

**Southeastern Veterinary Education Consortium**  
**Research Grants Program**  
**Request for Proposals**

**Purpose of the Program**

The goal of the Southeastern Veterinary Education Consortium Educational Research Grants Program is to encourage and cultivate collaborative education research scholarship among SEVEC membership within and across institutions. Although mentors are not required to participate, we strongly encourage all participants to work with a mentor to strengthen your proposal. If you do not have a mentor, feel free to reach out to anyone (does NOT have to be within your institution) on the mentor list (Appendix A) to ask for help and advice – that’s what they signed up for! You are also welcome to reach out to those not on the list if you have already worked with them or have a relationship with them, of course.

Since these goals include the promotion of educational research awareness within and without the consortium, it is expected that results from projects funded through this program will result in a peer-reviewed publication, although a presentation at a veterinary or education focused conference may, in some circumstances, be accepted in lieu of a manuscript.

Four (4) grants, 2 for career development and 2 for career enhancement, will be awarded for a maximum of \$2,500 for one calendar year beginning in January 2021. Extensions for up to one extra year may be requested with justification, although no additional funds may be requested.

Proposals in the *career development* category must be made by those who have not published a peer-reviewed article on a veterinary education topic, have never obtained an external grant specifically for veterinary education research, and do not have a terminal degree in education or related field of study. Those not meeting the eligibility criteria for career development awards are welcome to apply for a *career enhancement* grant.

Grant funds from this award may be used for part-time hourly work or consultant fees (e.g., external statistician, transcription services, student research assistant, temporary employees, etc.), to cover manuscript publication fees (if your institution does not cover such fees), and travel required for the conduct of the research study (i.e., to conduct in-person teaching observations at different schools for a comparison/contrast study; to gather data that cannot be gathered on-site or through electronic means, etc.).

With strong justification, funds may be used for technology required to conduct the research study; licenses for software programs not already provided by your institution (e.g., Nvivo, other

qualitative coding software, lesser-used statistical software, etc.); and participant incentives, with the added caveat that this is an accepted practice by your institution's IRB.

Grant funds from this award may not be used to pay any faculty salaries, tuition (student, staff, or faculty), technology not specifically required to perform the proposed research, computer programs for personal/home computer systems, travel not specifically related to conducting the proposed research, or conference registration fees.

Submit completed proposals, including the narrative, budget, and budget justification, through the SEVEC website through the "Grant Proposal" link, which will be live beginning **22 July 2020 and remain open through 30 September 2020**. Grant review will be conducted by an inter-institutional panel of veterinary educators from 1 October through 20 October 2020, and those invited to resubmit their revised proposals will be able to do so between **21 October and 13 November 2020**.

Decisions will be emailed to the Primary Investigator no later than 15 December 2020. Funds for successful proposals will be available beginning on or around 2 January 2021 and remain available through 31 December 2021, unless an extension has been granted.

*These instructions will be updated as further opportunities are developed.*

## **Evaluation of Proposals**

### Grant review panel

Each grant proposal will be reviewed by 2 separate veterinary educators currently employed by one of the current SEVEC institutions. Proposals will be randomly assigned to reviewers, and reviewers will be required to recuse themselves from a proposal review if they are directly involved in the project in any way or there are other circumstances that may prohibit them from providing a fair and honest review.

Each reviewer will individually rank their assigned proposals from strongest to weakest, then discuss their ranks with the other reviewer. Once all pairs have rank ordered their proposals, the group will come together to discuss the proposals, starting with the strongest proposals and moving down the line until agreement is reached. If there is a tie, the committee will come to consensus regarding the final awards.

Reviewers will have an agreed upon rubric by which to evaluate each proposal. The rubric is attached to these instructions as Appendix B.

## SEVEC/AAVMC Grant Proposal Submission Guidelines

### **Written Submission Format**

- Limit 3 pages for Project Description, not including References List\*
- Double spaced, 1” margins on top, bottom, and sides
- Arial 11 point or Times New Roman 12 point is required
- Figures, charts, tables and legends may be smaller but must be legible and included in the Project Description. No appendix material will be accepted.
- Write your proposal for colleagues who may not be experts in your area. Avoid jargon and excess use of abbreviations specific to your research area.

### **Section I: Project Description**

List Title, PI's & Co-I's

Introduction: A brief summary of problem and significance, the research question, and a hypothesis (if appropriate).

Background: Include a brief review of pertinent literature, including theoretical papers as needed (specifically for qualitative or mixed methods proposals).

Methods: Briefly outline the proposed participants, materials, design, and procedure to be followed. \*\*

Projected Impact: List theoretical implications for veterinary education, how the proposed study fits into long-term research goals of the PI or Co-Is, and plans for publication and/or presentation of results.

\* References: Abbreviated list of citations that are directly relevant to this project. Include an abbreviated list of authors and full titles of papers or chapters. The reference list does not count towards page limit, but should be no more than two pages.

\*\* IRB: Selected proposals may also require your college's IRB review before receiving funding. You may apply for funding before receiving IRB approval. Remember that all research with human subjects must be reviewed by the IRB before it can start. Party to this, each PI and Co-I may be required to complete CITI ethics training for research involving human subjects. Please contact the SEVEC Research Manager, work with your mentor, or reach out to your institutional IRB team if you would like assistance with this process.

### **Section II: Budget**

The budget should be completed in the SEVEC Research Proposal Budget Template ([get MS Word version](#)) and should be rounded to the NEAREST DOLLAR.

Budgets must be well-defined and itemized, including quotes for any equipment or materials to be purchased. Justification must be provided for temporary labor. Travel funds are limited to those necessary for conducting the research, such as collection of samples. Justification for providing research incentives must be provided.

**Research Proposal Budget -- SEVEC Research Support**

**Primary Investigator:** \_\_\_\_\_

**University:** \_\_\_\_\_

(ROUND TO NEAREST DOLLAR)

Budget Object	Total
<b><u>Labor</u></b>	
<i>Title / hours / rate</i>	
<b>Labor subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b><u>Supplies</u></b>	
<b>Supplies subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b><u>Services</u></b>	
	<b>\$</b>
<b>Services subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b><u>Equipment</u></b>	
<b>Equipment subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>

**Do you expect any matching or in-kind funding from other sources? If so, please name the source organization, amount, and any additional requirements below.**

## **Appendix A - Mentor List , including areas of interest/expertise**

**Misty Bailey** (mmcinn2@utk.edu): learning outcomes, statistical analyses, survey research, and situating studies within a conceptual framework

**Meghan Byrnes** (mbyrnes@vt.edu): Student Motivation, Clinical Skill Teaching and Assessment. Advice to give on supervising/management, high volume spay/neuter techniques (including teaching these skills) and the non-profit industry.

**Sherry Clouser** (sac@uga.edu): qualitative inquiry in vet ed med; generative learning strategies; reflective practice; ePortfolios and Teaching Portfolios; professional development for higher education faculty

**Bobbi Conner** (bobbiconner@vt.edu): assessment, clinical skills, great network of contacts

**Katherine Fogelberg** (katherine.fogelberg@lmunet.edu): qualitative research methods, theory, and design; attitudes and beliefs; professional development for higher education faculty

**Kent Hecker** (kghecker@ucalgary.ca): validation, assessment of competencies, education research methods

**Erik Hofmeister** (ehh0019@auburn.edu): survey, assessment, pedagogy, qualitative

**Julie Hunt** (Julie.Hunt@lmunet.edu): clinical skills training and assessment

**Ken Royal** (kdroyal2@ncsu.edu): Educational measurement, evaluation, research;  
[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kenneth\\_Royal](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kenneth_Royal).

**Jesse Watson** (jwawtson3@ncsu.edu): Collaborative learning, Motivation, Observational tools, Reliability/Validity, Cognition

## Appendix B: Proposal Review Rubric

### SEVEC Written Grant Proposal Scoring Rubric

Mark the appropriate scoring category for each item. Do not select more than one scoring category.

Item	Not included/ addressed (0 pts)	Deficient (20 pts)	40 pts	Adequate (60 pts)	80 pts	Exemplary (100 pts)
<b>Introduction</b> (weight = 25%)		No compelling case for the project. The research question or hypothesis is vague or incomplete.		Problem needs clarity and further planning. The research question or hypothesis is too broad.		Problem is convincingly described. Strong rationale for the significance of the problem. The research question or hypothesis is clear and specific.
<b>Background and theory (if applicable)</b> (weight = 20%)		Lacks sufficient detail to judge how the project fits into the existing body of knowledge. No evidence-based justification for the project. No demonstration of theoretical background (qualitative/mixed methods only)		Justification for project is based on evidence. Project may be redundant or potentially isolated from existing body of knowledge. Demonstration of theoretical knowledge is apparent but not fully explored or clear (qualitative/mixed methods only).		Justification for project is based on evidence. Project leverages and/or is a worthy contribution to existing body of knowledge. Solid grasp of theoretical underpinnings demonstrated clearly and concisely (qualitative/mixed methods only).
<b>Methods</b> (weight = 20%)		Does not describe project activities in detail. Unclear how objectives will be accomplished.		Describes some project activities. Methods are sound. Reviewers must infer some methodological information.		Fully describes project activities in appropriate detail. Methods are research-based and sound. Clear how objectives will be accomplished.
<b>Projected Impact</b> (weight = 20%)		Does not address how findings will benefit veterinary education. No meaningful connection with long-term goals. Project seems to be temporary. No plans to disseminate results.		Provides information on how findings will benefit veterinary education. Plans for the future are stated without solid supporting information. Vague plans to disseminate results.		Convincing theoretical implications for veterinary education. Project aligns with long-term, sustainable goals. Clear plans to disseminate results.
<b>Budget</b> (weight = 10%)		Expenses are not justified or described. Method for arriving at budget categories/amounts is not provided. Budget is tangentially connected to project goals. Insufficient information to gauge feasibility. May include unallowable expenditures.		Some expenses are described and justified. Method for arriving at budget categories/amounts is unclear or requires inference. Deficiencies or overestimations may exist.		Expenses are fully described and justified. Method for arriving at budget categories/amounts is clearly explained. Budget is directly connected to project goals and congruent with project description.

<b>Document Format</b> (weight = 5%)		Exceeds pg limit, not double-spaced, margins < 1", font < 11 pt (Arial) or 12 pt (Times New Roman), incorrect font		Not double-spaced but does not exceed page limit (~1.5 pages), margins larger than 1", font larger than requested, font similar to Arial or Times New Roman		Adhered to page limit. Double-spaced with 1" margins. Font is 11-pt Arial or 12-pt Times New Roman
<b>Score:</b>						

**Final Score (out of possible 100):**

**Notes for review committee:**

**Comments for Primary Investigator:**

**Recommendations for potential mentors:**

**Recommend Funding?**

Yes (\$\_\_\_\_\_) No \_\_\_\_\_

**If no, recommend resubmit?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_