

## Faculty Development Committee Meeting -- Minutes

**Date: March 11, 2024**

Present: Julie Megginson, Anish Dave, Laura Gosa, Melinda Chatham, Manoj Thapa, Glenn Robins, Natasha Snider. Michele Smith emailed her recommendations. Ian Brown and Mark Grimes emailed that they would support the committee's recommendations.

The meeting started at 1104AM with discussion regarding the Provost's suggestion of first excluding all applicants who have previously applied for the academic year. Priority would be to all first-time applicants for the academic year (Fall 2023 and Spring 2024). Our budget this semester is \$30,000.00 for all FDG applications.

The committee started off excluding all applicants who previously applied which totaled \$11,500.33

Suggestions should be sent to Anish to discuss procedures on the process for FDG. Plan is to meet once next month to discuss all the policies and processes for FDG and make necessary changes as needed.

Employees discussed:

1. Jim Aller: Approved \$1385.31
2. Surya Amarachintha Recommend approval with conditions \$1400.00: Ask why wasn't application submitted in Fall 23 and add receipts from the conference.
3. Jason Berggren: excluding for primary round of approvals.
4. Susan Bragg: approved \$561.79
5. Allen Brown: approved \$300.00
6. Jonathon Carter: excluding for primary round of approvals.
7. Joseph Comeau: Recommend approval \$1400.00 with acceptance notice.
8. Suzanne Conner: Approved for \$1400.00
9. Michael Crosby: Approved for \$183.08
10. Paul Dahlgren: excluding for primary round of approvals.
11. Anish Dave: Approved \$1077.82
12. Mohammad Dehzoei: Approved \$1400.00
13. Bonnie Gary: Approved \$600.00
14. Olga Godoy: excluding for primary round of approvals.
15. Mark Grimes: Approved \$1000.00
16. Joni Hammond: Approved \$300.00
17. Dawn Hart: Approved \$265. 14
18. Nediarka Lordanova: Approved \$952.30
19. Ashley Jones: excluding for primary round of approvals.
20. Alaina Kaus: Approved \$1400.00
21. John LeJeune: excluding for primary round of applications.
22. Tom Lorenz: excluding for primary round of applications.

23. Jamie MacLennan: Approved \$1400.00
24. Sally Merritt: Approved \$300.00
25. Ramona Mulleins-Foreman: more of training/participation versus presenting...approved for \$300.00
26. Satyaki Nan: excluding for primary round of applications.
27. Yangil Park: Approved \$730.05
28. Chris Pritchett: Approved \$600.00
29. Glenn Robins: excluding for primary round of applications.
30. Jesse Russell: excluding for primary round of applications.
31. Jennifer Ryer: Approved \$600.00
32. Rhonda Slocumb: Pending approval for \$600.00 --need documentation.
33. Michele Smith: excluding for primary round of applications.
34. Sondra Smith: Approval \$400.98
35. Natasha Snider: Pending approval of \$600.00 per documentation...on facilities committee.
36. Danielle Taylor: Approved \$435.03
37. Jeffrey Waldrop: Approved \$798.00
38. Jessica Watson: Approved \$600.00
39. Keaton Wynn: Approved \$1119.00...provide documentation to differentiate between students and faculty
40. Chu Chu Wu: excluding for primary round of applications.

Total of all approvals (including pending documentation): \$22,108.50

Remaining funds: \$7891.50

We decided to recommend the grant amounts in two rounds. In the first round, we decided to fund the first-time applicants in the academic year based on the committee's recommendations. Then, we decided to take up the applications put aside in the first round (because they are applying for the second time in the academic year) and fund these applications based on the funds available after the first round. We also decided that we did not see any problems in these excluded applications except when an application or two requested an amount higher than the prescribed limit according to the guidelines.

Meeting ended: 1212PM

Prepared by Laura Gosa and Anish Dave

## Faculty Development Committee Meeting on April 15, 2024

### Minutes

The Faculty Development Committee met today at 11 a.m. to discuss the recommendations of the Faculty Senate in the Faculty Development Grant guidelines in the Faculty Handbook. Six members attended, but only five were able to vote (one member left early). The voting members included Julie Megginson, Manoj Thapa, Dongwen Qi, Laura Gosa, and Anish Dave. The three recommendations were as follows:

1. There was a change in the language about priority to first-time grant applicants in a year. The proposal was to not subject second-time applicants who had “received \$600 or less for the first grant.” The Faculty Development Committee, five members voting, agreed with this recommendation but with a reduced amount of \$300.

The committee members felt that given limited funding for these grants, a lower threshold of \$300 was warranted in the case of giving priority to first-time applicants. The FDGs have categories of presentations (with four sub-categories of international/national, regional, state, and local, each qualifying for a varying amount). These grants also have additional categories of research, training, and academic supplies. The \$300 amount is recommended for training. The committee has often recommended this amount for passive participation (attendance) at a conference or a training-related request. The committee members felt that considering this amount as a limit for the purpose of assigning a priority in FDG funding is preferable to a higher amount (\$600 or less).

2. The second recommendation related to a request “at least once in both the Spring and Fall Semesters” by the Faculty Development Committee to the Provost “on all funding and appropriations related to the Faculty Development Account” for the committee’s review and feedback “where appropriate.” The committee agreed with this recommendation but believes this summary should be requested by the committee from the provost once in a fiscal year, preferably at the end of the spring semester.

The committee believes that requesting the summary in both semesters may not be necessary. In an email, Dr. Glenn Robins agreed with the Faculty Senate recommendation as worded, which we take to mean a summary in both semesters. However, the rest of us, five members voting, believe that a summary once in a fiscal year is adequate for the committee’s review and feedback.

3. The third and last recommendation was to post online the committee’s meeting agendas, minutes, and the Excel sheet containing the committee’s recommendations. The committee agreed with this recommendation.