

**Fiscal Policies Committee**  
**Discussion on Recommendations for Provost Neuman**  
**3/10/10 9:30am**  
**Broome Library 1710**

Fiscal Policies Committee:	Nian-Sheng Huang Jesse Elliott (not present) Liz King (co-chair) Kaia Tollefson Kristen LaBonte (co-chair)	Priscilla Liang Claudio Paiva
----------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Also Invited:	Kris Muller Judi Le (not present)
---------------	--------------------------------------

**MINUTES**

- 1. Approve minutes from 2/12/10.**  
- Approved unanimously
- 2. Indirect cost recovery and faculty equipment allocations (continued from 2/12)**

*-thoughts from FPC members prior to meeting:*

- Why not let the committee of faculty affairs review the applications for the new fund?
- I suggest members on the FPC not apply for the fund. There are always opportunities next year or a year after.
- From reading the minutes I got the impression that the draft announcement is the only thing pending? If so, could we try to agree on one via e-mail? It would be easier, since we would all have the draft(s) in front of us and could work on suggestions on our own time. I think the final product would be better.

If we are still discussing the selection process: my impression is that the anonymous system could resolve the conflict of interest issue, but we should keep in mind: (1) there is a cost (in terms of time) to implement the system and use so many professors to judge all applications - we should try to make sure the system is efficient from that standpoint (is there a simpler way to do it?); (2) although we in the committee may think the system solves the conflict of interest problem, it is crucial that all other professors on campus have the same perception (should we seek higher approval for the system?).

On the additional item at the end, about advisory committees spending a lot of time on activities... I believe that an organized exchange of e-mails could take care of some of the work involved in these advisory activities (especially the preliminaries and final touches of the process), leaving full-blown meetings for the more complex and controversial discussions that may require "brain-storming" and reaching a consensus. Having said that, I do believe administrative bodies could more carefully select the advice it seeks from advisory boards and suggest a schedule that would allow for advisory-committee inputs to be effectively taken into account.

**-Define name**

Provost's Faculty Resource Fund

**- Timeline for this year**

March 15 – Announcement Date

April 15 – Submission Due Date

May 15 – Deadline for review committee's recommendations to the Provost

? – Deadline for Provost's Office to Notify Recipients and Non-Recipients

Sept 1 – Disbursement of money to academic program

Year End Deadline – Funds must be spent

**- Timeline for subsequent years**

To be determined later

**-Criteria for who can apply**

All faculty

**-Craft an announcement**

Include the following:

“specialized equipment”

\$2500 limit per faculty member, but multiple faculty members can apply in conjunction for more funds

“non-personnel resources”

Product (eg. equipment or research materials such as data sets or databases)

anonymity

**-Application**

There are a few possibilities of committees to review committees such as:

Provost's Office Staff

Faculty Development Office

Faculty Development Committee

A new panel composed of faculty members from the following committees that did not apply for funds from Faculty Development Comm., Faculty Affairs Comm., and Fiscal Policies Comm.

To be included:

Name(s):

Program

Status (select one): Tenure Track Full Time Lecturer Part Time Lecturer

Rank /Title:

Item Requested:

Use (select one): Teaching Research/Creative Activities

Need (articulation of problem)

Purpose(s) (how or how often used)

Anticipated Benefits/Beneficiaries

**-Rubric****a. Need (articulation of problem)**

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

**b. Purpose(s) (how or how often used)**

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

**c. Anticipated Benefits/Beneficiaries**

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Additional Points:

Tenure Track (2)

## Full Time Lecturer (1)

### Tasks:

Kristen will craft the letter to Dawn with the FPC suggestions on the process. Kaia will craft the announcement letter. These should be sent to Dawn by 5pm on Thursday, 3/11. These items follow:

### Announcement of CI Provost's Faculty Resource Fund

All faculty (tenure-track, full- and part-time lecturers) are invited to apply for a competitive grant through the Provost's Office for the purpose of securing equipment or material resources needed for teaching, research, and/or creative activities. Proposals from individual faculty can be for the purchase of equipment and/or material resources costing up to \$2500; if multiple faculty members apply in conjunction, \$2500 per faculty member can be requested. A faculty member may not apply for more than one Provost's Faculty Resource Fund (PFRF) grant in any given year.

Funding for the PFRF is derived from Indirect Cost Revenues, which vary from year to year in accordance with the number and size of external grants awarded to CI faculty. For AY2010-2011, the total allotment dedicated to funding PFRF grants will be approximately \$18,000.

### The Proposal

The following elements must be included in each proposal, which may not exceed two pages (single spaced).

- Faculty member(s):
- Program(s):
- Status (select one): Tenure Track / Full-time Lecturer / Part-time Lecturer
- Rank/Title:
- Item(s) Requested:
- Total Cost, Itemized:
- Use (select one): Teaching / Research / Creative Activities
- Need (articulation of the problem):
- Purpose (how/how often equipment/material will be used):
- Anticipated benefits/beneficiaries:

E-mail your proposal to (\_\_\_\_\_ ) by midnight of April 15, 2010.

### Review Process

(Explanation of PFRF Review Committee Composition here.)

The following rubric will be used in reviewing proposals.

a. Need (articulation of problem)

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. Purpose(s) (how or how often used)

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

c. Anticipated Benefits/Beneficiaries

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Additional Points: Tenure Track (2) Full-time Lecturer (1)

Total points: \_\_\_\_\_/14

Reviewers will make recommendations to the Provost based on the total score from the rubric above. The Provost will then review recommendations and determine award recipients.

**Timeline**

March 15, 2010	Announcement of PFRF opportunity to faculty
April 15, 2010	Submission of proposals due
May 15, 2010	Reviewers' deadline for making recommendations to the Provost
May 31, 2010	Provost's notification of grant recipients and non-recipients
September 1, 2010	Funds dispersed to recipients' academic programs
End of fiscal year	All funds must be spent; receipts submitted to (_____)

To: Dawn Neuman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Fiscal Policies Committee—Elliott, Jesse; Huang, Nian-Sheng; King, Liz (co-chair); LaBonte, Kristen (co-chair); Liang, Priscilla; Paiva, Claudio; Tollefson, Kaia

Subject: Recommendations on grant review for the Provost's Faculty Resource Fund

Date: 11 March, 2010

The members of the Fiscal Policies Committee (FPC) have created the following recommendation on how to proceed with granting funds from the Provost's Faculty Resource Fund (PFRF).

**Timeline for this year:**

March 15 – Announcement Date (see below for Announcement and Rubric)

April 15 – Submission Due Date

May 15 – Deadline for the PFRF review committee's recommendations to the Provost

May 31 – Deadline for Provost's Office to Notify Recipients and Non-Recipients

Sept 1 – Disbursement of money to academic program

Year End Deadline – Funds must be spent

**Timeline for subsequent years:**

To be determined later by the PFRF review committee

**Criteria for who can apply:**

All faculty

**PFRF Review Committee:**

Members of the FPC agreed that our committee should not be the review committee of the PFRF based on many members' desire to apply for a grant while recognizing the committee should avoid any apparent conflict of interest. In addition, precluding FPC members from applying for the grant could introduce a negative incentive for faculty to participate in the committee (especially since Senate elections are ongoing, candidates would have decided to run without the knowledge of being excluded from applying for this grant if the FPC were to review it). The FPC proposes the following options of personnel for grant review:

- 1) Provost's Office Staff
- 2) Faculty Development Office
- 3) Faculty Development Committee
- 4) And preferred option: A new panel composed of faculty members from the following committees that did not apply for the grant: Faculty Development Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Fiscal Policies Committee.

Thank you for engaging the FPC in developing this opportunity for faculty members at CI.