

**Faculty Development Committee (FDC)**  
**Minutes for e-meeting over April 8-20, 2018**  
**Approved May 1, 2018**

**Participants- all FDC members (alphabetical):** Joan Carlisle, Neal Chesnut, Jessica Critten, Betsy Dahms, Michael de Nie, Swarna (Basu) Dutt, Megumi Fujita (chair), Mary Kassis, Pam Hunt Kirk, Soo Moon, Jeff Reber, Lacey Ricks

The meeting was held in the form of email exchange in two topics.

**Topic 1: Recap of Faculty Development Grant Review Process**

- Fujita shared her reflection on (1) two-round review method, (2) timeline, (3) review rubric, and (4) proposal format, and asked FDC members to give their feedback. Carlisle, Ricks, Kassis, Moon, de Nie, and Dahms provided feedback (summarized below)
- Fujita also shared comments received three unfunded applicants.
  - “I received only two reviews. Neither was from a close field (science in this case) and the reviewer did not seem to understand my proposal:
  - “I received two extreme reviews: one was highly positive, one was highly negative. Is there a way to have more consistency?”
  - “When the rank is revealed to reviewers, it decreases the anonymity.”

**Summary of feedback by category**

- (1) **Two-round review method?** (Round 1 by two different-field reviewers, about 2/3 proceeds to Round 2, by one same-field reviewer)
  - One-round review is preferred (x4) with clear and consistent rubric.
  - Problem found: If Round 1 has no same-field reviewer, it is more prone to extreme reviews from lack of understanding. If it does not proceed to Round 2, it does not get reviewed by same-field reviewer.
  - It is better to assure that each proposal is reviewed by the same-field reviewer from the beginning. Need to rethink the review work assignment.
- (2) **Timeline and workload**
  - The deadline of the proposal submission was Monday, February 12. Target announcement date was Friday, March 16, which was nominally set. The actual announcement was made on Monday, April 2 (2 weeks and 3 days late). In future, we can simply give the first week of April as an estimated announcement time. (March 16 may have been realistic if One-Round method was used.)
  - Need a longer time for review! (One-round may solve this, as well as a better streamlining the process)
  - FDC members need to be aware of this heavy task early in the academic year
  - Explain to reviewers how the money is allocated early on (how much fund is available, how the ranking is made, how full funding and partial funding are decided)
  - Increase the size of the committee, Ad Hoc member or external reviewers, from the beginning.

- What if FDC members apply? (This year, applicants participated in the review in Round 1 but not Round 2.) If one-round process is employed, applicants should not be reviewers. However, this will increase other member's workload.

### **(3) Review rubric**

- Need to develop some consistent standards for the review process (e.g. what is the difference between a score of 30, 25, 20, etc?) This year it was up to the judgement of each reviewer, but some guidelines would make the process more fair.
- Current point system is confusing. How about 7-point or 5-point scale (and weight of each category are adjusted by a staff member)? (→ But if we reduce the point scale it may be much harder to rank the proposals, as numerous proposals will end up with the same score.)
- "Professional Growth"... how to give points? Inconsistency in the reviewer's interpretation. If this is based on rank, then fixed points can be given by the staff member, and reviewers do not need the applicants' rank. This will be better for blindness of the review. (Second on automatic scoring of this by rank.)
- Difficulty in judging appropriateness of budget
- Clarification needed with the "minimum acceptable amount" and how to handle partial funding. If one does not declare a minimum acceptable funding, then that person can only get full funding?

### **(4) Proposal format**

- Proposal that does not follow the guideline (single space, too small font, exceeding 3 pages etc) should be disqualified without further review. (Second).
- Minimum funding level should be required, omission of this should lead to disqualification.
- Need for clear definition of "Sustainability"
- All-electronic cover page, including the chair's e-signature.
- Require to include the title in the main 3-page proposal
- Allow a page for references? (One opposed)
- Clarify that Figures and Tables can be used, but they need to fit within the three pages.
- Typos and grammatical errors? → decrease points in "Clarity and Understandability"
- Require same font size 12 for Budget Justification as well, though it can be single-spaced

### **Conclusion**

- Fujita proposed a revised review process and scoring rubric, addressing the points that were brought up, as the 0<sup>th</sup> draft (shared with FDC). FDC next year will discuss this in one of the first meetings and come up with more consistent rubric. No decisions are made at this point.

### **Topic 2: Revision of Faculty Handbook Section 103.0302-5 (for Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement)**

Per our discussion in January, Melanie McClellan drafted a revision of the list of evidentiary sources in FH 103.0302-5. Basically addition of an item in each of the three areas: Teaching, Service, and Professional Growth and Development.

5.1.11 Evidence of teaching that incorporates community-engaged approaches and methods

5.2.10 Successful service that includes community-engaged approaches and methods.

5.3.8 Evidence of scholarship that uses community-engaged approaches and methods.

**Discussion:**

- Question: Does this revision require all faculty to fulfill the community-engagement item? → Answer: No, it is not required, but is one of options that can be chosen from the list.
- Concern: Does this take our time away from excellence in teaching?  
→ Community engagement is already practiced by faculty as an integral part of teaching (to provide excellent teaching, rather than being a burden). But it is an option, not a requirement if it is not applicable.
- UWG already has many active community engagement activities (e.g. COSS, institution-wide Service learning courses), worthy of Carnegie Clarification. Clear mention of Community Engagement to count toward P&T is requirement for Carnegie application, but also to make it official to recognize them officially.

**Decision:**

- The FDC approved the revision draft by 11 votes (one no vote). This revision is submitted as an agenda item for the Senate meeting on Friday, April 27.

The e-meeting was concluded on Friday, April 20, 2018.

Respectfully submitted:  
Megumi Fujita