

**3333 Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Professional Development Modules Project
Proposal Cover Page**

Project Title: Professional Development Modules Project in Reading Comprehension **Proposal Number:**

Applicant Institution:		Budget Request:	
Name:	University of Texas at El Paso	Salaries and Fringe Benefits	\$180,046
FICE Code:		Travel (Staff Only)	\$9,350
Mailing Address:	500 University Avenue	Software and/or Licensing	\$5,598
City, State, Zip:	El Paso, TX 79968	Consultant Fees	\$27,000
		Subgrants and Subcontracts	\$0
Project Co-Directors:	Contact Person:	Miscellaneous	\$23,395
Name: Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez	Name: Harry Meeuwsen, Ph.D.	Total Grant Request	\$245,389
Mr. Sunay Palsole	Phone: 915-747-7239		
Phone: 915-747-5797	Fax: 915-747-8211		
915-747-5561	E-mail: meeuwen@utep.edu		
Fax:			
E-mail: blbrunk@utep.edu			
sunay@utep.edu			

We hereby certify that the information contained in this proposal is, to the best of our knowledge, correct and that the institution named above has authorized us as its representatives to obligate this institution. We further certify that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all RFP guidelines and instructions, and the Contract Terms and Conditions as applicable. It is understood that this proposal constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the Coordinating Board or renegotiated to acceptance, the Coordinating Board will issue a contract to be signed by both parties.

Name/Title of Chancellor/President/CEO from Applicant Institution	Signature	Date
Dr. Diana Natalicio, President		
Name/Title of Chief Financial Officer	Signature	Date
Ms. Cynthia Villa, VP Fiscal Affairs		
Name/Title of Contact Person	Signature	Date
Dr. Harry Meeuwsen, Co-Directors Center for Effective Teaching and Learning		

Section 1: Qualifications of Bidders

1.1 The Design Team. Identify the specialists who will lead the design effort for the project and briefly list their qualifications for working on this project. Institutional teams should be made up of multiple players that may include faculty and/or experts in the field (key to creating high-quality content and sound pedagogy), instructional technology staff (key to creating the technological infrastructure to support the project), and any other individuals necessary to carry out the project.

Dr. Harry Meeuwsen, PhD. Contact person for the project and Faculty Team member. Dr. Meeuwsen is the Co-Directors of the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning (CETaL). He has over 20 years of experience teaching in higher education and 7 yrs of experience in administration as department chair and interim dean. He developed and taught online and hybrid format graduate and undergraduate courses. His main interest in teaching is to help students acquire strategies to help their reasoning and thinking about applied problems using the models developed by Richard Paul and Susan Wolcott. All his courses are technology enhanced using WebCT as the delivery platform. He was heavily involved in the activities of ISS and CETaL prior to becoming the Co-Directors of CETaL. He will be the contact person for the project and assist in coordinating the activities of the team members.

Dr. Beth Brunk, PhD. Co-Director of the project. Dr. Brunk teaches in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies program in the English Department at UTEP. She is the associate Co-Directors of first-year composition. Her areas of expertise include teaching composition, teaching composition with technology, writing with technology, and histories of rhetoric. She has published several articles and is co-authoring an inquiry-based textbook for first-year composition courses. She teaches both undergraduate and graduate-level courses—all courses are technology enhanced and some are hybrid in which faculty and students meet one day face to face and the rest of the week online.

Mr. Sunay Palsole, MS. Co-Director of the project. Mr. Palsole is the Co-Directors of Instructional Support Services at UTEP, and has been involved in academic technology for 14 years. A geophysicist by academic training, he began to design multimedia applications for teaching and learning in the late 1990's, including multimedia applications designed to help students understand physiological processes in the human body. He developed his first online course for the School of Nursing in 1996. Since then, he has helped faculty from varied disciplines take their courses online and has taught online courses ranging in enrollment from 25 to 180 students. He is also co-developer of the Digital Academy, a training program that was a finalist for the Innovation Award by the Professional and Organizational Development Network. Mr. Palsole has taught this Academy in such diverse locations as El Paso, New Jersey, and Chile. He has been PI and co-PI on a number of grants related to education, educational technology, and online course development. He has also served on review committees for a variety of national conferences. Sunay has presented at numerous national and international conferences including Educause, E-Learn, ED-Media, and First Year Experience.

Terri Storey-Gore, MA, Faculty Team Member. Terri Storey-Gore has been a member of the Developmental English faculty at UTEP since 2000 and teaches developmental reading and writing, University Studies and composition courses for the English

Department. She has taught writing for UTEP, El Paso Community College, and ran a middle school writing lab for the Socorro Independent School District. She participated in the ISS Course Redesign Academy in late Spring 2007 with the entire Developmental English faculty to restructure the ENGL 0111 lab course, which is taken in conjunction with ENGL 1311 by student's requiring remediation, as an on-line hybrid course. She also participated in Phase Two of the Academy in January 2008, in which the ENGL 0111 faculty collaborated with a five faculty design team from ENGL 1311 English Composition to better align, refine, and expand the modules created for the ENGL 0111.

Mr. Steven T. Varela, MA. Faculty Team Member. Mr. Varela has a Masters degree in English Literature, a Masters degree in Education with a specialization in Reading, and a Masters degree in Educational Administration. He has taught in the Department of English for 6 years, and has been trained extensively in distance learning--both fully online, hybrid format, and technologically-enhanced courses. He has participated in two hybrid academies at UTEP, received an additional 50 hours of faculty development training for online courses at El Paso Community College, and has taught undergraduate English, Education, and Women's Studies classes using various technological/pedagogical formats. These include Rhetoric and Composition, Writing about Literature, Written and Oral Communication, and University Studies courses.

Ms. Nancy A.R. Shaffer, MFA, Faculty Team Member. Ms. Nancy Shaffer has been a member of the Developmental English faculty at UTEP for ten years and teaches Developmental Reading courses for freshmen. She has also worked on WebCT courses since participating in the ISS Technology Leadership Academy in summer 2005 at UTEP, and more recently in the 2007 and 2008 ISS Course Redesign Academy focused on the redesign of a Writing Workshop (English 0111) for incoming freshmen. She also holds provisional certification as a reading specialist from the Texas Department of Education and has had extensive experience as an Academic Therapist working with reading for learning disabled students.

1.2 Institutional Readiness. Describe the institution's or consortium's capacity for the project. If applicable, does the institution or consortium have mature instructional technology resources to support the development of this project?

UTEP created the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning (CETaL) in 1995 as part of the Model Institutions of Excellence National Science Foundation grant. Its mission is to promote innovation and excellence in university teaching and learning with a focus on pedagogy. The Center offers regular workshops and consults with individual faculty members to improve teaching and learning. Many of the teaching and learning workshops are close collaborations between CETaL and the Office of Instructional Support Services (ISS) to ensure a holistic, integrated approach to teaching and learning and the highest possible efficacy of instructional technology in courses.

ISS has developed workshops and technology integration plans for teaching, learning and research since its creation in 2004. It also designed and offered workshops specifically designed to help faculty transition from teaching in a face-to-face format to a technology enhanced, hybrid, or fully online format. These workshops emphasize instruction in the pedagogy of online teaching and learning and pedagogy-focused exploration of new technology tools. ISS has been involved actively with UTEP's first

year students experience program and developed numerous web-based modules designed to help students in the first year of college acquire and practice study and online literacy skills. ISS also supports all faculty who teach online at UTEP and the UT-TeleCampus, and has been very successful in this effort.

1.3 History of Experience and Use of Technology with Learning. Why should this institution or consortium be considered for this project? Does the institution or consortium have successful experience offering technology-enhanced and/or online courses, modules, or other successes that particularly position the institution or consortium for this project? Or does the institution or consortium have successful experience in professional development?

UTEP has a significant commitment to and substantial experience with applying instructional technology effectively to enhance teaching and learning. UTEP regularly offers 84 fully online courses and 3 online certificate programs, all of which were designed and developed by the Office of Instructional Support Services (ISS) staff. ISS was established in 2004, and is part of the intra-institutional partnership, which will provide support for the technology development, and integration of this project. In general, ISS services include consulting with faculty about instructional and curriculum development using technology, workshops and academies on all aspects of teaching and learning with technology, digital media and database production, learner-centered online and face to face classroom design, and distance learning. ISS offers a full range of workshops with some focused on the user of technology in face-to-face classroom settings to others focused on new technology integration in fully online courses. The office also serves as the principal designer and developer of fully online courses offered locally and via the UT TeleCampus. Working alongside the chief academic officer, ISS strives to provide quality checks for all online courses offered under the aegis of UTEP. ISS has also been involved in three course-redesign grants funded by the THECB and multimedia and web-based projects for other grants. These projects involved the creation of online modules, designing and constructing web portals, and creating interactive user experiences. Other institutions and organizations recognized the expertise of ISS and CETaL reflected in invitations to offer blended learning and active learning workshops as far away as the country of Chile. In addition to the blended/hybrid learning workshops, Examples can be seen at the following URLs: <http://univstudies.utep.edu/main.php>; <http://eduprojects.utep.edu/stepup>; and <http://www.txlearns.org>.

Another innovation conceptualized and created by the Co-Directors of ISS, Mr. Sunay Palsole, and his staff is the weeklong intensive Digital Academy (5 consecutive full day workshops) to help faculty make the transition from face-to-face teaching to hybrid/blended teaching and learning formats. This effort has resulted in a successful roster of 142 courses offered in online or hybrid formats. Most recently, ISS and CETaL staff led two weeklong Academies, one in the Fall semester of 2007 and one in January 2008, focused on the redesign of the hybrid ENGL 0111 laboratories associated with ENGL 1311 English Composition. The Academies strengthened the bonds between the faculty members teaching these courses, renewed a discussion about their common challenges, helped them align the courses more effectively, and let them explore the pedagogical potential of new technologies. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board sponsored this Academy as part of the course redesign project. In summary, CETaL and ISS have much experience collaborating with each other and faculty across the disciplines at UTEP.

For the proposed faculty development modules project CETaL will provide pedagogical, administrative assistance, and coordination support, while the faculty experts will be responsible

for the purpose, learning outcomes, structure, and assessments in each of the modules. ISS, with its expertise in internet-based instructional technology and pedagogy, and as part of the intra-institutional partnership, will provide support for the technology development, computer programming, and integration of these components into the modules.

Section 2: Professional Development Plan

2.1 Professional Development Content Selection. Identify the area in which you plan to develop professional development modules.

The Board has already funded the development of online professional development modules for algebra faculty. The purpose of this project is to create additional online professional development modules for faculty to learn the most effective strategies or “best practices” for improving both teaching and learning in a number of critical areas. The first two projects described below (“reading comprehension” and “critical thinking”) address deficiencies that many students have: lack of strong reading comprehension skills that transcend disciplinary boundaries and lack of higher-order cognitive skills that permit individuals to make informed decisions and form opinions based on analysis and synthesis. The third project (“second language instruction”) focuses on the need to develop high-functioning second language speakers (and writers). Each project should include twelve to fifteen separate modules.

All funded professional development projects must include the integration of the College Readiness Standards adopted by the Coordinating Board. All projects should be aimed at entry-level courses to better prepare students to continue beyond the first year of college. The topics prioritized by the Coordinating Board are the following:

- Reading comprehension: Modules should include effective strategies for teaching intensive, college-level reading. These modules are intended for faculty teaching in entry-level courses in disciplines other than English and for whom reading comprehension is not a part of their training. Modules should be broad enough to enhance the teaching of reading comprehension across disciplines.
- Critical thinking: Modules should include effective strategies for teaching complex, real-world problem-solving; generating multiple solutions to a problem; drawing inferences; synthesizing and integrating information; distinguishing between correlation and causality; among other high-level cognitive skills. Modules should be broad enough to enhance the teaching of critical thinking across disciplines.
- Second language instruction: Modules should emphasize effective strategies and techniques applicable to teaching the first year of any second language, e.g. English as a second language, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, etc. Modules should cover strategies for listening comprehension, speaking, writing, reading, and the development of cultural literacy.

Each professional development project should draw on solid research on effective teaching practices to inform the development and content of the online modules. Modules should be designed to appeal to instructors of entry-level college courses in a wide variety of academic disciplines. Where applicable, each project should include some content on theories of motivation and learning. Requests for professional development modules in areas other than those described above will also be considered.

This project aims to develop 14 modules to help faculty who were not trained in English develop effective strategies for teaching intensive, college-level reading in entry level courses in their discipline to improve students' reading comprehension.

2.2 Project Summary. Describe the proposed project in detail, including a brief description of each planned module of the project. Where applicable, reference the success of similar initiatives and how the proposed approach will incorporate the elements of other successful projects.

Professional Development Project to Improve College-Level Reading Comprehension

Current research at all levels of schooling emphasizes the importance of effective reading comprehension skills as well as the challenges instructors face in teaching it. Hilden and Pressley (in press) indicated that any instruction in teaching reading comprehension must be carefully designed to be effective. They cite several reports that suggest teaching reading comprehension at the elementary school level is so challenging for teachers that they are often unable to teach effective strategies (Klingner, Vaughn, Arguelles, Hughes, & Leftwich, 2004; Mason, 2004). Others found that reading comprehension strategies were not taught extensively in public schools (Pressley, Wharton-McDonald, Hampston, & Echevarria, 1998). Ray and Belden (2007) indicated that while some entering college students have the necessary reading vocabulary, they often do poorly identifying and organizing concepts, specifying relationships among concepts, or elaborating properties of concepts presented in a text. Consequently, many students arrive in college classrooms with deficiencies in reading comprehension abilities. This is a frustrating situation for faculty with limited experience and training in helping students overcome these deficiencies, master the material, and succeed in the course.

The purpose of this project, therefore, is to create 14 digitized instructional modules designed to provide college-level faculty with effective strategies to improve reading comprehension skills in entry-level college courses across disciplines. The modules are designed for faculty who were not trained in reading comprehension and are based on the assumption that faculty using these modules are novices in teaching reading comprehension.

Pressley and colleagues (Hilden & Pressley; in press) indicate that effective reading comprehension instruction begins with explaining and modeling of strategies by a teacher, followed by student practice with the teacher providing support and re-instruction as needed. Instruction involves progressive disclosure of increasingly complex comprehension strategies, and includes reminders to use the strategies and performance-related feedback. The modules will model this process by providing a sequence of learning activities that build on each other and progressively disclose the main concept. In this manner, the learning faculty member experiences an exemplar methodology of teaching a specific reading comprehension concept that she or he can easily adapt for his or her class. Several studies have shown that such strategies can produce large gains in comprehension and substantive improvements on standardized reading tests (Brown, Pressley, Van Meter, & Schuder, 1996; Collins, 1991).

In consideration of effective learning strategies, our audience, their needs, and their constraints, we designed each module to cover three basic components:

- 1) an introduction to the featured reading comprehension strategy
- 2) a sufficient explanation of the strategy as well as how and why it works
- 3) effective methods for introducing the strategy to students and promoting its continued use.

To achieve this, each module will contain an overview of the goals and objectives, an experiential exercise, an introduction to the module's central strategy, an application of the strategy, printable or take-away, suggestions for further reading, and a feedback/response area. All of these elements will be closely integrated (see below for further detail).

The extensive review of research on teaching and learning by the National Research Council (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000) further influenced the design and structure of the modules. This work suggests that three findings in the research literature have strong implications for teaching. First, learners come to new learning with preconceptions. Their understanding of the world around them needs to be engaged through teaching, otherwise motivation may be low, and they may fail to understand new concepts or internalize them. Therefore, each module will attempt to relate its learning activities to experiences common to most college faculty and their students. This will allow faculty learning from these modules to identify their strongest needs and then easily transfer their learning to the classroom. Because the design team has extensive experience in teaching reading comprehension, it possesses great insight in adult learners' experiences. These experiences will be incorporated into the modules in order to make them realistic and meaningful for faculty across disciplines.

Second, to develop competence in a discipline, learners must have a strong foundational knowledge of facts; understand those facts in the context of a conceptual framework; and organize their knowledge to enhance retrieval and application (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). To provide a strong foundational knowledge base and a significant depth of understanding, each module focuses on one key concept or strategy in reading comprehension. The modules provide factual knowledge based on principles of best practices in teaching reading comprehension and demonstrate the concepts at work. Where necessary, the modules will contain research-based information on the growth and development of students' reading capabilities to help faculty develop appropriate reading assignments within their discipline.

Finally, learners need to develop strategies that help them take control of their learning through setting goals and monitoring their progress in achieving those goals (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). Adult learners at all reading levels can use metacognitive strategies to analyze reading needs (Viise & Austin, 2005; Purcell-Gates, Degener, Jacobson, & Soler; 2002). The modules encourage college faculty to practice using metacognitive strategies to create an internal dialog regarding their concerns with teaching reading comprehension strategies. Through this, faculty can gain an explicit, declarative understanding of these strategies for improving students' reading comprehension. Based on the work by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) goal setting, questioning, and monitoring of understanding is integrated in each module. Additionally, asking learners to engage in these processes should benefit their motivation to complete them.

Based on work by Viise and Austin (2005) among others, the exercises in each module assume that the learner already possesses a certain level of proficiency. While the modules do follow certain sequence, each module can be completed in isolation from the others, allowing learners the flexibility to select modules that are most meaningful to them and that address their

immediate needs. Moreover, the design team will incorporate into the modules humor, multimedia presentations and exercises, and instructional technology where appropriate to help faculty broaden their view of the possibilities that exist through incorporating current instructional technologies.

Brief Descriptions of the Modules

All modules are based on Fink's (2003) strategy for developing significant learning experiences. Each module contains a brief background or introduction explaining its purpose, the learning outcomes, the learning opportunities, and assessments. The structure and strategies used within each module to ensure relevance and usability are based on cognitive psychology, educational theory, and practical experiences of the design team.

General outline for each module

To maintain consistency, each module will follow these seven steps.

1. **Overview**—provides a list and explanation of the goals and objectives
2. **Experiential exercise**—provides a passage or classroom scenario and asks the instructor to reflect on their experience with reading/understanding the passage or to consider what they would do in the classroom
3. **Introduce the strategy**—provides an overview of the strategy and why and how it works
4. **Apply the strategy**—provides either the same or another scenario and asks how they would handle it. After they have responded, they'll be given a "what we suggest."
5. **Printable**—provides a take-away that summarizes the main points, includes tips and strategies for going straight to the classroom, and an "is it working?" section that provides suggestions for assessing students' reading comprehension.
6. **Further readings**—provides articles, websites, books that were used in the production of the module as well as other useful sources
7. **Response**—provides an area for the users to include feedback regarding the module's usefulness via a blog or wiki.

Module 1: Reading comprehension—what it means, why we should care

BACKGROUND:

Many students come to college with insufficient reading comprehension skills. This becomes a source of frustration for both students and faculty. We assume that most faculty, however, are not familiar with effective strategies for improving reading comprehension.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- Experience with reading comprehension frustration and familiarization with strategies to overcome the frustration
- Awareness of reasons for teaching effective reading comprehension strategies
- Acknowledgment of caveats
- Overview of the 14 modules' purpose

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will provide the users with a difficult passage and then ask them questions about their experience and strategies of discerning meaning. We are working under the assumption

that because they are practiced and skilled readers, most faculty are not fully aware of the strategies they use. This exercise will help make them both aware of the experiences students may have when they read challenging passages (frustration and disappointment with themselves, the text, the subject matter, and maybe even the instructor) and more conscious of the strategies they automatically use to discern meaning which may need to be taught to many students.

This module will also provide reasons for the importance of addressing their students' weakness with reading comprehension and introduce caveats. While we certainly can provide good reading comprehension strategies in these modules, we also want to make clear that these will not "cure" their students of all ills.

Finally, we will provide an overview of what the modules will look like (the outline provided above) and the different topics to be addressed in each.

Module 2: Types of reading and the reading processes

BACKGROUND:

Many people—students and faculty alike—assume that when they encounter a text, they simply sit down and read it. Yet, different types of texts call for different strategies for reading. To lay the groundwork for differing strategies, the three stages of the reading process should also be considered. We plan to use the terminology established in this module in most of the other modules as well.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- Recognition of purpose-driven approaches to reading
- Knowledge of three stages of reading processes
- Application strategies for the purpose of reading
- Application strategies for each stage of the reading process

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module discusses various types of readings and connects those to the idea of a reading process. The three general types of reading we will address are: reading for pleasure, reading for understanding, reading for analysis and interpretation. The three stages of the reading process we will address are: pre-reading strategies—preview, reading strategies—while reading, post-reading strategies—recall. While everyone's reading process will be different—and varies within each context—this module will provide a general guideline for effective reading comprehension.

Module 3: Metacognition

BACKGROUND:

Faculty are often frustrated by students coming to class and mumbling "that was so confusing; I didn't get it" and then expecting the instructor to answer all their questions. To minimize this attitude, this module encourages faculty to assist students in becoming more aware of their comprehension struggles as they are reading and after they have completed a text, and then to find productive ways of working through those struggles.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- Awareness of metacognition, or self-talk, as an effective reading strategy
- Application strategies for introducing students to self-remedies for reading comprehension difficulties

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

Metacognitive thinking focuses on the self-talk that goes on when a person reads. This is accomplished by generating internal statements such as the following: "This is an interesting idea. It seems to relate to _____ in the previous chapter. I'll have to flip back and see how much the two are the same." "I do not completely understand _____. I will write a question that I will ask the professor in class tomorrow." Self-talk is effective in helping students recognize moments of confusion as well as moments of understanding (Kozol, 1985).

Faculty will also be presented with several additional strategies and suggestions for application to aid students in self-correction of perceived comprehension difficulties without resort to "asking the teacher."

Module 4: Previewing the chapter/Developing focus questions

BACKGROUND:

Cognitive psychology asserts that readers are not able to learn anything that is completely new. In other words, what is learned is an extension of we already know. Consequently, one practice that can aid reading comprehension is to preview the chapter by reading certain cues (McWhorter, 1998; Taylor, Harris, Pearson, and Garcia, 1995). In addition, readers struggling with comprehension often experience difficulties with generating interest in and focus on text content. Developing focus questions can generate the focus needed to facilitate comprehension.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of the importance of pre-reading exercises for reading comprehension
- Application strategies for linking new learning to previous knowledge
- Application strategies for generating focus and thereby increasing reading comprehension

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will develop preview strategies for reading. We will demonstrate how to help students generate questions that can link new learning to previous knowledge. We will demonstrate how to develop preview or focus questions using titles; subheadings; italicized, boldfaced, and underlined text; bulleted or numbered lists; visual aids/marginal notations; concluding summary or review; and graphics such as pictures and charts. We will suggest that instructors model this with the class on the first chapters they read. From there on, students can create their own preview questions and attempt to answer them. The instructor can continue to guide the students by supplying the "best number" of questions for a reading. The module will make suggestions about what kinds of questions are most appropriate for previewing the chapter: What and why questions often lead to deeper readings than questions of fact such as whom, where, and when.

Module 5: Distinguishing main and supporting ideas

BACKGROUND:

Students with reading comprehension difficulties often have a hard time distinguishing main or major ideas from supporting ideas. As a result the student may be overwhelmed by the amount

of information in a text, thus fail to comprehend the important ideas presented. Pointing out how topics often appear in headings is one approach, but also helping students see ways paragraphs are constructed helps even more.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Awareness of reasons students encounter difficulty distinguishing main ideas
- Application strategies for helping students distinguish major ideas for improved reading comprehension

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Skilled readers know how to find a main idea in a paragraph, whether it's stated or implied. This module will provide instructors with methods students can use to locate main ideas in their reading. Stated main ideas often appear in one of two places: the first or last sentence of the paragraph. Providing students with this navigational clue is a first step. Other clues such as general and specific ideas, word cues, and questioning will also be introduced.

When main ideas are implied, however, the reader has a larger task to complete. For this, students can be taught to look at major headings and main ideas in surrounding paragraphs. They can also be taught to "add up" the supporting details and determine the larger point the paragraph is making.

Module 6: Annotating texts and note taking

BACKGROUND: Because they have always been told not to write in a textbook all through their high school experience, many students are still afraid to write or otherwise mark in their textbooks. If they do mark in a text, most of them resort to basic highlighting—mostly because they've never been taught effective annotation strategies. Annotating a text has been shown to increase focus, understanding, and comprehension. Taking notes, either on paper or electronically, during and after reading a text also serves to deepen reading comprehension.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of how annotating a text and taking notes can promote strong reading comprehension
- Application strategies for teaching annotation and note taking to students

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will illustrate effective ways to annotate a text. What we encourage is demonstrating to student how they can engage in a dialogue with a text. In addition to annotating a text, faculty can demonstrate effective note taking that can be done while they are reading and after they have finished a text. Book notes and class notes are strategies which can help students reflect on the inter-relationships between class lectures and readings. Activities in this module will help faculty model effective annotating and note taking to further reading comprehension.

Module 7: Outlining and mapping strategies

BACKGROUND: Particularly for visual and kinesthetic learners, outlining or mapping reading material can enhance comprehension significantly since each shows relationships important to understanding processes or concepts.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of how outlining and mapping a text improves reading comprehension
- Application strategies for teaching outlining and mapping to students

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will create sample outlines and maps for a handful of texts. The instructor will be encouraged to model one or both of these strategies for the class and then give students a blank outline or map and ask them to complete it. Demonstrating outlining and mapping can help students pick out detail from the larger picture.

This module will encourage both individual as well as collaborative mapping. Since each student's outlines and maps will be somewhat different, a lively discussion of the various interpretations should follow.

Module 8: Vocabulary, or Cloze terms.

BACKGROUND: Weak readers often disregard unfamiliar vocabulary and seem unaware of the importance of vocabulary to overall comprehension. This leads to misreading and confusion. Many students have been shown strategies for understanding words in context, but these strategies often fail to reveal the real meanings of advanced academic vocabulary. Therefore, the importance of understanding all words in a reading merits emphasis by faculty.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of weak readers' tendency to ignore unfamiliar vocabulary
- Application strategies to emphasize the importance of understanding vocabulary for reading comprehension

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES: One strategy for emphasizing the importance of vocabulary in reading comprehension is called Cloze exercises. These exercises help them to internalize the meaning of what is read by forcing them to focus deeply on what is missing from one or more sentences. Similar to a fill-in-the-blank assessment, the instructor, using the list of end-of-chapter "key terms" or vocabulary, prepares a series of sentences with one or more missing words or terms. Students work individually or in groups to find the term or concepts that complete the thought. Cloze exercises assist students in reading for meaning and in synthesizing new material (e.g. Cunningham, 1995; Harp, 1988; Postman, 1990).

Module 9: Memory-enhancement techniques

BACKGROUND:

Using memory-enhancement techniques, or mnemonics, help students to remember new concepts and lists or sequences of information. More than rote memorization, however, using these techniques helps students to place read information into long-term memory which is essential for building a base of knowledge for further learning--and thus continued and improved reading comprehension.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of mnemonic techniques and how they can aid reading comprehension
- Application strategies that can be easily employed in the classroom and individually

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

There are many techniques which faculty can share with students, and different strategies appeal to different types of learners (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, etc). This module will suggest ways that instructors can help students find the best strategy for them.

A few strategies that will be highlighted here include: reading and studying out loud; talking-the-text; writing down what they just read in the forms of book notes, outlines, or reader's response/reflection writings; critical thinking about the topics, creating acronyms; using acrostics, rhythms, rhymes & jingles; making associations, and creating mental images.

Module 10: Organizing student study groups

BACKGROUND:

Because both cooperative and collaborative learning are meaningful ways for students to create new knowledge and understand what they read and hear, instructors can help students tremendously by organizing study groups. Groups work best with four to seven students. They can be used throughout the semester, but they are especially important prior to an exam or major project.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of cooperative and collaborative learning advantages and their impact on reading comprehension
- Application strategies for creating effective student study groups in the class

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

While many instructors promote the idea of study groups and facilitate their organization, students often need guidelines for maximizing their potential. This module will therefore provide instructors with guidelines for creating effective study groups. For example, one effective reading comprehension exercise within a study group is to ask each group to prepare 10-12 study questions for the entire class to study. The question sets can be collected and distributed among the entire class. The instructor might wish to select a specified number of those questions to appear on the exam. This module will also encourage instructors to make use of these study groups during class time when appropriate.

Module 11: Reading rhetorically

BACKGROUND:

Teaching students to read not just what the text says, but also how the text says it is important to reading comprehension. This is especially significant when reading texts that present an argument because it enables students to understand the strategies used to persuade a specific audience. Reading a text rhetorically encourages students to consider the reading in its various contexts and allows a deeper understanding of the material.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of basic rhetorical concepts that aid with reading comprehension
- Application strategies for teaching these concepts to students without a background in rhetoric studies

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will focus on a few basic, easily grasped rhetorical concepts. The first is from Communication scholar Lloyd Bitzer's (1967) idea of the rhetorical situation. Using this

framework, students will pause to consider the nature of the text, the characteristics of the target audience, the characteristics of the author, the constraints upon the author and the audience, as well as the exigency or purpose of the text. The module will also address Aristotle's three artistic appeals: logos (logic), pathos (emotion), and ethos (credibility of the speaker). Students can be encouraged to consider how these appeals affect the presentation of the ideas and how the audience will respond to it.

Module 12: Reading electronic texts

BACKGROUND:

So much of what students read at the college-level is in the form of electronic text. Sometimes students find this to be a bit more challenging than reading on paper or they don't take it quite as seriously. Reading electronic texts can also present challenges with comprehending graphics and multimedia features. As Cioro (2003) points out, "many Web-based environments . . . introduce a new set of cognitive barriers that can cause competent readers of conventional text to be cognitively overloaded and emotionally frustrated (Delaney & Landow, 1991; Eagleton & Guinee, 2002). Teachers need to be aware of these new cognitive challenges posed by Internet environments before we unnecessarily confuse our competent readers or overwhelm the struggling ones." For this reason, we present a module on improving students' reading comprehension of electronic, or digital, texts.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of the challenges students face when reading electronic texts
- Application strategies for aiding students when reading electronic texts

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

We recognize that faculty will come to this module with varying levels of expertise and/or anxiety over using digital texts in the classroom. Therefore, we will cover some very basic, but important, strategies for reading electronic texts. These include strategies such as effective navigating, recognizing the organization (or chunking) of information, interpreting web design, determining the credibility of online texts, effective annotating and note taking with online texts, and so on. The module will also consider multi-media and interactive texts.

Module 13: Reading visuals

BACKGROUND:

Visual representations have become a common way to communicate with an audience. More and more, authors and publishing companies are incorporating visual materials into their textbooks. Many students may not have the skills or strategies for reading and interpreting the visuals and/or do not take the time to understand them fully. In fact, some suggest that we do students a huge disservice by neglecting the visual literacy they developed and depended on before they learned to read in grade school. Students who are visually literate are able to understand basic elements of visual design; are aware of various influences in perceptions of visuals, and comprehend representation, explanatory, abstract, and symbolic images (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory and the Metiri Group, 2003).

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of the roles visuals play in text and how they impact reading comprehension
- Application strategies for reading multiple types of visuals

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

This module will provide strategies and sets of questions for reading, understanding, and analyzing various types of visuals. These will include photographs, drawings, charts and graphs, cartoons, and animation. Students will also be encouraged to consider both how the visual informs the text and how the text informs the visuals.

Module 14: Judging textbooks for efficient comprehension.

BACKGROUND:

It can be a daunting task to select the best textbooks for a course. Most faculty make their choices based on the depth and breadth of information covered. Less often do faculty consider how accessible the material will be for the students. Some texts include layout and design features, which enhance a student's ability to organize and digest information. We hope that by including this module, faculty will become ever more aware of the multiple ways they can enable and promote stronger reading comprehension strategies.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Awareness of how textbook design can influence reading comprehension
- Application strategies for selecting effective textbooks

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

The module will provide faculty with examples of texts (excerpts) which are designed, written, and organized for easier comprehension. We will provide a set of adaptable criteria that will help faculty see the strengths and weaknesses of the texts they are currently employing and those they may adopt in the future. This will help faculty to select the "best" text using this as a criteria as well as content.

References

- Bitzer, L. (1968). "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1.1 1.1. 1-14.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L. & Cocking, R.R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Brown, R., Pressley, M., Van Meter, P., Schuder, T. (1996). A quasi-experimental validation of Transactional Strategy Instruction with low achieving second-grade readers. *Journal of Education*, 88, 18-37.
- Collins, C. (1991). Reading instruction that increases thinking abilities. *Journal of Reading*, 34, 510-516.
- Cioro, J. (2003). *Reading Comprehension on the Internet: Expanding Our Understanding of Reading Comprehension to Encompass New Literacies*. Retrieved January 10, 2008 from http://www.readingonline.org/electronic/RT/2-03_column/index.html
- Cunningham, D. (1995). CLOZE: A rationale for practical application. *Language Learning Journal*, 12, 59 - 65
- Delaney, P. & Landow. G.P (1991). *Hypermedia and Literary Studies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Eagleton, M., & Guinee, K. (2002). Strategies for supporting student Internet inquiry. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 38, 39-47.
- Harp, B. (1988). When the principal asks: Is all of that drama taking valuable time away from reading? *The Reading Teacher*, 41, 9.
- Hilden, K., & Pressley, M. (in press). Stories of obstacles and success: Teachers' experiences

in professional development of reading comprehension instruction. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*.

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., Arguelles, M. E., Hughes, M. T., & Leftwich, S. A. (2004). Collaborative strategic reading: “Real-world” lessons from classroom teachers. *Remedial and Special Education, 25*, 291-302.

Kozol, J. (1985). *Illiterate America*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

L. Dee Fink (2003). *Creating Significant Learning Experiences*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Mason, L. H. (2004). Explicit self-regulated strategy development versus reciprocal questioning: Effects on expository reading comprehension among struggling readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*, 283-296.

McWhorter, K. T. (1998). *Academic reading*. New York: Longman

Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Mistretta, J., & Echevarria, M. (1998). The nature of literacy instruction in ten grade-4/5 classrooms in upstate New York. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 2*, 159-191.

Postman, N. (1990). The re-enchantment of learning. *Youth Theatre Journal, 5*, 2.

Purcell-Gates, V., Degener, S.C., Jacobson, E., & Soler, M. (2002). Impact of authentic adult literacy instruction on adult literacy practices. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*, 70-92.

Ray, R.D., & Belden, N. (2007). Teaching college level content and reading comprehension skills simultaneously via an artificially intelligent adaptive computerized instructional system. *The Psychological Record, 57*, 201-218

Taylor, B., Harris, L., Pearson, P.D., & García, G.E. (1995). *Reading difficulties: Instruction and assessment (2nd Edition)*. New York: Random House.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory and the Metiri Group (2003). *Twenty-first century skills for twenty-first century learners: Literacy in the digital age*. Retrieved January 11, 2008 from <http://ncrel.org/engage>

Viise, N.M, & Austin, O.F. (2005). Can adult low-skilled literacy learners assess their own spelling knowledge? *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literature, 48*, 402-414.

2.3 Timeline: Project Timetable by Goals and Objectives/Activities

What is the project timeline/timetable for all activities of the project? (Add additional goals and objectives as needed.)

Goal: 1. Project Management	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned
1.1 Receipt of contract; set up accounts and routing with ORSP	March 08
1.2 Project development team meets to review responsibilities,	March 08

timelines, resource needs, and tasks assignments.	
1.3 Co-Directors meets with evaluator to develop evaluation plan	March 08
1.3.1 Evaluation plan meeting with entire project team; dissemination of plan, data collection tools and methods, data reporting responsibilities	April 2008
1.4 Hire programming and technology specialists to complete the project team	March 08
1.4.1 Instruction of administrative staff and programming and technology specialists on roles, responsibilities, processes, and procedures of the project	April 2008
1.5 Purchase of hardware and software; supplies; etc.	March -April 08
1.6 Development of draft project process and procedures manual and record keeping and database management structure by Co-Directors and evaluator	March -April 08
1.6.1 Detail the faculty and programming specialist work schedule for each semester to clarify course releases and responsibilities	May 2008
1.6.2 Presentation of draft project process and procedures manual and record keeping and database management structure by Co-Directors and evaluator to project team for feedback and revision.	Early May 2008
1.6.3 Sign-off by entire project team of project process and procedures manual and record keeping and database management structure to ensure clarity of roles, responsibilities, and buy-in	Middle May 2008
1.7 Project progress assessment meetings with entire project team	Monthly for the duration of project starting in Month 2
1.8 Budget and finance reporting meetings between Co-Directors and administrative assistant	Monthly for the duration of project starting in Month 2
1.9 Report writing by administrative assistant and project Co-Directors based on weekly progress logs maintained by project team members based on the "punch list"	Monthly meetings starting in Month 2

Goal: 2. Proof of Concept Module Development	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned
2.1 Hire programming and design staff (also see 1.4); purchase necessary software, equipment and supplies	March 2008
2.1.1 Programming team creates tracking and reporting website for the project	May 2008
2.1.2 Detail the faculty and programming specialist work schedule for each semester to clarify course releases and responsibilities	May 2008

2.2 Programming and all faculty team members develop “story boards” and “look and feel” for 3 trial modules	May-June 2008
2.2.1 Evaluator collects quantitative data on hours spent by team members, and progress towards outcomes using weekly logs and digital images of programming progress	May-June 2008
2.3 Programming and faculty team members finalize 3 modules to present to group of randomly selected faculty teaching across disciplines at UTEP for evaluation.	July-August 2008
2.3.1 Evaluator develops online survey tool to collect qualitative data from the evaluating faculty and methods to collect quantitative data on use of the test modules by the evaluating faculty. Publishes results on the project tracking website.	July-August 2008
2.4 Evaluator collects qualitative data on the look, feel, and process of completing a module; and quantitative data on navigation and actual use (pages viewed, length of stay, etc.)	Sept 2008
2.5 Presentation of results of evaluation data from proof of concept modules; application of findings to development of draft modules	Sept 2008

<p>Goal: 3. Development of Modules (Continued from Goal 2) NOTE: Faculty team members will take responsibility for the development of specific modules that match their expertise and work in pairs with the programming specialists during the long semesters to complete modules in a progressive manner. This will result in differential levels of activity and compensation for the faculty members depending on the stage of the development process, but it will allow us to hire a smaller programming staff and still engage a larger faculty team, reducing overall expenditures for the project.</p>	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned
3.1 Faculty team members Brunk, Shaffer and Varela detail structure, procedures, look, feel and content of modules 4 to 6 working with programming specialists incorporating the results of the evaluation of the two proof of concept modules	Oct - Nov 2008
3.2 Evaluation by faculty external to the project from UTEP and EPCC using tools developed for proof of concept modules (possibly revised)	Dec 2008 - Jan 2009
3.2.1 Faculty external to the project from 4 colleges at UTEP and 3 programs at EPCC complete each of the modules and evaluate them using an electronic survey tool	Dec 2008 - Jan 2009
3.2.2 Evaluator meets with faculty external to the project in a focus group setting to obtain nuanced qualitative data for each of the modules.	Jan 2009
3.2.1 Evaluator presents results of evaluation by external faculty. Team incorporates evaluation results into modules 1-6 and plans for the next set of 4 modules (Note: with improved procedures and established structures we expect production to faster than for	Jan 2009)

the first set of modules)	
3.3 Faculty team members Brunk, Shaffer and Storey-Gore detail structure, procedures, look, feel and content of modules 7-10 working with programming specialists incorporating the results of the evaluation of the modules developed in Fall 08.	Feb-April 2009
3.4 Evaluation by faculty external to the project from various disciplines at UTEP and EPCC using established assessment tools	May 2009
3.4.1 Evaluator presents results of evaluation by external faculty. Team incorporates evaluation results in modules 1-10 and plans for modules 11-14	End May 2009
3.5 All faculty team members detail structure, procedures, look, feel and content of modules 11-14 and work together with programming specialists to finalize modules 11-14, and critically evaluate the entire project from a pedagogical and learning effectiveness perspective.	June – August 2009
3.5.1 Project team develops attractive discussion board/weblog pages and links these to all modules	June – August 2009
3.6 Project team design webpage for marketing and dissemination of the modules; includes creating CDs and mail-out packets	Sep – Oct 2009
3.7 Pilot phase, testing, and evaluation of modules by invited faculty at select public universities and colleges across Texas in addition to faculty at UTEP and EPCC external to the project and randomly selected professional faculty developers who are members of the Professional and Organizational Development Network; At least 20% of evaluators will be from Community Colleges	Sep – Oct 2009
3.7.1 Evaluator presents results of pilot phase testing and evaluation by external faculty. Project team incorporates evaluation results in modules 1-14	Nov – Dec 2009
3.8 Modules' development, testing, and final revisions completed	Jan 2010

Goal: 4. Detailed module computer programming objectives and associated timelines

Timeline - Reading Comprehension							
Legend:-	Tasks		Low contribution-task				
	Tasks		No Task				
Week	Tasks		Tasks		Tasks		Tasks
1	March '08		Hiring and purchasing Resources				
2	Module design						

3	discussions, software architecture, delivery architecture							
4								
5			Team setup and Task Delegations					
6		Server setup						
7	Overall Framework Design							
8								
9	May '08		Software Requirement Specification					
10								
11								
12				Module 1 - Content and Design				
13	Framework Development		Module 1 - Graphics Development					
14				Module 1 - Flash Interactivity				
15					Module 1 - PHP Integration			
16								
17	July '08			Module 2 - Content and Design				
18			Module 2 - Graphics Development					
19				Module 2 - Flash Interactivity				
20					Module 2 - PHP Integration			
21								
22				Module 3 - Content and Design				
23			Module 3 - Graphics Development					Module 1 and 2 Assessment
24				Module 3 - Flash Interactivity				
25	Sep '08				Module 3 - PHP Integration			
26								Module 1 and 2 Integrating Assessment Feedback
27								
28				Module 4 - Content and Design				
29			Module 4 - Graphics Development					
30				Module 4 - Flash Interactivity				
31					Module 4 - PHP Integration			
32								
33	Nov '08			Module 5 - Content and Design				Module 3 and 4 Assessment

34			Module 5 - Graphics Development	Module 5 - Flash Interactivity			
35							
36					Module 5 - PHP Integration		
37							Module 3 and 4 Integrating Assessment Feedback
38							
39				Module 6 - Content and Design			
40			Module 6 - Graphics Development	Module 6 - Flash Interactivity			
41	Jan '09						
42					Module 6 - PHP Integration		
43							
44				Module 7 - Content and Design			
45			Module 7 - Graphics Development	Module 7 - Flash Interactivity			Module 5 and 6 Assessment
46							
47					Module 7 - PHP Integration		
48							Module 5 and 6 Integrating Assessment Feedback
49	March '09						
50				Module 8 - Content and Design			
51			Module 8 - Graphics Development	Module 8 - Flash Interactivity			
52							
53					Module 8 - PHP Integration		
54							
55				Module 9 - Content and Design			
56			Module 9 - Graphics Development	Module 9 - Flash Interactivity			Module 7 and 8 Assessment
57	May '09						
58					Module 9 - PHP Integration		
59							Module 7 and 8 Integrating Assessment Feedback
60							
61				Module 10 & 11 - Content and Design			
62			Module 10 & 11 - Graphics Development	Module 10 & 11 - Flash Interactivity			
63							
64					Module 10 & 11 - PHP Integration		
65	July '09						

66				Module 12, 13, 14- Content and Design				Module 9, 10 & 11 Assessment & integration of feedback
67			Module 12, 13, 14 Graphics Development	Module 12, 13, 14 Flash Interactivity				Module 9, 10 & 11 Integrating Assessment Feedback
68								
69					Module 12, 13, 14 PHP Integration			
70								
71								
72								
73	Sep '09							
74								
75								
76								
77								
78								
79								
80								
81	Nov '09							Project Pilot phase Testing
82								
83								
84								Finalize Pilot Phase Evaluation
85	Integrate Evaluation into Modules and Modules with Framework Final Testing							
86								
87								
88								
89								
90								
91			Documenting	CD Packaging				
92								
93	Rollout							
94								
95								
2nd week of Feb '10								

Goal: 5. Delivery of Product and Dissemination Plan	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned

5.1 Completed project will be delivered to the THECB	Jan 2010
5.2 Upon approval of THECB, the project Co-Directors and administrative assistant will implement the dissemination campaign for Texas colleges and universities	Feb 2010
5.2.1 Dissemination Step 1: the project team members will post announcements about the completed project on professional bulletin boards and listserves for a large variety of disciplines	Feb 2010
5.2.2 Dissemination Step 2: the Texas Community College Teacher's Association are contacted and given the link to the UTEP site and a brief overview of the modules.	Feb 2010
5.2.3 Dissemination Step 3: Obtain contact information of all Faculty Development units at Texas Community Colleges and Universities through the Texas Faculty Development Network. Faculty development Co-Directors will be sent a brief overview of the background, purpose, structure, and use of the project and modules, and the link to the UTEP site.	Feb 2010
5.2.4 Dissemination Step 4: Obtain contact information of all Provosts and/or Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs at all public Community Colleges and Universities in Texas (a total of 35 universities, 9 health-related institutions, and 50 community college districts). They will be sent an electronic notice about the project with a brief overview of the background, purpose, structure, and use of the project and modules, and the link to the UTEP site. They will be asked to distribute this information to their academic deans, chairs, and faculty. In addition, due to the large amount of email they receive, the project will send a hardcopy notice as well.	Feb 2010
5.2.5 Dissemination Step 5: We will explore online opportunities to disseminate the project through existing professional development network websites such as the international Professional and Organizational Development Network	Feb 2010
5.2.6 Dissemination Step 6: The project will be displayed at professional conferences for faculty development such as the international Professional and Organizational Development Network of faculty developers, reading comprehension conferences, and conferences focused on student education in the disciplines such as the conference of the American Society for Engineering Education to increase awareness and interest across the country.	Within one year after completion (Travel funds will be encumbered prior to closure of project)
5.3 Purchase display board; create graphics and visual display information; create informational brochures and flyers (also for mail outs).	Dec 09 - Jan 2010

Goal: 6. Increase Awareness of the Modules after Project End Date	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned
6.1 CETaL Co-Directors will travel to the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to present the project and the evaluation data	Fall 2010
6.2 Each of the Co-Directors and faculty members on the project team will travel to a different professional conference to present the project and its data	Within one calendar year after completion of the project

Goal: 7. Timely Submission of Quarterly Reports to the THECB	
Objectives/Activities	Timeline Planned
7.1 CETaL and Project Co-Directors, Evaluator, and Administrative Assistant will complete quarterly reports for the THECB.	At minimum 1 week prior to the deadline
7.2 CETaL Co-Directors, Project Co-Directors, Evaluator, and Administrative Assistant will meet to complete the quarterly report. Administrative Assistant will record the minutes of meeting.	Group will meet 3 weeks prior to report deadline
7.2.1 Content of the report will be developed in this meeting. The Project Faculty Co-Directors will write the report using the THECB forms, and submit it to the THECB. Note that the design team meets monthly and keeps weekly logs. Both of these should greatly facilitate quarterly report writing.	Within one calendar year after completion of the project

2.4 Budget. Provide a budget by year for the project. If available, indicate matching funds and in-kind services that will be used to support this project. Indirect costs will not be covered under this project. (Add additional lines as needed.)

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule A - Salaries and Fringe Benefits

Year 1: March 1, 2008 – February 28, 2009

I. Activity	II. Title/Position	III. % of Time on Project	IV. Amount
Coordinate actions of team members, maintain progress and budget	Project Co-Directors, Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez	10% FTE	No cost
Data maintenance, filing; recording of	Part-time administrative assistant housed in the Center for Effective	20% Annual	No cost

minutes; report writing; facilitate communications within team and with outside evaluators; appointments; focus group transcriptions; clerical work	Teaching and Learning;	FTE	
Coordination of programming of the modules	Mr. Sunay Palsole, co-director	10%FTE for 12 months	\$7,450
Programming of the modules	Graduate student programmer (full time from April 08-Feb 09 = 11 months)	50%FTE Grad Assistant	\$20,611
	Undergraduate student Flash developer Undergraduate student graphic designer	19hrs/week for 43 wks	\$16,440
Develop of proof of concept modules 1-3 in summer months 2008	Faculty members development team; 1/9 th of 9 month academic year salary & benefits; Ms. Shafer, Storey-Gore; Mr. Steven Varela;	100% for 1summer month	\$19,909
Completion of modules 1-3 Develop modules 4-7 Start modules 8-11	Faculty members Shaffer and Varela with one course release Fall 2008; 10% of annual workload for lecturer. Dr. Brunk (Co-Director) 2/9 th of academic salary for summer	100% for 2 summer months	\$14,700
Total Year 1			\$79,110
Year 2: March 1, 2009 – February 28, 2010			
Coordinate actions of team members, maintain progress and budget	Project Co-Directors, Dr. Beth Brunk-Chavez	10% annual FTE	\$6,925
Develop of modules 8-12 (starts in January 09)	Faculty members Shaffer and Storey-Gore with one course release Spring 2009; 10% of annual workload for lecturer	10% Annual FTE	\$20,652
Develop modules 11-15 and work together with programming specialists to critically evaluate entire project.	Faculty members development team; 1/9 th of 9 month academic year salary & benefits; Ms. Shafer, Storey-Gore; Mr. Steven Varela;	100% for 1summer month	
Incorporation of pilot phase evaluation results in modules 1-14	Dr. Brunk (Co-Director) 2/9 th of academic salary Ms. Shafer, Storey-Gore; Mr. Steven Varela. Dr. Brunk during winter break Dec 09 - Jan 2010	100% for 2 summer months 100% winter break 09	\$15,109 \$10,000

Data maintenance, filing; recording of minutes; report writing; facilitate communications within team and with outside evaluators; appointments; focus group transcriptions; clerical work	Part-time administrative assistant housed in the Center for Effective Teaching and Learning	20% Annual FTE	No cost
Coordination of programming of the modules	Mr. Palsole, Co-director	10%FTE for 12 months	\$7,654
Programming of the modules	Graduate student programmer full time 12 months	50%FTE Grad Assistant	\$22,485
	Undergraduate student Flash developer Undergraduate student graphic designer	19hrs/week for 47.4 wks	\$18,111
Total Year 2			\$100,936
Grand Total			\$180,046
<p>In-kind Services and Contributions Provided by UTEP for the Project: 1) office space; 2) necessary computer programming hardware (computer stations) and programming specialists work space; 3) conference room for team and smaller group meetings; 4) collaborative instructional technology workspace; 5) usual utilities; 6) internet and phone access; 7) technical support for hardware and software; 8) No cost contributions of the Director of CETaL; 9) Administrative support; 10) no cost contribution of Dr. Brunk Chavez as co-director.</p>			

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule B – Travel (Staff Only)

NOTE: All travel except trips to the THECB will occur after completion of the project to increase the effectiveness of the dissemination efforts.

I. Activity	II. Title/Position	III. Purpose	IV. Amount
Conference travel 1 for each faculty member for 4 total	Faculty team members (includes Dr. Brunk, Co-Director)	Dissemination of final product	\$5,000
Travel to 1 conference each for dissemination	Programming Co-Director Mr. Palsole	Dissemination of final product	\$1,250
Travel to International Conference for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 2010	Director of CETaL	Presentation of evaluation data collected during the pilot phase and after conclusion of the project	\$1,500
Report project progress and deliver product to THECB	Project Co-Directors or CETaL Director: 4 trips to Austin for THECB presentations	Report to coordinating board; 2 trips in Yr 1 (\$800) and 2 in Yr 2 (\$800)	\$1,600
Total			\$9,350

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule C - Software and/or Licensing

NOTE: All purchases will be completed in Year 1 of the Project

I. Activity	II. Description	III. Amount
Programming modern look and feel of modules	Adobe CS3 Master Collection 2 x \$2500	\$5,000
Create user demos for all modules	Adobe Captivate 2 x \$299	\$598
Total		\$5,598

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule D - Consultant Fees

NOTE: Year 1 and 2 contributions are listed under “Purpose” in this table.

I. Activity	II. Individual or Firm	III. Purpose	IV. Amount
Assist faculty in preparation of evaluation process, collection and analysis of data, reporting results on ongoing module evaluations. Conduct pilot phase evaluation of project: collect and analyze data, report results	UTEP has several qualified grant evaluators on staff who will be able to participate in this project. Because of ongoing commitments we have to be flexible in hiring this consultant.	Conduct module and project evaluation Yr 1: 150 hours @ \$70/hr Yr 2: 150 hours @ \$70/hr	\$21,000
Same	Graduate Evaluation Assistant (to be named)	Yr 1: complete 16 - 10hrs weeks @ \$15/hr Yr 2: complete 24 -10hrs weeks @ \$15/hr	\$6,000
Total			\$27,000

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule E - Subgrants and Subcontracts

I. Activity	II. Recipient	III. Purpose	IV. Amount
Total			

2.4 Budget: Cost Category Schedule F - Miscellaneous

I. Activity	II. Description	III. Amount
Year 1: March 1, 2008 – February 28, 2009		
Equipment to host modules	Dell PowerEdge 2970 Energy Smart Server, Windows Server 2003 (5 CALS)	\$5,500
Equipment for developers to design modules	Dell Precision Workstation T7400 2 x \$3000	\$6,000
	Mac Pro 8-Core	\$4,200
Backup storage	External memory units for back-up and storage of entire project and its developments (including draft versions)	\$500
Evaluation	Incentives for external faculty evaluators; \$25 gift certificate upon completion; entry into lottery for personal music player. One randomly selected faculty evaluator from 4 randomly selected UTEP colleges and 3 faculty from EPCC for 2 evaluations (14 total).	\$350
Evaluation	Lunch for external faculty evaluators who attend focus group meetings at UTEP; 2 lunches for 9-10 individuals @ \$8/each	\$160
Record keeping	Office supplies	\$150
Total Year 1		\$16,860
Year 2: March 1, 2009 – February 28, 2010		
Dissemination	Display materials for conference presentation; display unit; graphics, images; flyers/brochures (same as below)	\$750

Dissemination to provosts	Postage; envelopes, flyers/brochures, CD (100 total),	\$500
Evaluation	Incentives for external faculty evaluators; \$25 gift certificate upon completion; entry into lottery for personal music player. One randomly selected faculty evaluator from 4 randomly selected UTEP colleges and 3 faculty from EPCC for 2 evaluations (14 total); 75 randomly selected evaluators across Texas, UTEP, and EPCC for final pilot phase. At least 20% of these evaluators will be from Community College.	\$2225 gift certificates \$250 music player
Evaluation	Lunch for external faculty evaluators who attend focus group meetings at UTEP; 2 lunches for 9-10 individuals @ \$8/each	\$160
Distribution of final product	CDs and mail-out packets: CD, CD case, CD label, instruction pamphlet, security code, envelopes, postage, address labels. 500 for sale nationally and internationally (subsequent batches will be produced using revenue generated by the initial 500)	\$2,500
Record keeping	Office supplies	\$150
Total Year 2		\$6,535
Grand Total		\$23,395

2.4 Budget: CB-100 - Budget Summary Page

COST CATEGORY	(A) Original Budget		
1. Salaries and Fringe Benefits (Schedule A)	\$180,046		
2. Travel (Staff Only) (Schedule B)	\$9,350		
3. Software and/or Licensing (Schedule C)	\$5,598		
4. Consultant Fees (Schedule D)	\$27,000		
5. Subgrants and Subcontracts (Schedule E)	\$0		
6. Miscellaneous (Schedule F)	\$23,395		
7. TOTAL (Lines 1-6)	\$245,389		
Name/Title of Chief Financial Officer Ms. Cynthia Villa, VP Business Affairs		Phone: 915-747-5113 Fax: 915-747-5068 Email: cvilla@utep.edu	

2.5 Program Evaluation and Follow up Services. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has identified five goals as priorities for funding:

1. Provide opportunities for students to obtain financial resources;
2. Promote effective public or higher education teaching;
3. Encourage student motivation, academic efficacy, and persistence;
4. Create or expand social and academic support systems;
5. Promote high academic expectations leading to college readiness or completion.

This RFP is directed at goal 2. Successful applicants will indicate how they plan to meet this goal and include reliable and valid measures of their ability to achieve the goal in their Project Evaluation.

Provide a description of how each of the goals of this project will be evaluated. Using the table below indicate 1) the goal you are trying to reach; 2) anticipated activities/strategies you plan to develop to reach that goal; 3) anticipated short and long-term outcomes; 4) measures that you will use to evaluate the success of each strategy's ability to meet the proposed outcome(s); 5) the stakeholders impacted by this goal; and 6) the methods used to gather the data. Evaluation activities should be included in the project timeline. The methods used should be both qualitative and quantitative, and all stakeholders should be included. Finally, include a short description of the individuals responsible for conducting the evaluation and their qualifications.

In addition, applicants agree to participate in the THECB cross-site evaluation. Successful applicants must have authority to gather, review and report to THECB data from all partners. The THECB evaluator will send standard data entry and transmission instructions and program evaluation reporting templates to successful applicants. Applicants must designate an individual who will be responsible for generating these data and reports, and submitting them to THECB.

Finally, if there will be any follow-up activities with program participants after the end of the grant period, applicant shall describe in this section these proposed activities and how they will be evaluated.

Project Evaluation Plan					
Goal	Activities/Strategies	Expected Outcomes	Measures of success	Stakeholders involved	Methods for collecting data
Track project development process calibrated against the planned timeline	Development of electronic shared continuous tracking system of project progress using weekly logs completed by development team members in a shared online environment	A clear chronological report that clearly documents the rate of progress and obstacles encountered	A clear comprehensive final report to the THECB at the close of the project with educational value for future projects	The project Co-Directors and the evaluator will develop the log instrument; rest of the team members contributes to it	Online log (blog) with specific entry requirements for the team members when they report progress
Keep programming activities moving forward and on schedule	Implement tested "punch list" of specific programming activities and timelines in common online space for the project team	Sustained progress that meets preset timelines	Items in the "punch list" are checked off at the planned dates	Entire project team, but program Co-Directors are responsible for list implementation	Program Co-Directors checks "punch list" items as they are completed

Obtain qualitative feedback about efficacy of modules	Focus group interviews of external faculty evaluators from UTEP colleges	Qualitative report detailing issues with project	Focus group reports indicate ease of use, successful learning processes, clear potential application in entry level courses	Evaluator assistant and Co-Directors conduct focus groups at each of the four points of evaluation at UTEP	Standard focus group interview protocols; audio recordings to be transcribed by admin assistant
Obtain additional qualitative feedback about efficacy of modules	Evaluation survey for faculty evaluating the modules	Data on ease of use; pleasure, engagement and effectiveness in achieving learning outcomes	Faculty indicate modules are easy to use; pleasurable, engaging, and effective in achieving learning outcomes	Evaluator, evaluator assistant, Co-Directors, administrative assistant and faculty external to the project	Online survey that faculty can complete while testing the modules
Obtain user behavior when completing draft modules	Quantitative login page use data collected on each user while completing modules	Data on navigation behavior; use of pages	Data supports qualitative feedback	Evaluator assistant, Co-Directors, programming specialists, and faculty external to the project	Evaluation program will collect data automatically after use log onto the site
Collect qualitative and quantitative data from pilot phase participants	Modified user satisfaction survey tool given to UTEP and statewide faculty evaluators during final pilot phase; login and page use data	Broader data on ease of use; pleasure, engagement and effectiveness in achieving learning outcomes	Statewide faculty indicate modules are easy to use; pleasurable, engaging, and effective in achieving learning outcomes	Evaluator assistant, Co-Directors, administrative assistant and faculty external to the project	Online survey that faculty can complete while testing the modules
Feedback and discussion board/weblog after completion of the project	Modules will link to discussion board/weblog pages to help create a community of practitioners that share effective teaching techniques and strategies	The creation of an additional resource by faculty who are using the modules	Active contributions to the discussion board/blog by faculty using the modules	Active users of the modules	Archive of discussion board/blog entries

<p>Post project dissemination</p>	<p>CETaL Co-Directors, Project Co-Directors, and faculty team members will present the project at different professional conferences to create greater awareness</p>	<p>Increased number of professionals who know about the project and took informational products with them</p>	<p>The number of informational products distributed at each conference and the number of request for the CD following the conferences</p>	<p>The CETaL Director, the Project Co-Directors and the faculty who worked on the project, the THECB</p>	<p>Faculty will record the names and institutions of the persons who took information about the program. This list will be checked against requests for the project CD. Administrative staff will follow up with people on the list subsequent to the conference</p>
-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--	--

3 Dissemination

3.1 How will the project be shared and distributed to other institutions?

See also Goal 4 in Section 2.3 above

1. UTEP will host a server with a dedicated webpage that will be accessible to UTEP faculty with their regular identification and password. The website will feature video clips about using the modules and multiple screen shots with brief explanations.
2. All Provosts and/or Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs of public colleges and universities in the State of Texas will receive a no-cost CD with the complete packet of modules and instructions on it; they may install the modules on their secured servers.
3. The Texas Community College Teacher's Association members will be contacted and given the link to the UTEP site. There they can learn whether their college or university has received a free CD and who at their institution received it and is responsible for installation and notification of the faculty.
4. Private and out of state institutions and individuals can register via the secure UTEP server, pay a one-time charge, and receive a CD with the modules. The size of the one-time charge will be determined in communication with the THECB. These institutions may also send a purchase order for the product.
5. CETaL and ISS will develop an electronic, hardcopy, and presentation marketing campaign (see Goal 4 in Section 2.3 for details) focused initially at public colleges and universities in Texas.
6. Faculty development professionals and faculty teaching reading comprehension will be informed of the new site through the Texas Faculty Developers Network, the Professional and Organizational Development Network (POD), and reading comprehension and other English professional conferences the faculty team members will attend during the first year after completion of the project.
7. Disseminate the project through existing professional development network websites, bulletin boards, and Listserves that provide resources for teachers across the disciplines (organizations such as the New Media Consortium, the American Society for Engineering Education IEEE, Geology, Math and others focused on excellence in teaching and learning) as well as reading comprehension.
8. The project will be displayed at professional conferences for faculty development such as the international Professional and Organizational Development Network of faculty developers and conferences for specific disciplines (preferably those that have teaching-related sections), to increase awareness and interest across the country.
9. After completion of the project, the Co-Directors of CETaL will present its pilot phase evaluation data at the International Conference for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. The design team will submit at least one article to a professional journal about the efficacy of the modules based on the evaluation data in order to stimulate the use of the modules in scholarship of teaching and learning projects.