

11-5-2013

## Faculty Development minutes 11/05/2013

Faculty Development Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/f\\_develop](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/f_develop)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Development Committee, "Faculty Development minutes 11/05/2013" (2013). *Faculty Development Committee*. 24.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/f\\_develop/24](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/f_develop/24)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Development Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

Faculty Development Committee minutes: Tuesday November 5, 2013

Present: Siobhan Bremer (chair), Rita Bolluyt, Mark Logan, William Straub, Michelle Page, Emily Carruth

Absent: Stacey Rosana, Tianyue Li

Minutes from previous meeting were approved.

Discussion of time-release program and criteria for selection:

In the past there was a subcommittee that read the proposals and made recommendations. Each member of the subcommittee rated proposals on a 1-4 scale and selected their top 5. Ratings were based on published criteria and the quality of each segment of the application and how applicants addressed criteria. Now criteria have changed a little so evaluation of proposals might change a bit. For example, item #2 has now been split so that "Describe how you will use this release to advance your research or creative project" and "if applying for a course release, discuss how your discipline/division plans to cover the release without significantly impacting course availability or colleagues' workloads" are two separate items.

The first "cut" of applications was completeness--if the application is not complete it's out. The second review involved the committee scoring and ranking proposals. Last year there were 8 applications for 5 awards.

What worked well and what didn't work? The number of applications made it fairly easy last year. If we have a large pool of applicants that will certainly make it more challenging to rank and/or score.

Criteria of this award (published in the application) include:

- The intellectual/creative significance of the proposed research to the field
- The effect on raising the profile of the department or University or directly engaging the public through the project
- The impact on professional development

Were there other informal criteria that helped scorers to decide or tie-break? One thing was that time-release is preferred so that was sometimes applied. Do awards need to encompass all Divisions? There is no formal requirement to spread out the awards over the Divisions. Specificity and detail were valued by last year's committee.

As per the requirements of the time-release award project, the subcommittee evaluating the proposals will be comprised of the three faculty members of the FDC.

A rubric will be created and distributed to the committee for revision and subsequent approval. If approved, use of the rubric will be piloted this year. The purpose of the rubric is to guide the committee's scoring, offering a small amount of reliability.

Siobhan will check with the Dean's Office to see if there is a sample application that we could provide to applicants to help enhance their understanding of the quality and level of detail desired in proposals.

Submitted by Michelle Page