

Approved: February 2, 2018

**Faculty Development Committee (FDC)  
Minutes January 30, 2018**

**Present:** Megumi Fujita (Chair), Joan Carlisle (scribe), Basu Dutt, Mary Kassis, Betsy Dahms, Jeff Reber, Winston Tripp (sub for Pam Kirk)

**Administrator:** Michael Crafton, Provost

**Not present:** Soo Moon, Lacey Ricks, Neal Chesnut, Michael de Nie, Jessica Critten

**Guest:** Denise Overfield (ORSP), Amber Kelly (ORSP), Melanie McClellan (Community Engagement)

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm, TLC 2134

Meeting minutes from 11/17/2017 were approved as circulated.

Announcements: Outside Employment recommendation (revision of Faculty Handbook section 114) as presented by FDC was passed by Faculty Senate

***Faculty Development Grants***

The FDC will be reviewing all Faculty Research Grants from this year forward. This will be the main work of the committee for February and March 2018. We will be using ORSP's internal grant submission system to review and comment on the proposals online.

Denise Overfield and Amber Kelly presented to the committee about "InfoReady Reviewers" the application building/routing/reviewing software that has been purchased by ORSP for institutional use (see attached powerpoint).

***Discussion Points:***

- Blinded vs non-blinded. Applicants are required to submit an abbreviated CV. However, ORSP can blind the proposals (as much as possible for this year) if we decide to blind the applications. They are not blinded at present.
- Process for review
  - Applicant will receive the reviewer comments (if we decide to do that) but will not know who the reviewer was
  - Does the entire committee review all applicants?
    - If not, "who" will review applicants? Concern expressed about judging "significance" of a project outside one's area of expertise
  - If applications are distributed among committee members, will a member review applications from their own school/department/discipline?
  - If applications are distributed, how many people should review each application?
  - Should the review be a 2-or even 3-step process? First round of review with rating; second round of review with rating? Third round of review with rating? At what point, if any, does the entire committee review the final selections?
  - Can rubric categories be included into the InfoReady system? How will the individual 'scores' be submitted and tabulated?
- Judging "justification" and quality of the proposal
  - Very important that application follows all guidelines and that it is written in "lay" language for those reviewers outside specialty (specified in the guidelines)

**Decisions:**

- By a vote of 4-2, the committee decided to have blind reviews (the 2 were “either way is fine”). Amber Kelley will attempt to blind the applications that have already been submitted and a clarification email will go to faculty to avoid identifying information in the application as much as possible.
- The committee and ORSP will wait until after the deadline for applications (February 12) to determine the best process for review---will invite additional reviewers, as needed, to include subject matter experts in the review process.
- Use a 2-step (or 3-step) review process, if needed, to accommodate the number of applications.

### ***Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement***

Dr. Crafton distributed handouts with info about community engagement from Carnegie, Kennesaw State, and UWG. Melanie McClellan also provided a handout with the latest info from Carnegie.

### ***Discussion Points***

- Several schools in UWG system have included community engagement in promotion and tenure guidelines (see KSU handout)
- The use of community engagement in our guidelines can be broad and can be used as examples of how to demonstrate P & T criteria
- The use of the term “community engagement” should include the idea of “collaborative” activities instead of just a “one-way” flow of activities
- Colleges, departments, schools may develop more specific examples or criteria

### **Decision**

- Melanie McClellan will draft ‘wording’ for current UWG promotion and tenure guidelines for discussion at the March meeting. She will send the draft to the FDC chair for distribution.

### ***Handbook Revision***

- The committee voted to approve revision to the Faculty Handbook section 103.02, second bullet point to read “the Student Evaluations of Instruction as specified in Section 103.06”
  - Needed in order to be in compliance with previously approved revisions (eliminated of the chair’s teaching evaluation form from P & T, which had been removed already last year)

### ***Next Chair***

- Eligible: Betsy Dahms, Basu Dutt, Jeff Reber, Soo Moon
- Note: Betsy will be on professional leave; Jeff is a chair of Sociology Department

### **Next Meeting: March 2018**

The meeting adjourned at 2:10pm.

Respectfully submitted:  
Joan Carlisle