![NKU Faculty Senate logo] **Faculty Senate**
Excellence in Collegial Governance

MEMORANDUM

To: Sue Ott Rowlands, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Matthew Zacate, Faculty Senate President

Re: Changes to section 11.4.4. of the Faculty Handbook (evaluation of faculty development award applications) as recommended by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of March 25, 2019

Date: April 5, 2019

After reviewing faculty development award applications this past fall, the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee adopted the position that the "investigation of alternative funding sources" is a separate criterion from "the possibility of the project leading to future grants," making it awkward, at best, to evaluate "either or both" of them. The committee, therefore, recommended to the Faculty Senate that it support a change in the Faculty Handbook to make them separate bullet points. Furthermore, the committee recommended that the senate approve a change in wording from "the possibility of the project leading to future grants" to the "contribution of the project to the applicant's ongoing scholarship or creative activity," which it felt was more closely aligned with the purpose of the faculty development award program. Finally, the committee recommends changing the bullet points to letters so that they can be referred to easily in the evaluation forms used by the committee.

Section 11.4.4 of the Faculty Handbook as it would appear with revisions is shown below with changes highlighted in yellow. The senate voted to approve these recommended changes to the handbook at the March 25, 2019 meeting.

[[Begin section 11.4.4. of the Faculty Handbook after all proposed changes, highlighted in yellow]]

11.4.4. EVALUATION
In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:
   a) How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
   b) The value of the project to the applicant's growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community;
   c) The value of the project to the applicant's teaching responsibilities and students;
   d) The value of the project to the University;
   e) The value of the project to the non-academic community;
   f) The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant's background, previous success, and attainability of the goals stated);

g) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside his/her own academic discipline;
h) Contribution of the project to the applicant's ongoing scholarship or creative activity;
i) Investigation of alternative funding sources;
j) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
k) Overall quality of the proposal.

Other things being equal, preference should be given, first, to a candidate who has not previously received a program award; second, to a candidate without tenure; and, third, to a candidate who received a Program award the longest time ago.

[[End proposed section 11.4.4.]]