

## Faculty Benefits Meeting Minutes

November 4, 2020

Zoom; 3:15pm

Members present: Alyssa Appelman, Jay Avenido, Paige Byam Soliday, Charlisa Daniels, Mike DiCicco, Rebecca Elkins, Suk-Hee Kim, JeeEun Lee, Boni Li, Zeel Maheshwari, Debbie Patten, Ausbra McFarland, Kalif Vaughn, Darrin Wilson, Xiaoni Zhang, Jennifer Kinsley, Lynn Warner, Sharon Vance-Eliany, Jamey Strawn, Junko Agnew, Brittany Sorrell, Qing Su, (Grace Hiles)

### Call to Order

Agenda- The agenda was unanimously adopted.

Minutes from 10.7.20 meeting were approved by majority.

Discussion about part-time faculty with FDA access: PCC requested that this committee discuss this item and pass on a recommendation. A discussion ensued about the definition of a part time faculty member and what benefits are granted to them, including Faculty Development Awards (FDAs). A Zoom poll was executed. The results showed that the committee was in favor of allowing part time faculty to apply, as long as it was very clear that T/TT faculty would be given priority. The Chair will relay these sentiments to the chair of the PCC.

Discussion about relationship to University Research Council: The Chair had been approached about possible connections between the FDAs and the URC. She presented the mission of the URC and outlined their purpose. Members of the Benefits committee who also served on the URC committee gave insight into how the URC wanted to increase its promotion and visibility of its programs and thought that the FDAs were a natural way to start. A Zoom poll was executed. The results showed that the committee was in favor of 1) directing FDA awardees to the URC programs and 2) Asking the URC to give preference to FDA awardees in their program evaluations. The Chair will report to the URC.

Discussion of Summer Fellowship Applications: One fellowship application had not been made available to the subcommittee. The Chair employed a Zoom poll which resulted in a discussion of the reviewed proposals and a subsequent update and vote via email.

The discussion began with the fact that the Provost budgeted for 16 summer fellowships available and 20 applications were filed. Those that scored in the top 16 from the subcommittee rankings and discussions are recommended for award; 3 additional applications were also found to be equally acceptable and added in case the Provost finds additional funding; 1 application was deemed unacceptable. The Benefits committee held a vote via email and a quorum approved the ranked list recommended by summer fellowship subcommittee.

Discussion of Project Grant Applications: The discussion began with the fact that the Provost budgeted for \$66,000 available with \$56,247.65 requested. The top 9 applications were recommended for full funding, up to the \$6,000 limit (one applicant requested \$7237.50). One application was deemed unacceptable. This led to a requested budget of \$49,010.15. The Benefits committee at large unanimously approved the ranked list recommended by the project grant subcommittee.

The committee at large requests that the surplus in the Project Grant budget fund the Summer Fellowship surplus.

Discussion of Sabbatical Applications: The discussion began with the fact that the Handbook calculation allows 23 available sabbatical awards and this cycle saw 19 applications. 18 were deemed largely acceptable. The 19<sup>th</sup> had the subcommittee divided, so the details were put to the committee at large. A hand vote was called. A slight majority of members felt that the application was unacceptable. The Benefits committee at large unanimously approved ranked list recommended by sabbatical subcommittee.

Future Business: The Chair presented the following topics for future business

- Discussion about award/completion date of sabbaticals for repeat awards
- Discussion of TIAA change (other increased employee contributions)

The meeting was adjourned after participants were placed in sub-committee breakout rooms at 4:27pm.