

1-31-2006

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, January 31, 2006

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, January 31, 2006" (2006). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 101.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/101

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Professional Standards Committee
Approved Minutes from January 31, 2006
12:30 pm Hauck 110

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 14, 12:30 p.m., Hauck 110

Introduction/Preliminaries

The meeting was convened at 12:30 pm in Hauck 110 by the chair, Nancy Decker. Faculty members present were: Gloria Cook, Don Griffin, Maria Ruiz, Steve Phelan, David Charles, and Paul Stephenson.

Information

1. Agenda Items

I. Travel Policy

2. New Business

No New Business was discussed

3. Old Business

A. Travel Policy: The current Travel Policy allows faculty \$1200 for domestic travel and \$1500 for international travel expenses.

The PSC has been asked by the Dean of faculty's office to update the current Travel Policy procedures. As noted in the PSC minutes from September 5, 2005: "This year the Dean of Faculty has more requests for travel money than can be funded. To help control costs the Dean's office has implementation of points 1 (a mandatory date to submit travel requests) and 2 (airline tickets must be purchased 21 days in advance). PSC is being asked to consider points 3, 4, and 5 from the Dean's office regarding car use, food, and priority of funding."

The mandatory date to submit travel requests, and the requisite that airline tickets be purchased 21 days in advance have been previously approved by the PSC. The focus of this meeting's discussion was the way in which travel funding is prioritized through the Dean of faculty's office.

After some discussion on allotment of travel funds, the committee decided that there was a need to discuss with the Dean of Faculty the process by which travel funds are allotted to faculty members.

Questions raised were:

1. "Are some faculty members receiving more than the \$1200/\$1500 limits and if so why?"
2. "If this is the case, is it common practice?"
3. "Where is the money coming from and does this effect access to travel funds for other faculty?"

The committee agreed that if other faculty were unable to travel b/c of unequal travel fund distribution then a problem exists.

Chair N. Decker raised a question regarding the intent to travel forms. Did the committee see a need to change this process for any reason? The PSC felt that the current travel forms and their use were in no need of revision.

N. Decker then expanded the discussion to include consideration of the IDG and Critchfield Grants which include requests for travel funds. The PSC was concerned that a problem exists in this process whereby a faculty member may be awarded three Critchfield grants in a row then (being excluded from applying for a fourth consecutive Critchfield grant) applying for an IDG grant that essentially funds the same project. This type of use becomes a "loophole" method of acquiring constant "in-house" funding through the college.

D. Griffin noted that there is a difference between using an IDG to travel and pursue an extended stay of study and travel grants used for trips to professional meetings.

M. Ruiz pointed out that there is an increased need to require a grant awardee to present the tangible results that came out of their award.

N. Decker added that the IDG monetary requests have been steadily increasing. How will accountability be built into the system?

D. Griffin noted that it is possible to have accountability built into the IDG.

D. Charles added that the lines which delineate an IDG from a Critchfield grant often blur.

D. Griffin stated that the Critchfield award should require that the ultimate goal of any funded project should be a publication and that IDG recipients should be required to submit a report on the work that was accomplished as a result of their award.

M. Ruiz raised the issue of limited funding and its distribution. Her concern was how will we be able in the future to decide upon distribution of limited funds between proposals of equal merit?

D. Griffin suggested that b/c funds will become increasingly limited that IDG grants be available to a person only once every five years.

D. Charles cautioned that some disciplines are more geared towards IDG than Critchfield grants. So, limiting the IDG so much might not be equitable.

P. Stephenson asked for a point of clarification.

N. Decker clarified that the PSC was proposing two options:

1. Faculty members could receive only one IDG every 5 years
2. IDG and Critchfields be treated equally such that faculty would only be able to receive three awards in a row of a any combination (Critchfield and/or IDG).

M. Riuz remarked that there was a need for a grant administrator on campus in the office of institutional advancement.

D. Griffin agreed that it would be helpful to have someone who has expertise in finding grants.

G. Cook suggested that there be a record in the Critchfield/IDG forms that lets the PSC know if a candidate had recently tried to obtain extramural funding.

N. Decker summarized that the PSC wants to encourage individual faculty to be inquisitive in finding outside funds.

P. Stephenson suggested that if faculty receive three years of "in-house" funding, they be required to seek extramural funding prior to being allowed to submit another Critchfield or IDG proposal.

D. Griffin suggested that there simply be a question on the Critchfield application asking what efforts had been made by the individual to seek outside funding and if faculty has not been funded we could recommend options.

S. Phelan suggested that it would be helpful to ask (survey) the faculty regarding their satisfaction with the level of funding they have received from the college and ask them what the college could do to help them get funding.

N. Decker noted that the New Faculty Orientation program could be used to incorporate training for new faculty on how to seek extramural funding.

D. Charles suggested a seminar or workshop on successful grant writing.

M. Ruiz suggested that we meet with Roger Casey at the next PSC meeting.

S. Phelan noted that the development office has information on local opportunities for faculty development and support.

M. Ruiz suggested that we talk to R. Casey about local sources of funding and distribution of this material.

S. Phelan also suggested that the PSC speak with someone from the development office.

N. Decker suggested a faculty retreat that was focused on extramural funding.

4. Adjourn The meeting was adjourned (1:45 pm.)

Respectfully submitted,
Paul Stephenson, Recording Secretary