

## FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE

The SOLES Faculty Status Committee is comprised of three faculty elected by their peers at the May monthly meeting. Committee members serve for a two-year term, which begins in September of the following academic year. Once elected, the committee selects a chair. The Faculty Status Committee oversees the Faculty Research Grants (FRGs), changes to course evaluation forms, and other related issues.

[Click Here to jump to additional information regarding FRGs.](#)

In addition, the University Senate, which has two SOLES elected representatives who may serve on the USD Faculty Status Committee.

USD Faculty Status Committee:

*Charge:* Review with University counsel the “Faculty Rights and Responsibilities” section of the *Policies and Procedures Manual* (PDF, 2.4) to determine which provisions of these policies, if any, should be revised in order to comply with current applicable law. Report to the Executive Committee of the Senate with recommendations of a process for dealing with any compliance issues that are identified.

Explore changes to current workload policy (PDF, 2.4.11) to reflect teaching-related duties beyond regular teaching duties, such as thesis and dissertation supervision, independent studies, honors theses and the like. Suggest a policy that is more responsive to the work involved in these duties.

Review the Compensation Policy (3.4, par. 3 in the new and updated posting of policies). Investigate how faculty salary increases are determined in the schools and the College. Determine whether the practices employed by each of these academic units are in fact accurately stated in the language of paragraph 3 of the policy. Propose modification to the policy or to the practices of the academic units if modifications are needed.

## FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

### I. Definition

For the purpose of awarding faculty research grants, the sine qua non of research/scholarship is the creation of a substantial scholarly product that is intended for dissemination beyond the School of Leadership and Education Sciences. Therefore, publication is understood to be the aim of research/scholarship. However, “to publish” is understood in the very broad sense of “to make publicly or generally known.” The School of Leadership and Education Sciences recognizes that faculty members may legitimately choose to disseminate their work through any number of traditional or non-traditional channels, depending upon the audience with whom they wish to communicate.

Examples of activities that, in themselves, do not qualify for faculty research grant awards include writing or rewriting program documents for credentialing, working to obtain licenses or credentials, revising course syllabi, developing new courses, preparing documents for accreditation agencies, or any other activities that do not culminate in a substantial scholarly product that is imbued with intellectual ambition and intended for an audience beyond the School of Leadership and Education Sciences.

### II. Eligibility

Only tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences shall be eligible for faculty research grant awards. Each faculty member may only submit one proposal per year.

### III. Proposal Guidelines

1. **Cover sheet:** The cover sheet must contain your name; title of proposal, running heading that reflects the intent of the project (in upper right corner of every page). Also include on the cover page the amount of assigned time and/or funds requested and the semester in which you plan to do the research.
2. **Previous FRG Award Status Sheet:** On a second sheet stapled to the cover sheet, list the semester and year of your last two FRGs. Describe the dissemination results of each of your last two research awards (this can be the one page report required under Section V. Reporting/Disseminating). If less than two FRGs have been received, so indicate on the sheet. This information is kept with the Dean’s Administrative Assistant and it is not attached to the material disseminated to the Faculty Status Committee during the review process. The cover sheet and previous FRG status sheets are used as part of the oversight process after the recommendations for rank order of proposals have been forwarded to the Dean.
3. **Proposal Summary Sheet:** On a separate page entitled Proposal Summary Sheet answer the following questions:
  - 1) Title of proposed faculty research grant proposal
  - 2) Type of credit/amount of unit release requested
  - 3) If you are requesting course release, please indicate the semester and year during which you would use the release time
  - 4) Rationale for award: Complete a brief statement (100-200 words) explaining why you think your project merits an award. Indicate ways the project might lead to professional dissemination of your research, including publications or conference proceedings that might be generated from your findings
  - 5) Have you received an FRG within the past three years? If so, during what semesters/years?
  - 6) Is your FRG Proposal

- \_\_\_A New Project or Initiative
- \_\_\_A work in progress not previously funded by a FRG
- \_\_\_A work in progress or continuation of a project previously funded by an FRG

- 7) What is the word count of your proposal (excluding references?)
4. ***Length and formatting of the proposal:*** The abstract should contain no more than 150 words. The proposal itself should not be more than 3000 words (excluding references). Proposals that exceed specified lengths will not be considered for awards. Proposals should be double spaced and a clear and consistent formatting style should be used throughout the proposal. Because proposals will be blindly reviewed, no identifying information should be included in the body of the proposal
5. ***Content of proposal:*** The body of the proposal should consist of the following:
  - a. Abstract
  - b. Statement of the Problem and its Significance: *This section should establish a need for the project that is being proposed. The need could be practical and/or theoretical. Appropriate citations should be used in framing the problem that the project will address and in demonstrating its significance.*
  - c. Purpose of the Project (and, if the project is a research study, the research questions): *In this section, the proposal writer should indicate how the project relates to the problem articulated in the prior section.*
  - d. Procedures: *This section should describe in specific terms the procedures – qualitative, quantitative, or organizational in the case of writing done after analyses are complete - that will be used in the project, as well as a rationale for using these procedures. If what is being proposed is a piece of a larger and longer-term initiative, this section should provide an overview of the overall procedures that have been or will be employed and a more in-depth discussion of the procedures that will be used in the portion of the project for which support is requested. If the proposal writer has received other Faculty Research Grants to support work on other aspects of the larger initiative, copies of the proposals for these initiatives (minus any information that would reveal the identity of the faculty member) should be appended to this proposal.*
  - e. Tentative Timeline for Project Completion.
  - f. A Dissemination Plan
  - g. A Discussion of Human Subject Issues
  - h. A List of References (As noted above, the reference list will not be counted in the 3,000 word limit.)
6. ***Submission of FRG Proposal:*** All FRG proposals are to be submitted to the Dean's Administrative Assistant by the end of the workday as announced by electronic mail by the Chair of the Faculty Status Committee. A total of four copies will be submitted. One copy will include the cover page and previous FRG Award Status Sheet; the other three will include ONLY the Proposal Summary Sheet and proposal. The deadline date will be established once the University sets the allocations and deadlines for the academic year.
7. ***Document Submission:*** The cover page and previous FRG Award Status Sheet should be stapled together and attached to One copy of the. Proposal summary sheet and actual proposal with no indication of submitter should be stapled together as a separate document. Both documents should be paper clipped together and submitted to the Dean's Administrative Assistant.

8. **Coding:** The Dean's Administrative Assistant will code the proposals and remove the 2 cover pages.

#### IV. Criteria for Selecting between Competing Faculty Grant Requests

1. Fidelity to SOLES' definition of research and scholarship.
2. Demonstration that the project requires the amount of reassigned time or funding that is requested.
3. Scope and significance of the project.
4. Appropriateness of plans for completing the project.
5. Evidence that completion of the project is likely.

Within a month after the Spring cutoff date, and after the Faculty Status Committee validates inter-rater reliability, proposals will be blindly and separately reviewed and ranked by each committee member. Following discussion, the committee will jointly rank all proposals and submit their ranked list to the dean. Ultimate discretion for awarding FRGs rests with the dean.

#### V. Rubric to be use in Assessing Faculty Research Grant Proposals

##### The Problem and its Significance

- **10 Points:** The author clearly articulates a problem and establishes its significance by developing a convincing argument and citing appropriate literature.
- **6 Points:** The author attempts to identify a problem and demonstrate its significance, but either the description of the problem is not as clear as it should be *or* the argument about its significance is not as convincing as it could have been.
- **2 Points:** The author attempts to identify a problem and demonstrate its significance, but the description of the problem is not as clear as it should be *and* the argument about its significance is not as convincing as it could have been.
- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible to understand the author's problem and/or the author's argument about its significance.

##### The Purpose (and, if Appropriate, the Research Questions)

- **10 Points:** The author clearly articulates a purpose for the project that is (and, in the case of research studies, articulates research questions that are) consistent with and respond to the problem that was identified.
- **6 Points:** The author attempts to articulate a purpose (and, when appropriate, research questions), but the discussion of the purpose either is not as clear as it should be *or* the purpose articulated does not directly respond to the problem identified.
- **2 Points:** The author attempts to articulate a purpose (and, if appropriate, research questions) but the discussion is neither clear nor directly responsive to the problem that was identified.
- **0 Point:** The purpose section of the proposal is virtually impossible to understand.

##### The Procedures

- **10 Points:** The author clearly articulates procedures to be used in executing the project and also presents a convincing rationale for using the identified procedures, a rationale that, among other things, links the procedures with the identified purpose.
- **6 Points:** The author attempts to articulate procedures but either there is not enough detail for the reviewer to picture what the author will actually do *or* the rationale for using the identified procedures is not adequate.
- **2 Points:** The author attempts to articulate inquiry procedures, but there is not enough detail for the reviewer to picture what the proposal will do *and* the rationale for using the identified procedures is inadequate.

- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible for the reviewer to even imagine what the proposal writer intends to do, much less to understand the rationale that supports the procedures.

#### **Language and Formatting Issues**

- **10 Points:** The proposal is written in the format specified, is easy to understand and generally free of technical errors (e.g., typos).
- **6 Points:** The proposal is mostly easy to understand, but sometimes less than precise language and/or other technical errors require(s) the reader to reread sentences and/or whole sections of the proposal.
- **2 Points:** The proposal is often difficult to understand because of the author's less than precise language and/or other technical errors.
- **0 Points:** The proposal is often incomprehensible because of problematic writing.

#### **The Scope of Work**

- **10 Points:** The scope of work is consistent with the resources requested. In other words, the work described is clearly executable within the amount of time requested (e.g., 3 unit release equivalent to 51 hours of actual time spent on named project)
- **6 Points:** The scope of work seems either too large or too small for the resources requested.
- **2 Point:** The scope of work is totally unrealistic, given the resources that have been asked requested.
- **0 Points:** It is virtually impossible to determine the scope of work from the proposal.

#### **Dissemination Plan**

- **10 Points:** The dissemination plans described are comprehensive, specific and realistic.
- **6 Points:** Either the dissemination plans are not specific or they do not appear to be realistic.
- **2 Points:** The dissemination plans are neither specific nor realistic.
- **0 Points:** Dissemination plans are not discussed in the proposal.

### **VI. Reporting/Disseminating**

The faculty member is to file a one-page report (see appendix) no later than October 1 of the subsequent year with the Associate Provost and one copy with the Dean. If the project has not been completed by the end of the fiscal year, the faculty member will file a progress report by October 1st; this report will include a section on the use of the funds allocated.

At the beginning of each academic year, the chair of the Faculty Status Committee will be given a list of the previous year's grantees. The committee will then decide upon an appropriate forum to allow award recipients to share their work with colleagues. Such a forum will be held at a faculty meeting sometime each fall and spring semesters and will be convened by the Faculty Status Committee. Each award recipient is responsible for committing to and presenting the results and or progress of the work they completed with the FRG they were awarded. Failure to make this presentation may impact future grant awards to faculty members.

### **VII. Letters of Award**

When awards are made, an award letter will be issued by the Dean with a copy to the Provost, specifying the amount and nature of the award (or incorporating by reference the proposal which has been approved), and notifying faculty of the procedures and time deadlines. Non-expendable equipment remains the property of the University. Requests for funds, purchase requisitions, etc., should be finalized by *June 1st*, so as to be processed before the close of the fiscal year. There may be June payments, but these will have been authorized

in advance. If special circumstances require June check requests, purchase requisitions, or the like, specific arrangements with the Dean must be made in advance.