

Faculty Benefits Meeting

November 4, 2015

SU 108 3:15 PM

Members in Attendance: Patricia Sunderhaus, Debbie Patten, Kimberly Allen-Kattus, Emily Shifley, Jennifer Kinsley, John Farrar, Brad Scharlott, Marius Truta, Gabe Sanders, Kimberly Clayton-Code, Ben Martz, Andrea Gazzaniga, Jackie Wroughton, Ausbra McFarland, David Dunevant, Deb Engel Chilcote, Matthew Zacate, Melissa Moon, Justin Yates, Vanessa Hunn, Joan Ferrante, Perry Bratcher, Jamey Strawn

Call to order –

Adoption of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes October 7 Meeting

New Business:

Review of Subcommittee recommendation of Faculty Development Awards Committee members who applied for sabbaticals were asked to leave during the discussion and vote for sabbaticals.

Sabbaticals:

18 sabbatical applications were approved without reservation.

2 sabbatical applications were problematic.

The first of these presented issues for the committee because the Dean's recommendation noted that the application lacked clear statement of goals and lacked a clear explanation of how the candidate planned on disseminating research gained during the sabbatical, in context with follow up.

The subcommittee also had issues with the second, based in part on the Dean's evaluation. Chief among the issues was the fact that the applicant requested a full year sabbatical to complete three articles. Members largely agreed with the Dean that an entire year was not warranted as much of the research had been completed during a prior sabbatical.

Discussion:

Questions were brought up in context of how much weight should be given to the Dean's evaluation. After discussion it was decided that while the Dean's feedback should be considered, since the Dean and Provost had to sign off on the awards, the committee was allowed to form a contrary decision primarily on their own determination of the merits or deficits of the application.

Discussion also addressed the nature of sabbatical leave, that is, whether it was to be viewed as a right or a privilege. On this point a general consensus among committee members was that sabbatical applications be held to a high standard.

After further discussion the meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes while the Sabbatical subcommittee convened to vote on the final two applicants. After the Benefits meeting reconvened, the Sabbatical subcommittee reported their final decision. 18 sabbaticals were approved the latter 2 were not recommended.

A committee vote was called, seconded, and a vote was held. There was one opposition vote. The subcommittee's recommendation passed.

Summer Fellowships:

The Summer Fellowship Subcommittee reported their recommendations:
15 Summer Fellowships were recommended
2 were not recommended.

A committee vote was called, seconded, and a vote was held. The subcommittee's recommendation passed unanimously.

Project Grants

The member who applied for a project grant was asked to leave during the discussion and vote on Project Grants.

23 Project Grant Applications were received and reviewed
Total dollar amount for Project Grants: \$56,000.00

The Project Grant Sub Committee recommended 11 of the 23 in a ranked list. They recommended a split grant of \$2750.00 for two of the last three applicants on the ranked list with a recommendation that if additional funding became available the full \$6000.00 be awarded to those two applicants as well as an additional \$6000.00 for the applicant whose proposal was next in ranking.

Discussion:

The issue of a bias toward the Sciences emerged and was addressed. It was resolved that there was no bias toward the Sciences.

The next topic of discussion was who to award grants to if recipients declined any of those grants already approved. Members of the subcommittee indicated that some but not all applications that were not in the top 11 merited support; however, they were not presented to the full committee in ranked order in part because members did not expect more than \$12,000 in extra funding to be made available by the provost.

A procedural decision was made not to rank the remaining applications before voting on the subcommittee's recommendation. The motion was made that the committee accept the recommendations of the Project Grant Subcommittee as

they were presented originally. The vote to accept the recommendations of the Project Grant subcommittee passed 21 to 2.

Unfinished Business:

Time did not permit the prioritization of goals for this year.

Meeting adjourned

Next meeting: December 2, 2015 at 3:15 p.m. in SU 108

Respectfully Submitted

Kim Kattus