COBA Professional Development Committee Meetings
Pertaining to Grant Applications, Evaluations, and Decision for
2008-2009

Minutes

Present:  John Anderson
Jim Beatty (Chair)
Joe Belch
Alex De Noble
Moon Song
Jim Lackritz

1. At the October 10, 2008, meeting of the Professional Development Committee (PDC), it was agreed that since the remainder of the meetings for the Fall 2008 semester and the onset of the Spring 2009 semester 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 10, October 24, October 28, November 10, and November 21, 2009, as well as February 6, February 27, and March 13, 2009.

2. On October 10, 2008, the Professional Development Committee met in the Dean’s Conference Room to discuss the requirements and eligibility rules for the UGP grants, as well as the methods for evaluating these applications, and the required documentation that must be forwarded to the Dean and ultimately to the Division of Research Affairs (DRA) across campus. The PDC is required to inform the DRA of the Committee’s composition by October 13, 2008. Kelly Doiron will submit that information to the DRA by the deadline. The DRA is responsible for “oversight of research management, regulatory compliance, research assurances and activities related to intellectual property development and technology transfer. DRA is responsible for institutional approval of all grant proposals and contracts relating to sponsored research, instruction, and service agreements.”

3. Jim Beatty reminded the Committee that each grant application must be rated, ranked, and submitted with written comments, all of which must go to the Dean and to the Committee on Grants and Lectureships (UCGL), which is under the direction of the DRA. The process is that proposals go from the applicant to the Department Chair for approval but not evaluation; they then go from the Department Chair to the College committee (the PDC for the College of Business Administration) for rating and ranking; from College committee to the College Dean for endorsement or modification of committee ratings; and from the Dean to University Grants and Lectureship committee (UGLC) for integrated. The UGLC provides rankings across the University;
the applications then go from UGLC to the Vice President for Research for final selection.

4. PDC Chair Beatty agreed to develop a comprehensive Excel workbook for the purpose of inputting the ratings and rankings for each of the UGP applications. Each individual member of the PDC agreed to submit the completed workbooks to the Chair prior to the meeting of October 24. The Chair would then develop a composite all workbooks, including each evaluator’s rankings, along with the mean rankings, the trimmed mean rankings, the standard deviations, and the combined rankings for all applicants. The committee members are to come to the formal evaluation meeting with their own ratings and rankings in order to engage in a thorough discussion of the applications. The Chair also agreed to create separate worksheets for the UGP grants, the College of Business Administration Faculty Development Program (COBA-FDP) grants, the EMC grants, the CIBER grants, the applications for regular sabbaticals and difference-in-pay sabbaticals, and the Alumni Awards. The deadlines and subsequent evaluations of each of these programs will take place during different time periods throughout the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semester. All Committee members were present for this discussion and agreed to thoroughly read and evaluate all applications and to submit the Excel workbooks in a timely manner.

5. The Committee then met on October 27 to discuss the applications. A total of 17 faculty applied for UGP grants. Each committee member 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. After a thorough discussion of each applicant and a final ranking and rating, each member of the Committee was then asked to write up a brief summary assessment regarding assigned applications and submit these to Chair Beatty for review, consistency, and conformity with DRA guidelines. The Chair then completed the required documents, which were then forwarded to the Dean and the Committee on Grants and Lectureships (UCGL) in advance of the deadline dates.

6. On December 12, 2008, Dr. Tom Scott, Vice President for Research, announced that the University Grants and Lectureships Committee (UGLC) had made its recommendations and had completed its work regarding grant awards for 2009. The following is a summary of Dr. Scott’s comments:
   a. The funds available were $411,110. These funds were generated as follows: Grant-in-Aid funds from the Research Foundation: $92,125; RSCA funds from the Chancellor’s Office $199,984; Faculty Development funds from the Provost: $95,844; Adams Endowment funds from the John Adams Trust: $13,400; and Unspent funds retrieved from 2007 awards: $9,757.
b. Dr. Scott noted that the UGLC received 120 proposals, requesting a total of $991,810, or 2.4 times the funds available. The mean request was $8,265.

c. The applications were distributed as follows across the ten units within the university:
   i. College of Arts and Letters: 30 (25%)
   ii. College of Business Administration: 17 (14%)
   iii. College of Education: 13 (11%)
   iv. College of Engineering: 11 (9%)
   v. College of Health and Human Services: 13 (11%)
   vi. College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts: 19 (16%)
   vii. College of Sciences: 15 (13%)
   viii. Imperial Valley Campus: 2 (2%)
   ix. Library 0 (0%)
   x. Student Affairs 0 (0%)

d. Proposals were distributed across faculty rank as follows:
   i. Lecturers: 1 (1%)
   ii. Assistant professors: 81 (68%)
   iii. Associate professors: 25 (21%)
   iv. Professors: 13 (11%)

e. Dr. Scott estimated that “about 80% of the outcome is determined by the College committee, which writes what amounts to the first draft of the results, which are then subject to minor modification by the Dean (5%), UGLC (10%), and VPR (5%).”

f. Dr. Scott also stated that the process resulted in 53 awards, for a 44% success rate. The mean award was $7,761. Awards and dollar amounts were distributed across the ten units (%) and amounts (%) as follows:
   i. College of Arts and Letters: 12 (23%) $87,862 (21%)
   ii. College of Business Administration: 4 (8%) $38,236 (9%)
   iii. College of Education: 7 (13%) $63,728 (15%)
   iv. College of Engineering: 6 (11%) $50,527 (12%)
   v. College of Health and Human Services: 7 (13%) $57,540 (14%)
   vi. College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts: 9 (17%) $59,917 (15%)
vii. College of Sciences: 7 (13%) $46,831 (11%)

viii. Imperial Valley Campus: 1 (2%) $6,469 (2%)

ix. Library 0 (0%) (0%)

tax. Student Affairs 0 (0%) (0%)

g. He noted that the awards were distributed by rank as follows:

i. Lecturers: 1 (2%)

ii. Assistant professors: 41 (77%)

iii. Associate professors: 9 (17%)

iv. Professors: 2 (4%)

h. Letters were to be sent out from Dr. Scott’s office to the participants by December 19, 2008. The successful applicants will have until June 30, 2010 to spend the funds.

7. As a result, 4 of the 17 College of Business Administration applications were funded, either partially or entirely. When comparing the results for this year with the results for the past two years for the College of Business Administration, the CBA applicants received 8% of the awards this year, 5% last year, and 8% the year before.

8. On Monday, November 10, 2008, the Committee met in from 2:00 to 3:30 to discuss the six sabbatical and/or 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 evaluated all applications in advance. One Committee member disqualified himself from the deliberations due to a potential conflict of interest and was replaced by a professor from the same department for the discussions and rankings. The competition among sabbatical applications was extremely high this year, making it very challenging to rank these well-written, sound, and meritorious applications. All applications were considered acceptable. 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.

9. On November 21, 2009, the committee met to discuss the EMC grant applications. These applications were forwarded to the Committee from the EMC to obtain the Committee’s input, although the EMC will make the final recommendations. Dr. Sanford Ehrlich participated in a conference call with the Committee to provide additional information for this discussion. Recommendations were made and forwarded to Dr. Ehrlich.

10. The Committee met on February 6 to discuss the available funding for the COBA-FDP applications and to discuss the applications. The Committee does not want to make final decisions about the FDP applications until other
funding programs, including the Entrepreneurial Management Center (EMC) and CIBER, have completed their deliberations. The Committee then evaluated the COBA-FDP applications. There were 22 applications for the COBA-FDP grants. The Committee followed procedures similar to those used for the UGP evaluations to determine the merits of the COBA-FDP applications. Approximately $60,000 was available for these grants. The Committee has consistently chosen to use the quality of the application as the first criteria for evaluation, while taking into consideration applicant compliance with regard to previous grants (and the corresponding deadline dates for reports), and the desire to distribute funds to as many applications as possible within these constraints and the funds available. Seven applications were funded, of which several were multiple-authored.

11. The Committee met on February 27, 2009, to discuss the results of the previous year’s COBA-FDP grants and the status of the required midyear and final reports. The Committee also met with one faculty member to review that person’s previous application. Chair Beatty then shared drafts of the letters that were to go to the COBA-FDP applicants, the award amounts, and the guidelines for receiving the funds. Those guidelines are as follows:

a. Approximately one-third of the grant funds will become available to the recipient around June 1, 2009.

b. Approximately one-third will become available to upon receipt of an official letter from a professional journal indicating the applicant’s paper has been received and is in the review process. This portion of the funding will be held in a university account for a period of up to three years, giving the applicant adequate time to complete work and submit the paper.

c. Approximately one-third will become available to upon receipt of an official letter from a professional journal indicating the paper has been accepted for publication. This amount will be held in a university account for a period of up to three years, giving the applicant adequate time to go through the review process. If the journal review process requires more than three years, the Committee anticipates that the members of the PDC serving at that time would be willing to review the situation in order to determine whether an extension is reasonable.

d. It is the expectation of the Committee that any publications or paper presentations that come to fruition as a direct or indirect result of funding received from any sources affiliated with San Diego State University will include the name of the university on the title page of the paper or article.

12. The remainder of the meeting on February 27, 2009, was dedicated to a discussion of the Alumni Awards. There were four nominations for this award, one of which was a Committee member. That person excused himself from the discussion. The guidelines are that the College
committee (PDC in this case) shall obtain curricula vitae and supporting documentation for each nominee. The PDC shall submit at least three unranked nominations with written rationales for the committee’s choices that convey the values of each candidate’s contribution. Colleges with fewer than 50 tenured, probationary, and FERP faculty may submit two unranked nominations. Each dean shall forward seven copies of these recommendations and supporting materials to the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee via the Office of Faculty Affairs. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee shall recommend nominees to the President, who shall select the recipients. Deans shall submit to the Office of Faculty Affairs a discussion of the recipients’ accomplishments. (p. 74, SDSU Senate Policy File) In accordance with the Policy File, the Professional Development Committee of the College of Business Administration serves as the “faculty committee designed to review nominations for the award.” The Committee is charged with forwarding its recommendations regarding the top three nominations for this award for the 2009-2010 academic year.

13. The Committee members discussed perceived requirements and meritorious characteristics appropriate for being a recipient of the award. These included professional growth, teaching effectiveness, service to the university, community, to the country, and/or to the world, lifetime achievements, years of service at San Diego State University, any past history of receiving such an award, years since receiving the award in the past, and position roles within the College. At that point, the Committee discussed the merits of the nominees. Subsequently, a statement regarding each candidate was forwarded to the Dean on February 27, 2009, for consideration.

14. Regarding the COBA-FDP grants, letters were sent out to all applicants on March 5, 2009, providing information on the results of their applications and the distribution of any funds received.

15. The next meeting of the Professional Development Committee will be on Friday, March 27, from 9:00-10:30am, in the Dean’s Conference Room.