

CHS Professional Development Committee  
Annual Report  
May, 2009

The purpose of the CHS Professional Development Committee is to review and rank Foreign Travel Grant (FTG) applications, applications for Faculty Professional Development Activities (FPDS) and other grant applications as asked. As Chair of this committee I also serve as the CHS representative to the University Faculty Recognition and Development Committee.

The members of the CHS Professional Development Committee for 2008-2009 were: Roger Smith - Chair, Leslie Bloom, Ruth MacDonald, Dan Russell, Amy Welch, Linda Niehm, and Carla Peterson – Ex officio.

The committee held approximately four virtual meetings and did our work via email. Work by the committee is usually done in October, January, and April. Because our work is done on very short timelines and we need to report back to the Dean's Office so that appropriate recommendations can be forwarded to university committees, this has worked very efficiently.

The accomplishments for the year included reviewing approximately eleven FTG applications and three FPDA proposals. The following individuals were recommended to receive FTGs in the October, January, or April reviews: Linda Niehm, Daniel Russell, Daniel Robinson, Pat Leigh, Ana Correia, Sara Marcketti, Jessica Hurst, and Jean Parsons. There were no FPDA or other proposals for other grants in 2008-2009 that were forwarded to the committee by the Dean's Office.

The major issue this year was the timeliness of the submission of the proposals. Three proposals were submitted after the published deadline and the committee had ranked the proposals. (Additionally, one even came in after the Dean's Office had submitted its ranking to the Faculty Senate Office.) The committee graciously reviewed them anyway but decided not to forward them because it was determined by the committee that they were a group proposal which are not funded through this process.

The major challenge for this committee is to read and evaluate, and then ultimately rank the proposals that are received and do this in a matter of a few days. This has been accomplished by having the proposals come in electronically as well as on paper so that they can be forwarded to the committee immediately. The committee does its review and returns its ranking to the chair. If there is consistency in the rankings a memo is sent to the Dean's Office and if there is disagreement, a face-to-face meeting is convened to resolve the issues and then the committee's recommendation is forwarded to the Dean's Office.

The primary recommendation for improving the processes that this committee deals with is to make sure that the submission deadlines are clearly and often advertised. Some education also needs to take place within the departments so that faculty members realize

that submission to the Dean's Office is much earlier than the published submission dates to the University. The CHS deadlines have been placed on the website but they probably should be mentioned in Cabinet meetings and placed on "tickler calendars," if those are used. The dates also need to be part of the CHS Announcements for several weeks before the due dates.

The committee will continue to do its work and meet the timelines specified by the College and University related to the tasks assigned to it.

Report submitted by:  
Roger Smith, Chair  
May 5, 2009