

Report 2017 Fall Activities of the Faculty Development Committee
November 27th, 2017

The Faculty Development Committee is composed by 16 faculties of both SSS and SNSM. We met This Fall twice on October 27th and November 16th.

Both time the meeting failed to reach the quorum to elect the chair. The election of the chair is currently being held by email vote. The size of the committee make it very difficult to find time when to meet during the semester. Despite this problem the committee think that it is important to have a large representation from the full college since the different disciplines have significantly different necessity and methods of evaluations.

The following points are based on informal discussions among the member of the committee present at the two meetings since no quorum was reach for formal discussions or votes.

1- One of the main work of our committee is to review the faculty applications for internal awards. The committee expresses frustration of the fact that CAS has still not received even an approximate budget designated to the internal awards making impossible to discuss the topic. In preliminary discussions the committee think that:

1-a It is important to run the proposal submission and awards twice per year (in Fall and Spring) and has discussed with Prof. Larsen the possibility to roll over money between two fiscal years to make this possible;

1-b The rubric for the evaluation of the proposal submitted for the internal awards needs to be modified to improve and facilitate the process. The members present at the meeting recognize it is a challenge to create a rubric that would be able to incorporate the different souls of our diverse college and that it is important that the full committee does the discussion about the rubric. The committee believes that it is very important that the rubric is publicly available before the submission of the proposal.

1-c On suggestion of Prof. Larsen the committee has decided to discuss the pros and cons of limiting the internal awards to travel grants only.

1-d The members present at the meetings think that it is important to discuss further the internal award process and to provide recommendation to the CAS Associate Dean for Research office.

2- Multiple members describe the necessity to further discuss the faculty mentoring program in particular for Associate Professors in their path to full professorship. Sever questions were raised during the discussion (e.g. the differences between departments) and a decision was taken to further discuss the issue.

3- The committee asked about the status of last year's subcommittee document on "Recommendation 12" that was submitted to Dr. Bell. It is very likely that the committee will further discuss the issue.

4- No members of the past year's subcommittees: "Work and Life Balance" and "Sabbaticals.Financials incentives" were present at the meeting. Both subjects are felt to be very important by the committee but the discussion highlighted how the lack of funding to support eventual recommendations makes the topic not a priority.

Last year returning members present at the two meetings expressed frustration about the usefulness of the discussion within the committee. Apart from the evaluation of the internal awards, the returning members of the committee feel that the past year discussions have always been tapered by the lack of funding or the impossibility to implement any of the suggested recommendations.