided.

**Intellectual Merit:** Are measures included that can be used to evaluate success? Is there sound documentation and evidence of student learning?

- 0 = Not enough information provided to determine if objectives, goals, methodology, and assessment are sound.
- 1 = Vague information provided to determine if objectives, goals, methodology, and assessment are sound.
- 2 = Adequate information provided to determine if objectives, goals, methodology, and assessment are sound.
- 3 = Articulate information provided to determine if objectives, goals, methodology, and assessment are sound.



**Significance:** Is the research advancing LBD pedagogy in the field or discipline by generating significant new or creative thought and learning? Is there significant contribution to the academic pedagogical literature?

0 = Not enough information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant.

1 = Vague information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant.

2 = Adequate information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant.

3 = Excellent information provided to evaluate if creative, scholarly, or scientific contribution is significant.

**Broader Impacts:** Was a statement provided of the benefits that will accrue to the University, to the profession, the community, and/or long-term to students?

0 = No justification is provided to address the benefits of the research.

1 = Vague justification is provided to address the benefits of the research.

2 = Adequate justification is provided to address the benefits of the research.

3 = Excellent justification is provided to address the benefits of the research.

**Evidence and Quality of External Validation:** Was evidence of external validation provided? Were measures of the quality of the external validation provided?

0 = No evidence of external validation or quality is provided.

1 = Adequate evidence of external validation and quality is provided.

2 = Specific evidence of external validation and quality is provided.

3 = Excellent evidence of external validation and quality is provided.

### Optional Elements

Each element either translates to NO (0 point) or YES (1 point).