

Faculty Development Committee

Meeting of December 4, 2001

Present: Jo Beld, Elizabeth Hutchings, Heather Klopchin, Dolores Peters

Observer: Jeannine Grenberg

Absent: Eric Cole, Arnie Ostebee

Announcements:

- Faculty Manual Revision: Dolores spoke with Diana Postlethwaite re the revision of the FDC section of the Faculty Manual. RPC “plate is full” at the moment. However, Diana requested that FDC have a revised version of its section of the manual submitted by mid-February. FDC will discuss revision in February. Jo offered to prepare a draft in January.
- Spring Semester: FDC members were asked to email Dolores possible meeting times for Semester II.
- Elizabeth provided a summary of the stipend discussion at the 12/4/01 meeting of IGS chairs and committee reps. Comments reflected both sides of the issue with note being made that, on one hand SAA stipends are one of the few ways senior faculty can gain merit recognition at St. Olaf and, on the other, that TCD stipends are valuable vehicles for motivating faculty to work on teaching and curriculum development projects. Both forms of stipends are deemed important. IGS faculty wanted assurance the per diem expenses would still be supported by FDC grants. Concern was also expressed on behalf of pre-tenure support for junior faculty. In the time vs. money discussion, it was noted that some faculty prefer a two-course release to a single course release, as the latter can often be consumed by meetings and other responsibilities.

SAA Stipend Discussion:

- A review of some points raised previously included: Different faculty are motivated by different things. Merit awards can be important leverage for subsequent grants. Stipends may be used to support expenses not itemized elsewhere i.e. childcare. Stipends do serve enabling functions for some faculty i.e. merit awards can be a big motivational factor.
- If stipends are removed altogether, this will eliminate some projects. The meaning and message given by offering stipends is important.
- Question: what is most effective use of limited funds?
- Is there a consensus on what FDC means by “enabling” language? Some members thought wording of 5/1/01 draft (“Enabling meritorious professional development that would not otherwise happen without college support”) implied that expenses are necessary but not stipends. However, stipends have since been seen to offer both merit recognition and an enabling factor that makes a project possible. “Enabling” has a wide spectrum of meaning ranging from broad general support to specific support for expenses without which project would not happen. It was agreed to use “enable” in its broadest sense as illustrated in first sentence of 11/26 draft: “Purpose: To enable faculty to pursue scholarly or artistic projects during summers...”

- Proposal by Jo Beld:
 1. Limited number of stipends to be offered for proposals of “exceptional merit” beyond the expectations of the grant criteria and of the Faculty Manual language indicating that faculty are expected to continue their professional development during the summer i.e. exceeding the standards.
 2. Stipends to be a flat amount: \$2000 recommended. No budget justification is needed.
 3. Number of stipends, while limited, need not be specified by FDC in advance. Preference expressed to have stipends spread across campus, if possible, based on available funds and quality of applications.
 4. Fewer summer grants to be offered overall, so that some funds may be reallocated to release time grants, with hope that the college will match these funds. To reiterate, this would lower maximum amount to be offered for expenses and stipends.
 5. FDC agreed to consider a draft proposal to this effect.

Review of funds offered:

- 2001: 17 grants; 2000: 14 grants; 1999: 26 grants.
- Of \$40,000 in grants awarded in 2001, 28% = TCD and 72% = SAA grants. Of the 2001 SAA grants 33% were stipends and 66% were expenses.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth O. Hutchins