FD イベント報告

University of Tsukuba – Center for Education of Global Communication CEGLOC Faculty Development Committee Year Report 2021

sharing methods & ideas

Teaching & Research

The FD Committee logo represents the nine languages taught at CEGLOC: Chinese, English, French, German, Korean, Japanese as a foreign language, Japanese as first language, Russian and Spanish.

Mission statement

"The CEGLOC FD Committee aims to create a double-focus multilingual platform 1) where faculty can exchange ideas related to education and teaching practices in order to meet the challenges of educating students and 2) where faculty can discuss and cooperate in research in order to support professional growth"

Vision statement

1) Mini-conferences: We organize workshops, roundtable discussions, seminars and lectures in order to facilitate faculty growth in scholarship and teaching;
2) 'Colleague to colleague' orientation: We offer seminar sessions to assist new faculty in understanding university structure and culture.
3) Faculty learning communities: We facilitate the formation of group research projects for scholars with shared interests.

Positions from April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022

A) Chair	Ruth Vanbaelen
B) Vice chair	Anubhuti Chauchan
C) Secretary	Naomi Yamada (ended September 30, 2021)
	Anubhuti Chauchan (from October 1, 2021)
D) Treasurer	Murod Ismailov
E) Editing coordinators	Anubhuti Chauchan, Bruno Jactat,
	Hirosada Iwasaki, Mizuho Imada,
	Hiroaki Hatano (from October 1, 2021)
F) Publicity coordinators	Markus Rude, Rafaël Poiret

We can provide logistical support and eventually financial support when you plan to hold an FD related event at CEGLOC. For more information, please contact the Chair: ceglocfdcommitteeevents@gmail.com

FD Event 1, 2021

Title: 3rd Kakenhi Seminar for Non-Japanese Researchers
Date: Tuesday July 6, 2021, 10:10-11:40
Venue: Hyflex (Special Conference Room at the University Hall, and Zoom)
Organizer: Center for Education of Global Communication FD Committee
Co-organizers: URA and Faculty of Humanities

Overview

On July 6, the CEGLOC FD Committee, in cooperation with URA and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, held its third Kakenhi Seminar for Non-Japanese Researchers. This was a Hyflex event that allowed participants the option to either come to the venue or join through Zoom. The seminar was open to all faculty and researchers who are interested in drafting successful Kakenhi/JSPS grant applications.

Program

10:10-10:15 Welcome Remarks by Assistant Professor Anubhuti Chauhan (CEGLOC FD Committee Vice Chair)

10:15-10:35 "Managing the two 'unknowns' for effective grant proposal: Lessons learnt from successful applications" by Assistant Professor Murod Ismailov (Humanities and Social Sciences, CEGLOC)

10:40-11:00 "Some personal reflections on applying for Kakenhi" by Assistant Professor James Harry Morris (Humanities and Social Sciences, CEGLOC)

11:05-11:25 "Kakenhi application strategy and attention points from URA" by University Research Administrator Chen Chen (Research Administration/ Management Office)

11:25-11:40 General Q&A, informal communication, closing remarks by Associate Professor Ruth Vanbaelen (CEGLOC FD Committee Chair)

Session 1

The first speaker, Assistant Professor Murod Ismailov outlined his personal history of applying for Kakenhi focusing on "the two unknowns". The first unknown is the applicant's conditions and the second is the review environments. He talked about how these two unknowns can be managed, advising that applicants focus their energy on the most important while emphasizing "less but better" as an effective strategy.

Next, he outlined four key challenges and his solutions to these challenges. The first challenge was "How do I convince myself and JSPS reviewers that my topic is 'researchable', novel and significant?" His advice was to firstly think about the

topic from the reviewers' viewpoint and explain it in simple terms and secondly, to show evidence of how well you understand your topic. The second challenge was "How can I succinctly present everything important within such a limited space?" Here, he emphasized that it is not necessary to give a complete literature review, and though there are no "rules", the point is to highlight the critical gaps that exist in studies done so far. Another strategy to save space was to effectively use diagrams and figures, which has an added advantage of capturing the reviewer's attention. The third challenge was "How can I effectively present research that may be a bit too narrow or complex?" Here Prof. Ismailov emphasized that "simple" does not mean "simplistic". He suggested chunking and underlining and visually explaining key ideas. The fourth challenge was "How can I convince the reviewers that I am competent enough to handle the project?" Four key points were emphasized as possible solutions – (1) clearly presenting the methodology and implementation plan, (2) showing realistic and specific examples of implementation, (3) inviting co-investigator(s) if you feel you lack the experience, and (4) displaying the evidence of your expertise by including information about your previous work or experiments. Prof. Ismailov ended his talk by reemphasizing that to keep the reviewer's attention applicants needed to ensure the reviewer's comprehension.

Session 2

The second speaker, Assistant Professor James Harry Morris also drew from his experience when applying for Kakenhi to give advice on how to write a successful application. After giving a brief introduction of his research topic, Prof. Morris underlined the importance of choosing a unique topic that applicants have publications in; completing the application in advance; including copious references and using bullet points to improve readability for reviewers; and setting ambitious but manageable goals.

Next, he spoke about five aspects that every applicant should consider. The first concerns incentives for getting Kakenhi. While there can be many incentives like university expectation and how it looks in CVs, one's personal interest and commitment to the project should be paramount. The second aspect concerns time spent working on the project. While researchers may commit anywhere between ten to fifteen percent of their time on the project, it is important to remember that up to twenty to forty percent of that time is related to project administration. This connects to the third aspect which is related to sustainability once receiving Kakenhi and the need to manage administrative work while maintaining enthusiasm for one's project. Another related aspect is meeting the goals set in the application which makes setting manageable goals while writing the application an important step. Finally, Prof. Morris spoke about budget related concerns. He talked about the university's expectation to maximize the budget so as to receive more money but to consider the fact that a higher budget meant more administrative paperwork. He concluded by underlying the importance of the researchers' passion, uniqueness of the topic, manageable goals and completing the application early.

Session 3

The third speaker, Ms. Chen Chen, a Research Administrator from the Research Administration/Management Office of the University of Tsukuba (URA), explained the various kinds of Kakenhi categories; the peer review process; strategies and points to pay attention to; along with the support provided by the URA.

While presenting an overview of the various categories, Ms. Chen also gave advice on how to choose a category most suited to the applicant's background. Furthermore, she answered frequently asked questions like how to apply to a higher level Kakenhi.

In the second section, she introduced new review categories, grouping Kiban (B), (C) and Early Career Scientist under "Basic Section", Kiban (A) and Challenging Research under "Medium-sized Section" and Kiban (S) as "Broad Section", noting that as categories expand a broader range of reviewers is selected. She then moved on to explaining the peer process, noting that for the "Basic Section" the process involved a two-stage document review, whereas for "Medium-sized Section" the document review was followed by a discussion from a broader perspective. The former involves four to six reviewers while the latter six to eight reviewers. The assessment criteria for document review include (1) academic importance of research project, (2) validity of research method, (3) appropriateness of ability of conduct research and research environment and are evaluated on a four-point scale.

Ms. Chen's advice concerning strategies was to (1) write for the reviewers, (2) be specific by presenting related data and specifying the exact methods etc., (3) keep the writing simple, and (4) refer to successful applications. She ended her talk by introducing the support offered by the URA and how to access related information.

Final remarks

The seminar was attended by 43 people (13 were present at the venue and 30 attended via Zoom) of whom 29 filled out a survey. Most of the attendees were educational staff and researchers and about 30% identified themselves as URA staff or university graduate students. Around 76-78% of the participants expressed overall satisfaction with the presentations and said that they would likely recommend this type of event to their colleagues.

The survey also recorded an overwhelmingly positive response on the content of the presentations as well as using a Hyflex format. A few commented that the presentation time was slightly short and that they experienced technical difficulty. Participants also suggested topics like how to find other grants both within and outside Japan, as well as workshops on technical aspects like writing skills and creating figures, and online application procedures.

For the CEGLOC FD Committee
Editing and Survey Coordinators

FD Event 2, 2021

Title: Workshop on Online Teaching: Tips and Sharing Experience
Date: Monday December 6, 2021, 9:30-11:05
Venue: Online, University of Tsukuba
Organizer: Center for Education of Global Communication FD Committee
Co-organizer: BPGI (Bachelor's Program in Global Issues)

Overview

Four presenters of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences tackled some solvable remaining problems with online teaching. Focusing on synchronous teaching, the workshop offered tips on how to use online teaching tools. Presenters and participants shared their experience.

Program

Session 1

9:30 Manaba: Benefits and limitations in using manaba by Assistant Professor Bruno Jactat

The speaker overviewed the manaba interface and then shared practical tips such as using icons for each class for easy reference, storing class resources, sharing the class calendar, giving assignments, giving tests and others. He also showed how to do a survey with manaba.

Session 2

9:55 Mentimeter: Using Mentimeter to boost student engagement by Assistant Professor Murod Ismailov

The speaker showed how "Mentimeter," an interactive presentation app, can be used to boost online learning environments and replicate or even improve face-to-face settings to some extent. It was shown that the app is effective to avoid the students' silence, involve everyone, and enhance online discussion.

Session 3

10:20 Zoom: Hints on how to create an interactive atmosphere by Assistant Professor Markus Rude

The speaker first invited the participants to separate breakout rooms and asked them to talk freely on what online problems they faced and how they were coping with them. Then in the main room, each group reported what they talked about and the whole group of participants shared their experience, which included web-camera use, group work and motivating students.

Session 4

10:45 Experience sharing: Sharing the participants' expertise, concerns, and successes by Associate Professor Ruth Vanbaelen

The session continued with the discussion of the previous sessions, and shared tips on online collaborative work, organizing hybrid classes and others.

11:05 The session went 10 minutes overtime to answer questions and receive comments.

Final remarks

The seminar was attended by eighteen people of whom thirteen filled out a survey. Most of the participants expressed overall satisfaction with the presentations and found the content useful. Comments such as "I learnt new functions", "This was very useful information to improve class" "It made me think about different ways to share information" and "The presentation was very easy to follow" and "I enjoyed this format" show the participants' satisfaction with the content. Many attendees suggested the need for more workshops like this. Some suggested topics such as hybrid education, ways to make learning interactive, use of technology in classrooms and ways to share resources among faculty. Some useful suggestions were also made to improve the event such as allocating more time for each session and sharing the slides and other material used by the presenters.

<div style="text-align: right">

For the CEGLOC FD Committee
Editing and Survey Coordinators

</div>