4 April 2011
Faculty Senate meeting

Meeting Called to order at 3:01 pm
APPROVED MINUTES

Location: Schuster Center, Room 130

Senate Members Present: Paula Adams, Becky Becker, Tammy Condrey, Pat Duttera, Josh Eyler, Pat Hogan, Brenda May Ito, Rita Jones, Teresa Lang, Ellen Martin, Mike McFalls, Jacqueline Radebaugh, Neal Rogers, Dan Ross, Kim Shaw, Melody Shumaker, Gary Sprayberry, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Dan VanKley, Troy Vidal,

Guests Present: Marlena Mobley, Ed O’Donnell, Iris Saltiel, Gregory Domin, Cindy Henning, Tom Hackett, Tim Mescon

1. Report from the President and/or Provost

Dr Mescon: Thanks. I thought it would be appropriate to talk a little about the FY2012 budget. We had a pretty large contingent participate in state budget hearings 2 weeks ago, to offset attempts by Earhart of Cobb County to redirect $12 million of university system funding to Kennesaw State and Valdosta. The impact would be another 1% cut of our funding. This attempt by Earhart to backfill funding deficiencies at those two institutions due to large enrollment growth. One of our senators, Josh McCoon, testified at that meeting. All USG schools would be impacted by 1% to put this change in place. This additional 1% would be devastating on our operations for next year. It’s all politics.

Question: What was the logic? Response: If you look at the funding formula, most universities fall outside a range of +/- 5%, so it is an attempt to move these two schools closer to the centerpoint of those ranges. So in some ways, this is reasonable, but this is not the year to do this. It would reduce our appropriations by $300,000. Earhart is from Cobb County, and is a very powerful person on the appropriations committee. Josh McCoon did a good job for a freshman senator here.

Dr. Mescon: There will definitely be a reduction of 6%, and this is true across the system. We think the total reduction will be about 8.6%, which is what everyone has planned for. If this other adjustment takes place, this will place our cut at 10%. The additional 2.6% to get us to 8.6%, we think we have identified. The last 1.4% is really problematic.

Then you deal with revenue, which is mostly tuition. Everyone has been following the changes to HOPE, as well as the green light to 2-year institutions to offer SACS accredited 2-year programs beginning this fall as well. Everyone is grappling with what enrollment projections will look like. At the same time, most institutions built budgets based on a 10% tuition increase in fall. However, if you follow the press, the legislature is in all-out war with BOR, trying to wrest tuition setting control from the BOR, and there is a measure in place to restrict tuition increases to the consumer price index (which is 2% this year). Both of these are unmanageable, and will be devastating to the entire USG. The legislature will finish meeting in the middle of the month, and then the BOR will meet and announce tuition. If you talk to any school, especially in our sector, they expected a 10% increase in tuition, and research institutions wanted more.

The Chancellor search is nearing completion, and it is very likely that a Chancellor will be selected that will have better relations with the Governor and the Legislature. The best news out of all of this is that it is certain it will be better this time next year. Any questions on that? There is a president’s meeting with the Chancellor this Thursday – probably the last one he will preside over with all of the presidents. Ultimately, all of the flex on our budget is with enrollment, and this is a little weighted toward graduate enrollment. Summer becomes a big
4 April 2011  
Faculty Senate meeting  
Meeting Called to order at 3:01 pm  
APPROVED MINUTES

part of our FY 2012 operating budget. As faculty, you should start letting students know about what you are doing. Right now applications are tracking, ahead of schedule, but you don’t know how that converts into matriculating students yet. At the April BOR meeting, the Regents hope to fix everything, and there should be no surprises after this meeting.

We continue to visit with all of the legislative leadership. There is real contention between legislature, the BOR and the governor’s office.

Dr Hackett: Tom Helton went to the CBO meeting last week. The good news there is that we will have a budget a lot earlier. We shouldn’t be figuring out what to do in July, as has happened in recent years. At the BOR meeting on the 19th, several of our program proposals are up for approval – MS in Nursing, MS in Theater Ed, Master of Music, MA in History, BA in art History. These are on the April agenda. I think these should be approved, as we have done a good job in returning responses to questions.

Nicole Devries asked me to mention that online evaluations will be April 18 – May 2. This will be the last time before we go back to paper evaluations. She has created a campaign to improve student participation online this time. She asks to remind that only you can get your students to participate.

Greg Domin has a cool initiative. The Grad School Expo will happen tomorrow. This allows us to pitch to our own students on graduate studies here at CSU. Kyle Christiansen had done some research, and he found that awareness of our own programs was low. As much of our enrollment increases have come in graduate enrollment, we should encourage our students to participate.

2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

I would like to mention that the Conflict Prevention and Resolution group is putting together a steering committee. If you are interested, call Jim Owens, who will be leading this group. This is not a senate committee, and there is no set number of members. The more the merrier.

3. Old Business

a. Lecturer and non-tenure-track faculty standards task force report – Jackie Radebaugh

Distributed draft policy ahead of time via email, distributing handout. Attached in appendix below. The task force met several times, and studied 8.3.8 BOR policy, which did not provide a lot of guidance. We also looked at policies on campus. Since non-tenure track faculty are so diverse, we decided to develop a very general policy. As you see, we have distributed BOR policy as well as the proposed CSU policy. We wanted to keep the evaluation at a departmental level, as most departments have their own Standards of Excellence. Dr. Stokes also asked us to look at 8.3.8.1-2 regarding lecturers. Suggestions here as well in italics. Any questions or suggestions?

Who will vote on this? Is this just a non-tenure-track faculty vote?

Glenn – I would think everybody votes. We did it that way for the tenure track policy. Recommendation comes from committee, does not require second.

Vote: Motion passes unanimously.

b. Distance Education Committee – Jackie Radebaugh

We are making a report about what committee has done since our most recent charge. We have been very busy. You charged us with putting together faculty forums, to discuss issues. The committee decided to collect information first, and have written a white paper regarding state of distance learning at CSU, and then we sent a copy to Deans and Chairs. Committee has taken that
feedback and revised white paper. Worked with Dr. Christiansen to create a faculty survey. I think it is finished, and will be going out sometime this week. The goal is to get survey results, put these in the white paper, and report out from here. A lot of the comments we have gotten so far have to do with the quality of our courses. Our role is also to promote online course development grants – this semester, we totally revamped proposals, included quality assurance points. There are now more chances for comments, feedback, so that the resulting course will have improved quality. The DLDD has a liaison program, helping to promote distance learning at a department level. Our suggested timeline is that we do survey, put results in white paper. We would like to set up faculty forums, and send out white paper at that point. Be able to provide further recommendations at that point. Any questions or suggestions? Hoping to have forums late this month/early next month. White paper revisions in June.

Question: Who is taking survey? Response: All faculty.

c. Shared Governance Committee – Dan VanKley (15 minutes)
Has handout (to be attached). We have a draft of a draft, instead of a full proposal for you. We have a new chart that tries to lay out the structure, really focusing on the center structure. We have worked on laying out relationships between different groups, and we have a bead on how that should look. Which issues should go to which group? We are still waiting on SGA list of issues. This is crafted to make sure that whatever University Council produces gets acted upon, those are the best-established things. We have a statement on the scope and purpose.

We are stuck on the membership issue. And of course we need to determine executive committee structure. We are also working on establishing college and staff councils. These are modifications of these things from Kennesaw. These would then be established through department bylaws. Having department bylaws will be a way to make department policies transparent. It will be left to departments to decide what is in them, but each department should have a council, which is tailored to the department. We have got to have flexibility to accommodate small and large departments.
The committee has a website, tries to post minutes and meeting times.

4. New Business
   a. Staff Appreciation Celebration – Marlena Mobley
Ms. Mobley introduced herself as the Staff Council Appreciation Day chair. Last year in May they did an event, which was a sponsored lunch in the cafeteria. Last year, faculty joined in, and they went over budget. This year, that committee wanted to see if Faculty Senate would cosponsor this event, on May 13. There should be no more than $400 cost overall.
Reply: We (Faculty Senate) don’t have a budget at all. Are you asking for us to donate personal funds?
Response from Ms. Mobley: Staff council has not yet approached HR. We can approach HR, and then come back to Senate.
Reply: We (faulty) can stay away if you want us to.

   b. Elections Committee – (5 minutes)
We have to remind everyone that annual elections will be held next month for exec committee, elections committee.
How many vacancies – 2 from COLS, COA – 1, COBCS – 2, COEHP – 1, Library -1. Each college will need a new alternate. Will now transmit numbers to the Deans.
Comment from Glenn – there have been several meetings where we struggled to get a quorum. We dug to see if we have policies regarding attendance. There is one college that is missing 25% of meetings on average. That college does not have reasonable representation for their faculty. Encourage you in College meetings to only accept position if they are committed to coming one afternoon a month. You might understand for their first fall, but after that, you should find a way to not teach at that time.

c. Honors Scholarship Committee – Ed O’Donnell
I think we had a good year this year. We had a demand placed on the committee. Our first meeting was on 10/15 – come up with standard application package, unlike in prior years. We decided to go with a form, added checklist to package for students. We also chose an interview date (3/1) and elected next year’s chair. Qualifications for students to enter the program included a 1200 SAT or 27 ACT score, and a GPA 3.5 minimum. We had 63 applicants. 52 were invited for an interview, and 44 came. 22 scholarships were offered. We got these students on campus with their parents. Two students have declined. 14 more students were offered 1-year scholarships (met some but not all qualifications).

There is a disturbing trend: freshman pool staying constant at 1000. However, we are seeing a drop off of qualified candidates. Those are 1st time full time students that meet honors scholarship specifications. We are seeing a decline – working on changing that. We had a good applicant pool, however.

Question: How is retention among the honors students? Response from Dr. Henning: When I look at them, around 80% retention/grad for 2005-06 pool. Seemed lower looking at freshman…

Question: I know that application deadline is early (Jan 31). Is there any way to have a late selection? Many students wait to apply here until they hear from UGA, FSU, other schools. Reply: I know. Theater does recruitment after our event. So this would be up for discussion in committee. Servant leadership has a common deadline with this program; we also try to offer honors housing, and that deadline is 3/31. If we forego that, we can move it later. We offer enrollment into classes – also takes time. The committee has to make that recommendation. I get quite a few phone calls.

Question: What are we doing about promotion? Reply: In the last year, we worked with Kristin Williams in enrollment. We gave a survey to students who came, and the email sent directly to students was highly effective. Sent out to high school counselors. Follow up with electronic fliers.

My push is as we move away from open access to more research based university, we need to think about how we change our image to attract more honors students. If anyone wants fliers, contact Cindy Henning.

d. International Education and Exchange Committee – Dan Ross
The committee is one of the more effective/efficient committees. We meet primarily through subcommittees – 5 or 6 of them. We meet 2 times a semester. More than half of each meeting is subcommittee reports. You may know that different groups bring in scholars, etc; every year European committee brings in a Fort Scholar. Another subcommittee goes through potential topics and lecturers. A lot of people doing a lot of important work.

High on the list of activities: We have been involved in creating/promoting international learning communities. I encourage you to participate in these. This often works well with freshman learning communities. We have about 20 of these a semester, & most are clearly lower level. If you think an upper level class might fit, there is a call for proposals every semester. What a lot of us do is that we try to get students really like global dialogs – international students at each round
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Students go to these, come back to class enthusiastic. We also show around 6 international films a semester. It really helps get them involved, and helps students understand connections — sometimes our most important work is outside the classroom. We have faculty lead a book study group each term too.

Second, there has been an attempt to get a global access fee. This could provide scholarships for study abroad. Some schools have this, others do not. We are hoping for success this year, after we were turned down last year.

Third, we are making an effort to get an endowment for international student scholarships and study abroad scholarships. They are essential! That’s currently capital campaign money; it will be gone in a few years. They have established an account. Once you get $25k, you have an endowment. We are trying to raise it among the faculty. We are optimistic this will go well. Once the faculty commit, it is easier for the Foundation to then sell it to the public. There are multiple ways you can do this. Can designate if some goes to international students, study abroad, or both. If you are interested in this, talk to Adam Johnson about bringing an international student to class for discussion. The Center has accumulated a lot of films over the years as well.

Comment: I want to support what Dan said – a lot of faculty don’t participate in these events, but last week we had over 100 students in a lecture by an African speaker. Did anyone go to Africa Night last week? It was really fabulous. The dance was great, and some talented stand up comics. It was different this year – really different than previous.

e. University Grants program - Greg Domin
Handout. (See folder – have this already).
We have been meeting for the last few months, have circulated this to Academic Council and Chairs Assembly, now bringing to Faculty Senate. This is a 2-tier system. All internal grant money in one pot. This covers all the different items – mentorship, travel, and summer grants, equipment grants. The process starts at Colleges, using scoring rubric to prioritize grants. Your peers evaluate your work. After this and dean approvals, it is sent to university committee, who vets it using same process. We think this is more efficient, fairer, eliminates a lot of confusion over the last year or so. We have some $236k at our disposal this academic year. I dare say this will be smaller next year. We capped grants at $10k this year. We understand the Arts often travel with their shows, and that COLS faculty often have expensive equipment.

Question: So – all individual grants gone- just this process? Reply: Yes. Hope to put this online next, so this can be handled electronically.

Question: Is this to assure student success through faculty? Reply: Yes, because student grants go through Shamim Khan’s committee.

Question: No continuing education opportunities for faculty now? What if you want to go somewhere to study? Reply: We couldn’t list everything that was possible – but if you can think of it and your college ranks it highly, it could get funded.

Question: Will the approach be to fund a few good proposals fully, or a slew of proposals so that everyone can say they got something. Reply: The philosophy was to fund as many proposals fully as possible, rather than partial funding.

Question: In the past, I’ve done a lot of small-scale presentations at regional conferences, taking students. This doesn’t describe what I have done in the past. I got confused this year, whether travel to conference should be requested here. Reply: We had a robust debate – if you look at proposals, travel is often high dollar to present work. Should ask at department and college levels first.
Question: Are we readjusting deadlines? Reply: Yes. The committee will reconvene next week. The sense among Academic Council and the Chairs was that deadlines seemed too short. Later date needed, twice a year, so that you have a chance to breathe, get organized, fully submit a proposal.

Comment: My concern is that a proposal to go to a meeting in November, needs a proposal submitted by the deadline in February, but presentation not approved until July. I think those early dates need to be looked at closely.

Comment: I too found the first sentence of the policy confusing. I know there is a tradition of boilerplate. We should pull back from advertising rhetoric. We ought to say what we mean here. I think you will have a hard time saying faculty projects will assure student success. Say what we mean, mean what we say. Reply: But some on the committee feel that we should be aspiring to be world class – it may take us a long time. Comment: We may be using language in a way that promotes the type of misunderstandings that we decry.

Comment: A faculty member can put in more than one request.

Question: How equitable is it between colleges? Reply: COA led the way with their number of grants, then COLS. Busiess and Education were further down the list. The funds were not divided equally, as the goal was to fund the best proposals. Sometimes not many proposals come from a college.

Comment: I appreciate the streamlining, but I think having both a college and a university committee contradicts that. I would expect that my colleagues could speak to my work. This just creates more politics. We should submit just to university, evaluate it on merit alone. Those in the colleges should vet language of a school. But isn’t this why colleges have representation on each committee?

Reply: Currently no priority comes forward from the Colleges – Dean just signs off.

Comment: For COLS, if you have 2 from one side of school or another, may have disciplinary misunderstandings.

Question: Did you discuss the possibility of having 2 types of grants? I often ask for conference money to attend regionally with students. This does not involve a lot of research, but I might write a paper. But $10k of funds is a different ball game, and I would expect a peer review publication.

Reply: It was the sense of the committee that smaller ones could be funded through college or dept.

Dr. Mescon: Recall in October, the University distributed $1M in surplus revenues from summer to colleges, with intent to support travel, papers, page charges for publications, and so on. That is a completely separate pool, early in the year. The deans had agreed upon a revenue formula based on summer credit hour generation.

Dr. Domin: We are hoping to bring clarity to the process.

Comment: Serving on the committee, I am never a fan of more beaureaucracy – rating of applications is helpful. With all grants under this umbrella, I don’t think you want just one group ranking over 100 proposals. You can imagine the amount of attention you give to them if this happens. You get much more attention to your individual proposal at the college level. In some cases, before, you were looking for reasons to disqualify in order to make funding decisions, rather than looking at quality of proposal.

Dr. Hackett: I’m hearing this about increasing beaureaucracy – but don’t we want to increase participation and governance? Doing it the other way decreases governance. Yes, it requires more work, but that is the very nature of governance.

Comments: Are you looking for an endorsement, or comments?
Senator Zuiderveen asked for another vote of confidence/no confidence. The President has done a number of things to try to bring confidence back. The notice from last year’s vote has been taken off the Senate website. It would be nice to have BOR know status of the faculty as it truly stands at present. Senator Zuiderveen moves that we have another vote. No second. Motion dies.

Senator Studstill: At the last meeting, the Committee on Committees was asked to form Faculty Evaluation Committee. Did any of you get the email sent out? It appears that most did not get the email, during the Great Email Blackout. Will send this out again.

Senator Jones: My department chair brought to my attention recently the questions in the evaluation. There is some redundancy in these questions. Who is in charge of the questions?
Reply: This was a senate task force a couple years ago. Question: Will paper evaluations have the same questions? The committee to be formed will be determining those questions. There were 10 common questions, and then each college could add their own, plus opportunities for free response.
Comment: The first 10 are redundant — those are the common questions.
Comment: Don’t wait for the email – go ahead and volunteer for the committee now.

Senate meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Appendices attached below:

**Lecturer and Non-Tenure Track Faculty Standards Task Force Report**

The below BOR policies are available online at:
http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/policy/8.3_additional_policies_for_faculty/

The content added by the task force is indicated in italics below.

**BOR Policy 8.3.8: Non-Tenure Track Personnel**

USG institutions are authorized to establish professional positions designated as non-tenure track positions. Each institution shall prepare annually, along with its budget, a list of positions so designated for signations submitted during the budget year that must also be approved by the Chancellor or his/her designee. Positions designated as non-tenure track positions or as tenure track positions may be converted to the other type only with approval by the institution president. (BOR Minutes, August 2007).

Non-tenure track positions may be established for full-time professional personnel employed in administrative positions or to staff research, technical, special, career, and public service programs or programs that are anticipated to have a limited lifespan or that are funded, fully or partially, through non-USG sources. There shall be no maximum time limitation for service in positions in this category.

The following provisions shall apply to all non-tenure track professional personnel:

1. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure.
2. Probationary credit toward tenure shall not be awarded for service in non-tenure track positions, except for lecturers and senior lecturers.

3. Notice of intention not to renew contracts of non-tenure track personnel who have been awarded academic rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) shall follow the schedule required for tenure track personnel. This schedule of notification shall not apply to other professional personnel.

4. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may apply on an equal basis with other candidates for tenure track positions which may become available.

The transfer of individuals from tenure-track positions to non-tenure track positions shall be effected on a voluntary basis only (BOR Minutes, 1982-83, pp. 255-256).

Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty with Academic Rank

Because some non-tenure track faculty holding academic rank teach and some do not, they will be evaluated on the same departmental standards as tenure-track faculty depending on the duties of the non-tenure track position. The criteria for evaluation should be solely determined by individual departmental standards of excellence.

8.3.8.1 Employment of Full-Time Lecturers

To carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction, institutions, including Georgia Gwinnett College, universities may appoint instructional staff members to the position of lecturer. Lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure. Reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. The reappointment process must follow procedures outlined by the institution (BOR Minutes, February 2007) and the criteria for annual evaluation should be solely determined by individual departmental standards of excellence.

Not more than 20 percent (20%) of an institution’s FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction may be lecturers and/or senior lecturers (BOR Minutes, 1992-93, p. 188).

8.3.8.2 Senior Lecturers

The title of senior lecturer may be used at the discretion of institutions that employ lecturers. Institutions are discouraged from initial hiring at the senior lecturer level. Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six (6) years at the employing institution may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer if the institution has adopted this title and has clearly stated promotion criteria at the departmental level.

Promotion to senior lecturer requires approval by the president. Reappointment procedures for senior lecturers follow the same reappointment procedures as those for lecturers. Senior lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure (BOR Minutes, August 2002).

Not more than 20 percent (20%) of an institution’s FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction may be lecturers and/or senior lecturers (BOR Minutes, 1992-93, p. 188).
Shared Governance

The University Grants Program

Vision Statement

The vision of Columbus State University is to provide its students with a world-class education and to assure student success through creative inquiry and community, regional, and global partnerships. The University Grants Program is designed to support the Vision by providing funding for activities related to research, scholarship, and professional development. Flexibility and accountability have been written into the University Grants criteria to take into consideration differences in each College's focus, accreditation requirements, and funding priorities.

Competitive University Grants applications are those that commit to one or more specific, tangible products of research, scholarship, or professional development projects, such as:

- an article submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- a juried performance or exhibition
- a proposal submitted for external funding
- research project development, data collection, or analysis

The tangible outcome should be achievable within one year of the award of funds. In the case of multi-year projects, the applicant should identify a tangible benchmark that is achievable within one year of the award.

University Grants are limited to a maximum of $10,000 and are generally not intended for routine travel to conferences, etc.
All University Grants applications will be reviewed by two committees, one at the college level*, and one at the university level. The College Screening Committees* will vet and prioritize applications from faculty of their own college before sending the applications to the University Grants Committee for review and award. These College Screening Committees are established in the belief that the faculty are best equipped to evaluate the applications of their colleagues based on the funding and research needs of their Colleges.

*Faculty who are organized directly under the Office of the Provost rather than a College (i.e. Servant Leadership, Basic Studies, Honors, etc.) will submit their applications to the Provost Screening Committee comprised of their peers and organized out of the Office of the Provost.
Application and Screening Process for
the University Grants Program

Process: All faculty members, including non-tenure track, are eligible to apply for funding through this program. All participants should consult the Academic Affairs Planning Calendar for the due dates for each step in the process.

[Last year, we were able to do these electronically with a Google site - this would cut down on paper shuffling. Maybe we can have an on-line submission form with places for the various evaluators to comment. This could be worked out after the concept is approved.] This is a good idea. –greg.

1. A Faculty member completes the University Grants application and submits it to the Department Chair.
2. The Department Chair approves and adds comment.
3. The College Screening Committee reviews the applications by using the University Grants Scoring Rubric. It prepares a rank-ordered list of applications, with a 1-3 sentence justification of each ranking, for use by the dean and University Screening Committee. Note that the college committee may choose to screen out some applications.
4. The College dean reviews the applications using the Scoring Rubric and adds a memo that ranks and comments on all applications in the packet.
5. The University Screening Committee reviews the applications using the Scoring Rubric and considering comments received with the packet. The committee makes award recommendations to the Provost.
6. The Provost’s office administers the awards.
7. No more than 60 days after their target completion date, successful grant applicants file a University Grants Accountability Report with the Provost’s office, distributing copies to the chair and dean.
Office of the Provost  
Columbus State University  
University Grants Application and Accountability for Final Project Report

*Must be typed or word-processed; handwritten applications will not be considered* [Preferably an online submission form can be implemented]

Faculty Name ________________________________________________________

Department __________________________________________________________

Phone ___________ Fax ___________ E-mail ____________________________

Department Chair’s Printed Name_________________________________________

Signature _____________________________________________________________

Dean’s Printed Name and Signature ________________________________________

Project Title _________________________________________________________

Proposed Start Date ____________________________________________________

Requested Amount ____________________________________________________

Department funds designated to this project (dept. and amt.) ____________

College funds designated to this project (college and amt.) ________________

External funds designated to this project (source and amt.) ________________

Other funds designated to this project (explain and include amt.)
_________________________________________________________________________

Competitive University Grants applications are those that commit to one or more specific, tangible products of research, scholarship, or professional development projects, such as

- An article submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- A juried performance or exhibition
- A presentation of scholarship at a professional conference
- A proposal submitted for external funding
- Research project development, data collection, or analysis
Part I: Application

1. Provide a one-paragraph overview of your project.

2. Explain how your project contributes to the mission and appropriate goals of the college and university.

3. Describe what is intended to be the specific final product of your project.

4. Describe your project’s methods.

5. Demonstrate that your project has a feasible path to completion by a target date within one year of the award. In the case of multi-year projects, identify a tangible benchmark that is achievable within one year of the award. Include a detailed budget.

6. Append a University Grants Accountability Report for each University Grant you have received in the past five years.
Part II

*University Grants Accountability Report*

To be submitted to the Provost (with copies to dean and chair) no more than 60 days after the project’s completion date.*

a. Include a copy of the University Grants application (Part I only).
b. Include a detailed budget of actual expenses.
b. Include a statement describing the project’s actual outcome.

*If project is not completed by the projected completion date, an interim report must be submitted prior to the final report deadline that provides a project update, explains what aspects of the project will not be completed by the original target date, and provides a new target date for project completion.*
Part III

**Required Statement**

University Grants Recipient is required to initial the following statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmation of Information Provided in Application: By the applicant’s signature below, the applicant represents and warrants that he/she has read this document and attests that all the information and documentation furnished in connection with the application process is true, accurate, and complete to the best of his/her knowledge and that any regulations relative to the funding will be followed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name: ___________________________  Title: ___________________________

College, Department, Other: ________________________________________________

Note: Please identify classification for “Other”; e.g., Library.

Signature: ___________________________  Date: ____________


Part IV

**University Grants Scoring Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Scoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| __Eligible__  
__Not eligible | Proposal is complete. |
| College and University Mission  
(10 points) | The applicant demonstrates that the project supports the mission and appropriate goals of the college and university. |
| Final Product  
(10 points) | The intended final product is tangible and of high quality, as recognized by the standards of the discipline. Examples might include:  
• an article submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal  
• a juried performance or exhibition  
• a proposal submitted for external funding  
• research project development, data collection, or analysis  
Higher scores are given for wider or more significant recognition. |
| Methods  
(10 points) | To achieve its goals, the project uses sound methods, as recognized by the standards of the discipline. |
| Feasibility  
(10 points) | The application itself is organized and presents a feasible route to the project's completion within one year of the award. If it is a multi-year project, it identifies a tangible benchmark that is achievable within one year of the award.  
Its detailed budget presents an appropriate use of university funds. The applicant has used previous University Grants productively (if applicable). |