

Faculty Welfare
November 14, 2012

Attendance: Jim Carper (chair), Tambra Jackson, Christine Lotter, Eva Monsoma, Jeremy Searson, Diane Monrad, Bethany Bell, Joe Flora

September 12, 2012 Minutes from Faculty Welfare Committee were approved by committee

Meeting location moved to Wardlaw 009 for all future meetings.

Discussion:

Faculty Awards: Committee agreed that Staff Awards should be handled by another committee—Jim Carper would check with Lynda Tilley.

We would be in charge of Faculty Awards and would review and edit Faculty Award documents at our next meeting in December. We would tentatively seek nominations by February 1st and decide on awards by March 1

Eva Monsoma asked about the communication structure between the chairs of committees and faculty and how this communication could be improved. Some suggested that Executive Council could put out summaries of its meetings in email to all faculty or through program coordinators who could share with program faculty.

New Business:

Incentive Grants Revisions: Christine Lotter and Diane Monrad led a discussion of the drafts of the two new College of Education Research Grant programs to the committee for feedback. Dr. Lotter had served on a subcommittee with others in the College to provide Dr. Seaman with some initial feedback before bring to Faculty Welfare.

Suggested changes included:

Grants Program B: External Grant Proposals

1. Change Award decision time from “within One month of receipt” to within 6 weeks at the top and end of the form
2. Bold “inclusion of a faculty mentor who has demonstrated success in securing grants” in the Description section
3. In Eligibility: Add competitive in the sentence: “Preference is given to those who have never been awarded a major ‘competitive’ grant..” to also include those who have received state contracts that were major but not competitive
4. Increase page length to 5 pages to distinguish from 3 page proposal for Program A
5. We also discussed the need for the awardees to submit a final report at the end of the funding period to show what work was completed as well as the submission of a proposal. This might help to weed out individuals who might submit proposals that are not of quality to a funding agency.
6. The committee wanted to know the amount of funding available to give at each funding deadline—Dean could say that \$_____ dollars are available and it is likely that we could award _____# at the \$12,000 amount. This

would help the committee to know how many awards to fund and if money in a proposed budget might need to be cut to award additional quality proposals.

Grants Program A: Publication

1. The committee wants clarity on whether the money could be used for summer salary. All discussed that this is a very important need for this money and the committee suggested increasing this award to up to \$4,000 to be equal to teaching a summer course.
2. Clarification on what the money could be used for was needed: transcription, graduate student funds, salary, etc.

The committee is going to give the proposals a final read and submit all changes to Dr. Lotter by Monday November 26th. Dr. Lotter will then communicate these changes to Mike Seaman.

Next meeting: December 12 1pm to 2pm in Wardlaw 009