CBA Professional Development Committee Meeting
October 3, 2003

Minutes

Present: Jim Beatty
Bob Capettini (for Chee Chow)
Larry Rhyne
Donald Sciglimpaglia
Moon Song
Bob Wilbur

Excused: Chee Chow

Absent:

Guest(s):

1. Jim Beatty, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10am on October 3, 2003, in the Dean’s Conference Room.

2. The meeting agenda was reviewed, modified, and approved.

3. Minutes of 09/19/2003 were moved, seconded, and approved (unanimous) with one modification.

4. Donald Sciglimpaglia gave a preview of his write up of the MBA Consulting Project (BA 795) as it relates to faculty growth and development. The topic will be reviewed in a future meeting.

5. Bob Wilbur reported that the next Brownbag, with light lunch, will be held on Friday, October 10, 2003. Gangaram Singh, Department of Management, will be the presenter.

6. Bob also reported that there were two problems regarding funding for the mentor program. First, the amount to be made available to each department would be minimal, perhaps not enough to justify the bookkeeping involved. Second, the State has rules against using such funds to buy lunches. Another strategy for supporting the mentor program in a positive but financial way needs to be developed. The Committee will continue to pursue this matter.

7. The Committee discussed the requirement that all grant or award recipients are required to submit a progress report, even if the entire project is not completed by the deadline. The absence of such a progress report will reflect negatively on future applications. Members of the Committee pointed out that
when one applicant receives an award, this limits the Committee’s ability to give an award to a competing candidate. Thus, unfulfilled projects become an opportunity loss for someone else.

8. The Committee discussed setting a formal policy for the length and format of applications (e.g., the number of pages, APA format, etc.) for the future. These guidelines, of course, have to be consistent with any existing university guidelines. The Committee will consider such concerns in advance of next year’s call for applications.

9. Jim reported that not very many of the applications for various grants had included an “Executive Summary” or “Layman’s Version” of the application. The faculty had previously received a letter from the Committee encouraging them to do so in order to enhance their chances when competing with applications across campus. After reviewing the applications, the Committee decided to again encourage favorably reviewed applicants to add a one-page summary that would explain their projects to the non-business academic audience. Such a summary should be written with the intent to help the all-campus committee understand the impact the research will have on "society," where society in this context is society in the broader sense. The all-campus committee is very interested in the value the research will have on the betterment of this world in some way. This is not to imply that the research needs to be a sociological study by any means; it simply means that the applicant should address how the research contributes to a better world. Business disciplines do make contributions that advance and improve society in the broader sense, and applicants need to make sure their research applications clearly indicate how the research will contribute and how it is meaningful. The packaging of the applications is often important as well. The onus is on the applicant to make sure the audience recognizes the value of the research. The Committee realizes many of the competitors for these awards across campus will include a "Layman's Version" of a few paragraphs (maybe three or four, but more than an abstract) that get right to the heart of the project. In business terms, this could be thought of as an Executive Summary. Obviously, applicants want to be able to effectively communicate their proposals to all members of all the various committees, regardless of the reviewers' backgrounds. Including an executive summary written in layman's terms might go a long way in helping to "sell" the project at that level and to help others appreciate that such research might be beneficial and worthy of funding.

10. The Committee then spent the remainder of the meeting discussing the evaluation and ranking of the 16 SDSU FPD applications. Each Committee member had read the applications, had ranked them, and then provided feedback. After considerable discussion, the Committee gained consensus on those applications deemed the most meritorious. All 16 will be sent forward to the all-campus FDP Committee without reservation, while additional comments of support will be provided for those deemed most meritorious by the Committee.
11. The next meeting of the Professional Development Committee will be on Friday, October 17, 2003, from 9:00-10:30, in the Dean's Conference Room.

12. Jim Beatty adjourned the meeting at 10:40am.