COBA Professional Development Committee Meeting
October 19, November 7, November 30, and December 14, 2007

Minutes

Present:  Jim Beatty
          Joe Belch
          Alex De Noble
          Dave Ely
          Jim Lackritz
          Howard Toole

1. At the October 19, 2007, meeting of the Professional Development Committee (PDC), it was agreed that since the remainder of the meetings for the Fall 2007 semester would focus entirely on evaluating grant, sabbatical, and difference-in-pay applications, and since the Committee cannot report on the results of this process until its conclusion, interim minutes would not be distributed. The current minutes include a general summary of the activities of the Committee for the meetings held on October 19, November 7, November 30, and December 14, 2007.

2. The minutes for October 12, 2007, were moved, seconded, and approved (unanimous) at the October 19, 2007, meeting. The composite review of the minutes for the remainder of 2007 will be discussed at the first meeting of the Committee in January 2008.

3. On October 19, 2007, the Professional Development Committee met in the Dean’s Conference Room to discuss, evaluate, and make recommendations regarding the UGP applications. All Committee members were present for this discussion. Each had completed the preliminary evaluation process, including ranking and rating of the applications in advance of the meeting. The Committee then verified that all applicants who were recipients of grants in the previous year were in compliance with the required submission of both the midterm and the final report regarding their previous grants. Various members of the Committee expressed disappointment that only six applications had been submitted, especially since the College of Business Administration had been very successful the previous year.

4. A lively discussion of the candidates and applications ensued, eventually leading to a composite ranking and rating of each application. Since the University’s UGP Committee requires a narrative for each application, the responsibility of writing these narratives was distributed among Committee members. In previous years, Gary Grudnitski, Chair of the University Committee on Grants and Lectureships (UCGL), has stated that the UCGL pays close attention to these summary statements, as well as to the numerical rankings and ratings. Each Committee member was diligent in this report-writing responsibility. The Committee’s ratings, rankings, and
summary evaluations were submitted to Dean Naughton on October 22 for her consideration and input; the Dean’s office then sent the required information to the UCGL.

5. On December 12, 2007, Dr. Tom Scott, Vice President for Research, announced that the University Grants and Lectureships Committee (UGLC) announced had made its recommendations regarding grant awards for 2008. He stated that individual letters would be sent out in mid-December. The funds will be made available on January 1, 2008 and must be used by June 30, 2009.

6. Dr. Scott also provided summary statistics regarding the applications, success rates, and the distribution of awards and funds across ranks and colleges, noting that $397,455 was available for distribution. There were 139 applications, which totaled to requests for $1,133,449. Thus, the available funds satisfied 35% of the requested amount. He stated that “the UGLC ranked the 139 applications largely according to the priorities established in the colleges. Where there were deviations from the college rankings, they were usually due to additional input from the deans. Had we awarded the full requests of each successful applicant, we would have been able to fund 49 proposals. In an effort to stretch our funds, we imposed the following limits on the budgets of recommended proposals: a) limit student support to $5000; b) limit conference support to $500.; c) delete funds requested for partial summer stipends; d) delete a summer stipend if a course release was also requested and funded; e) limit graduate student salaries to $12/hr unless there was an unusual justification; f) limit incentive payments to research subjects to $15/hr.”

7. As a result, 55 of the 139 applications were funded, either partially or entirely, yielding a 39.6% success rate. Assistant professors accounted for 75 of the applications, associate professors accounted for 35, professors accounted for 25, lecturers accounted for 3, and SSPARs accounted for 1 application. Regarding the applications that were actually funded, 34 were submitted by assistant professors, 12 by associate professors, 8 by full professors, and 1 by SSPAR. The success rate within each category was 45% for assistant professors, 34% for associates, 32% for professors, 0% for lecturers and 100% for the SSPAR.

8. Arts and Letters faculty submitted 31 (23%) proposals, received 12 (22%) of the awards, and the funding totaled $88,594 (22%). Business Administration faculty submitted 6 (5%) proposals, received 3 (5%) of the awards and their funding totaled $19,823 (6%). Education faculty submitted 10 (7%) proposals, received 5 (9%) of the awards and $41,324 (10%) of the funds. Engineering faculty submitted 14 (10%) proposals, received 6 (11%) of the awards and $36,527 (9%) of the funds. Health and Human Services faculty submitted 12 (9%) proposals, received 5 (9%) of the awards and $35,213 (9%) of the funds. Imperial Valley Campus faculty submitted 5 (4%) proposals, received 2 (4%) of the awards and $9,215 (3%) of the funds. Library faculty submitted 2 (2%) proposals, received 1 (2%) of the awards and
$5,261 (2%) of the funds. Professional Studies and Fine Arts faculty submitted 35 (26%) proposals, received 12 (22%) of the awards and $82,746 (21%) of the funds. Sciences faculty submitted 24 (17%) proposals, received 9 (16%) of the awards, and $78,752 (20%) of the funds.

9. When comparing the results for this year with the results for last year for the College of Business Administration, of the 150 applications submitted across the university last year, 8% were submitted by the CBA. The College received 9% of the awards. Of the $447,500, $37,112 was allocated to CBA faculty, or 8.3% of the total funds.

10. On Wednesday, November 7, 2007, the Committee met in SS 2512 from 11:00 to 12:30 to discuss the seven sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications received by the deadline. The Committee is of the understanding that the College has the potential for four sabbaticals this time. Each Committee member had thoroughly evaluated all applications in advance. After considerable discussion of the process, the criteria for awarding sabbaticals, and the merits of each candidate, the Committee ranked the candidates as required, and forwarded the ranked applications to Dean Naughton for her further input. The Dean’s office then sent the applications and recommendations across campus.

11. The Committee met briefly on November 30 for a progress report. No action items or motions were on the agenda. The Committee intends to discuss and deliberate on the College’s PDF applications in February, once the allotment of available funds has been determine. Further, the Committee will not make final decisions about the PDF applications until other funding programs, including the Entrepreneurial Management Center (EMC) and CIBER, have completed their deliberations. The Professional Development Committee has been asked once again to assist the Entrepreneurial Management Center (EMC) in its evaluation of EMC funds. The EMC applications will be available for review in either January or February 2008.

12. The Committee concluded its meetings for the Fall 2007 semester on December 14, 2007. No action items or motions were on the agenda for this meeting either. Future topics and directions for the Committee were discussed:

- The Committee intends to revisit the format of the CBA-FDP process to eliminate any confusion regarding the forms applicants are to use, the page limitations, the location and inclusion of references, and any differences or conflicts that may exist between the UGP application format and the CBA-FDP format.
- The Committee recognizes the need to update the website with regard to such forms and guidelines.
- The Committee intends to review processes related to sabbaticals, including forms, evaluations, determination of merit, and related issues. For example, various changes in the policy file regarding sabbatical
guidelines were approved by the Senate on December 4, 2007. While most of the changes were editorial, with language revisions to better align with the MOU, one substantive change in section 4.0 did occur. That is, if a college committee chooses to "not recommend" an applicant, that individual may no longer revise his or her proposal for final submission to the college committee. However, the applicant still has the opportunity to revise a proposal and resubmit it to the department committee (section 3.2).

- The Committee intends to review the Faculty/Staff Recognition Program that has been in existence for some time. There have been comments that the general attitude toward these critical awards may have diminished and that several faculty have chosen to not display the plaques on their doors. One suggestion submitted to the Committee is to consider letting the PDC take the responsibility of selecting one faculty recipient annually in each the following three categories: a) research (based on quantity, quality, and strategic issues); b) teaching (based on student evaluations, innovation, and other criteria); and c) service (based on quantity, quality, time consumption and involvement, committee leadership, intensity, and strategic importance). The recognition criteria, number of recipients recognized, and potential categories for staff recognition will also be revisited.

13. The next meeting of the Professional Development Committee will be on Friday, January 25, from 9:00-10:30am, in the Dean’s Conference Room.