

## Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting

September 11, 2013

In attendance: Bethany Bell, Allison Anders, Eva Monsa, Mike Seaman, Joe Flora, Christine Lotter, Jeremy Searson

Minutes submitted by: Bethany A. Bell

### 1. Internal Grant Proposal Discussions:

- a. Rubric Development: After reviewing many proposals last year, the committee discussed developing a rubric to help keep the reviews more structured and consistent.
  - i. Plan of action: Committee will review the ASPIRE scoring guidelines and rubric (that Bethany shared via email) and see if we can adjust to work with our proposal reviews. Have a draft rubric ready by next meeting, October 9<sup>th</sup>.
- b. Ad Hoc Committee for Reviewing Internal Grant Submissions
  - i. After some discussion about the pros and cons of simply relying on the FWC to review internal grant submissions or creating an Ad Hoc Review Committee that worked with FWC, Mike mentioned that it really be two committees that could be needed – one ad hoc committee for each section of the grants program. Conversation continued and for now, instead of forming official Ad Hoc Committees, FWC will continue to manage and review the internal grants with the help of other faculty members as needed. Faculty members with expertise in the substantive areas (and/or methodological areas) of the grants being reviewed will be asked to review proposals, as needed.
    1. To help facilitate this approach, Mike Seaman offered to ask Rhonda to supply a list of faculty members who have funding in the college and by funding source.
- c. Agreed to slightly revise Grant Program B by adding a requirement that applications must include documentation of the funding mechanism that the future proposal will be submitted to. Part of the information that needs to be provide is evidence that RFP that they will apply to meets the “major funding” requirement of the grant description.
- d. Revised submission dates for both Program A and B, effective January 1, 2014: January 1, April 1, and October 1.

### 2. Peer assessment concerns

- a. Plan of action: See our role as a committee to help promote equity across units - - bring to steering committee for further discussion about our concern about equity and rigor across departments. Shall we have college wide process, standards, criteria, etc. Christine will present our concern to the Steering Committee.
3. Provost compression plan (reported to committee by Mike Seaman)
- a. This summer, Provost had a meeting and shared their plan for using the Provost Money – simply using the faculty average from the Oklahoma State University (OSU) Salary Database for U.S. Universities and multiply by 0.9 so that everyone is within 90% of the OSU average.
    - i. Provost plan is set to happen over the next 3 years.
  - b. Within the college plan, our target salaries were 100% of OSU average. For those that made the list (based on department rankings – only giving monies for those with 4s and 5s).
    - i. If name is on both lists, use the Provost money to get to 90% and then college money to supplement the rest. This allowed our college to use their money more broadly.
  - c. No provost requirements for determining clinical raises – most received raises. Was determined primarily based on years at the university and lack of pay increases over the years. Clinical faculty with 4s and 5s also got “extra” money just like the tenure track process.
  - d. Cannot use any monies to give raises to Research Faculty.