Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes - APPROVED

Friday, September 12, 2014
Room 225, SUB
1:00 PM

I. Call to Order – 1:01 – meeting attended by Jane Finan, David Massaro, Jennifer Cromer, Amanda Van Lanen, Claire Davis, Cara Thompson, Jenny Scott, Travis Osburn, Clarence Griffin, Alex Bezzerides

II. Chair’s Report
   a. Explanation that the faculty affairs committee has now subsumed the responsibilities of the faculty development committee and the administrative procedures committee. The faculty development work will be at the forefront this semester as there are two rounds of faculty development. It would be helpful to streamline the process and make the system a bit more cut and dry. Jane has experience with application processes (ie. INBRE fellows) that have objective sections with point values and subjective sections. It would be helpful to have more of a form for applications to make them easier to compare. Discussion today about the ranking process and then have applications ranked next week.

III. New Business
   a. Discussion of how to rank applications
      i. Current round
         1. Need to decide if we should fund all presenters up to the total amount they’re asking. If we’re going to award a fraction of the requested amount (ie. 80%) then there is an issue about the wording in the proposal process. Some individuals have only requested $1,000 even though there total expenses are greater than $1,000. If they were aware that the maximum award would only be 80% of a request up to a maximum of $1,000 then they likely would have requested more than $1,000 understanding that it would get knocked back to $1,000. For now, let’s fund presenters up to $1,000 and work to rank the other proposals. Also, while ranking this time, keep in mind which kinds of information would be helpful to have as part of the application for future rounds of professional development grants.

      ii. Future rounds
         1. Discussion about whether or not rank should be a part of the equation. Does the greater need of assistant professors to be professionally active weigh in the decision process?
         2. Should recent professional development application history play a role in the process? There is a system in place for sabbaticals by
which you can only apply if X number of years have passed since last award. Could we use that kind of system for professional development?

3. Should divisional funding and external funding sources play a role? If an individual is going to receive money from another source, should that be involved in the discussion?

4. There has been an issue about the originality of the proposals. Even if people are submitting as part of a team, proposals should be written individually in each author’s own words.

IV. Adjournment – motion by Cara, seconded by Amanda, unanimous vote

Next meeting Friday, September 19, 1:00 PM