

Faculty Welfare Committee

10/19/15

Research Grants Program Discussion

Committee is responsible for assessing and providing feedback to Dean's office about the research grants program. Currently we have 3 requests for grants to review. The committee will permit individuals to revise and resubmit unfunded proposals within the same semester rather than forcing them to wait until the next semester to re-apply.

Erik Drasgow encouraged the committee to come up with ideas that might be consistent with the focus on research as part of the college strategic plan. For example, in what ways could we encourage or create a system that clarifies that this grant is part of a springboard for going out and seeking additional grant money.

Each committee member should review a grant submission and use the rubrics to complete reviews by our next meeting on Nov 16th. Stephen Thompson will send out the grant requests that have been received.

Action items for Fall 2015 were discussed; these items are based on previous year of Faculty Welfare committee meetings. Committees agreed that it would be helpful to revisit these items and consider what we need to follow up on and/or discuss to make sure it happens. Issues included:

1. Ask Dean's office if it is okay to create a link on College of Education Contracts and Grants Office website where we can include information about the outcome of individual's actual work product - publication, evidence. To ensure that this happens, we need to update the guidelines to ensure that the recipient provides a report about their outcomes; and this must happen before applicant is eligible for a subsequent grant. Also, need to work with College of Education Contracts and Grants Office to confirm that those who received money then used the money for their research.

2. Need to address various faculty concerns:

- Annual Performance Review transparency, uniformity, clarity and criteria

- Promotion and Tenure issues that interact with Annual Performance Review, getting revised Promotion and Tenure documents through the Provost office approval process has been a challenge

- Promotion and Tenure guidance would be helpful for all faculty members (tenure seeking and promotion process)

- Communication: Committee members discussed lack of communication and inconsistent

sharing by Department Chairs of the information from the Executive Committee meetings.

3. Committee was asked about request to create the COE Adjunct Faculty Teaching award. It does not necessarily have to include money, but some recognition would be a positive encouragement to those adjuncts who are critical to programs and who offer real value through their service as adjuncts.

4. There are a few other items on list from last year so Stephen Thompson will send this information out and we should each go to our Department meetings and get feedback from our colleagues to determine their priorities from this list.

Additional Discussion and Decisions:

Christine Lotter in her role as Faculty Chair will send the Annual Performance Review document listing key questions about the Annual Performance Review process to all Department Chairs and discuss this at the Executive Committee meeting. The goal is to then discuss the APR and needed revisions among faculty members in each dept.

Christine Lotter will seek feedback from the Department Chairs about how mentoring works in their Departments at Executive Committee meeting. For example, is there an assignment of new faculty members? Goal should be to gather e.g., Tenure and Promotion guiding documents that provide ongoing support for all faculty during this process.

Another area of interest might be to encourage the Dean's office to set aside money for rewarding successful post-tenure reviews.