

## Proposed Faculty Handbook Revision

**Rationale:** The Faculty Benefits committee feels that the “investigation of alternative funding sources” is a separate issue from “the possibility of the project leading to future grants” and it is awkward to evaluate “either or both” of these. We suggest these items be listed as separate bullet points. Additionally, although it is wonderful if Faculty Development awards may “lead to future grants,” not all Faculty Development Awards can lead to future grants. We therefore suggest changing this language so that Faculty Development awards are evaluated on how well they contribute to the ongoing creative or scholarly work of faculty.

### **Current Text:**

#### 11.4.4. EVALUATION

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- The value of the project to the applicant’s growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community;
- The value of the project to the applicant’s teaching responsibilities and students;
- The value of the project to the University;
- The value of the project to the non-academic community;
- 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);
- The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside his/her own academic discipline;
- Investigation of alternative funding sources, and/or the possibility of the project leading to future grants;
- The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
- 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.

### **Suggested Revision:**

#### 11.4.4. EVALUATION

In evaluating and ranking applications, the following are the primary factors that will be considered:

- How well the proposal meets the purposes of the program for which application is made;
- The value of the project to the applicant’s growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community;
- The value of the project to the applicant’s teaching responsibilities and students;
- The value of the project to the University;
- The value of the project to the non-academic community;
- 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);

- The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside his/her own academic discipline;
- Contribution of the project to the applicant's ongoing scholarship or creative activity;
- Investigation of alternative funding sources;
- The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
- 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.

**Additional note:**

In several documents provided by the Benefits committee, each bulleted evaluation point was previously given a letter as follows:

- 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;
- d) The value of the project to the applicant's teaching responsibilities and students;
- e) The value of the project to the University;
- f) The value of the project to the non-academic community;
- g) 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);
- h) The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside his/her own academic discipline;
- j) Investigation of alternative funding sources, and/or the possibility of the project leading to future grants;
- m) The urgency of the project to be undertaken; and
- n) Overall quality of the proposal.

**Suggested Revision:**

We suggest instead lettering each bulleted evaluation point in alphabetical order as follows:

- 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.