SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FACULTY EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING
GRANTS ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014

Introduction

The CFEST Grants Administration Committee, under the direction of the Provost, provides opportunities for professional development for all full-time, tenured and tenure-track SU faculty. Committee membership for 2013-2014 is shown in Table 1. Funds to support these activities are provided by the University operating budget and the SU Foundation (Table 2). In 2013-2014 an additional $3,000 was made available by the academic deans to support conference travel for faculty co-presenting with SU students. The total amount of available funds for the 2013-2014 academic year was $198,047, an increase of $34,592 from the previous year ($163,455). However, $21,535 of this year's available funds were carried over from the previous year compared to $6,943 in 2012-2013, showing that there was a total increase in additional funding to the CFEST Grants program of $20,000.

Table 1
CFEST Grants Administration Committee, 2013-2014.

Lea Adams, co-Director	Dept. of Psychology
Paul Taylor, co-Director	Dept. of Mathematics
James Johnson	Dean, College of Education and Human Services
John Kooti	Dean, College of Business
James Mike	Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Viet Dao	Dept. of Management Information Systems
Corinne Eisenhart (resigned Feb. 4, 2014	Dept. of Educational Leadership and Special Education
Phillip Henry	Counseling Services
Sally Paulson	Dept. of Exercise Science
Chris Wonders	Executive Director, Institute for Public Service / Sponsored Programs
Chris Sax	Associate Provost and Dean of Academic Outreach and Innovation (ex-officio member)

Table 2
Sources of CFEST Grants Administration Funding, 2013-2014.

Funding Source	Amount
SU Provost's Office	$83,512
Additional funding provided by Provost's Office	$50,000
SU Foundation	$40,000
College Deans' contribution to support faculty-student co-presentations (travel)	$3,000
Reserve funds remaining from previous CFEST budgets	$21,535
TOTAL	**$198,047**

<u>**2013-2014 Committee activities**</u>

Early in the fall of 2013, requests for proposals and program guidelines were made available on the CFEST web site (www.ship.edu/cfest). These materials describe CFEST programs including revisions from the previous year. CFEST manages three different granting programs to support faculty development: the Travel Grant, Faculty Teaching and Continuing Education (FTCE), and Teaching and Research Excellence (TRE) programs.

Travel Grants are to support presentations of a paper/poster, attendance as an elected association officer, or to support teaching enhancement. The Travel Grant program was re-introduced this year at a substantially more supportive and flexible level than previous years. Instead of a one grant maximum per faculty member, a total dollar amount per faculty member approach was trialed. Faculty could receive up to $1400 (previously $900), over several trips (previously only one). Additionally, restrictions as to the type of conference (i.e., regional, national, international) were removed.

The "Faculty Training and Continued Education" (FTCE) program supports attendance at workshops or other types of intensive training. The "Teaching and Research Excellence" (TRE) grants, which support larger professional development projects, were maintained this year, but at a substantially reduced level. In the two previous academic years, the PASSHE Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) annual grants were not offered because the APSCUF faculty contract was under negotiation for two years. (The state funds for the FPDC Annual Grant program is specified in the CBA.) However, the program was available in 2013/2014 at a higher than previous level (because the annual funds included two years of retroactive funding as well), up to $10,000/grant instead of the past $6,000/grant. Because there would be increased availability of FPDC funding and the amount per grant at the state level had been increased, monies to fund only 1-3 proposals was set aside ($30,000 or less), as opposed to attempting to cover 8 proposals at $6000/proposal ($48,000 or less).

An orientation workshop for new faculty was conducted in September 2013 to describe professional development opportunities available through CFEST. New faculty were introduced to CFEST sources of funding for faculty professional development related to: (a) research and teaching, (b) participation in conferences, (c) professional workshops, and (d) preparation of extramural grant proposals.

A workshop oriented to TRE and FPDC proposals was held in November 2012. Members of the CFEST Grants Administration Committee went over the guidelines for the RFPs and the process by which the grant proposals would be evaluated. Faculty members worked individually with Lea Adams and Chris Wonders in developing ideas and proposals.

Sub-committees of the CFEST Grants Administration reviewed Travel Grant and FTCE proposals on a monthly basis. In February 2014, the full Grants Administration Committee reviewed proposals for the TRE/FPDC program.
CFEST also worked cooperatively on the Council of Trustees Presidential Faculty Development Grant program. This program provides grants of up to $1,000 in each of the University academic divisions. Tenure-track faculty in their first or second year are eligible. CFEST managed the RFP and reviewed the proposals, making funding recommendations to the President. We encourage the President and the COT to expand on this important program in the near future.

CFEST Grants Administration support provided during 2013-2014

During 2013-2014, the CFEST Grants Administration awarded $179,998.14 to support a range of professional development activities (Table 3). The total number of proposals submitted (203) in time for reviews and funded (175) shows increased participation in the CFEST programs. CFEST funded 11 of the 17 proposals submitted to the FTCE program. CFEST funded 162 of 168 travel grant proposals, including 11 awards that supported faculty-student conference co-presentations. Supplemental funding from the academic deans in the amount of $3,000 helped to support the $12,331.79 awarded in that category.

Table 3 Activities funded by CFEST Grants Administration, 2013-2014.		
Grant Category	**Number of Awards**	**CFEST Funds awarded**
TRE Grants	2	$14,836.00
FTCE Grants	11	$13,814.71
Travel Grants	162	$151,347.43
Total CFEST Grant Support	**175**	**$179,998.14**

With the increased allowable allocation per Travel Grant, faculty attended many more conferences (162 conferences compared to an average of 140 in the previous 5 years). The increase in funding attracted more faculty to the program this year compared to last year (132 individual faculty members compared to 120 faculty members last year). Last year's limit of $900 was not enough to fully fund one trip with increases in conference expenses. Coupled with the lack of raises and policies of retrenchment in the state system, faculty expressed an unwillingness to spend their own money for conference travel. With the increased limit of $1400 more faculty presented at conferences this year. Additionally, the change in approach to travel funds (amount per faculty member, not number of conferences) provided the ability for some to parlay the $1400 into multiple trips. Twenty-two (22) faculty used travel grant funds to present at 2 separate conferences and four (4) faculty members presented at 3 local conferences.

This year there were 18 submissions to the TRE/FPDC program. This was a substantial increase

in submissions than in previous years. In the last two years, PASSHE's FPDC Annual Grant program was not available. Nine and 10 proposals had been submitted for the PASSHE unfunded 2011/12 and 2012/13 academic years, respectively. The last two years when the FPDC grant program was available were 2010/11 and 2011/12, when 12 and 13 proposals had been submitted, respectively.

Of the 18 TRE/FPDC proposals, 13 were evaluated as strong enough to be submitted to the PASSHE FPDC annual grants program for competition. Four (4) of the thirteen (13) proposals were funded by PASSHE, for a total amount of $36,971. Of our top ranked proposals, two were not funded by PASSHE and were chosen to be funded from TRE funds for a total of $14,836.

It should be noted that this year, in order to make up for the lack of funding over the last two years, PASSHE increased the award limit/grant to $10,000. The total amount originally amount requested with the 18 submissions was $116,000.00. The 13 viable proposals requested a total of $86,607.00. In the past, CFEST has tried to fund all proposals deemed as worthy (this year there would have been 9 left for funding after the FPDC competition). However, CFEST would have required ~$50,000 to fund the unfunded TRE/FPDC proposals. Therefore, the decision was made to fund only those with the highest rankings (those ranking at a score of 2 or better, where 1 is the best). The funded TRE and FPDC proposals are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Funded Proposals
CFEST Teaching and Research Excellence Grants, 2013-2014.

Researcher	Department	Project Title	Amount	Funding Source
Curt Zaleski	Chemistry	The synthesis of Lanthanide 12-MC-4 molecules and the investigation of their magnetic properties	$8,580.00	FPDC Award
Christopher Woltemade	Geography-Earth Science	Influence of riparian forest cover and irrigation withdrawals on stream temperature: Anderson Creek, California	$9,228.00	FPDC Award
Emily Kramer	Biology	Investigating the fate of aberrant tRNA molecules in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*	$9,598.00	FPDC Award
Joseph Zume	Geography-Earth Science	Initiating pre-drilling, baseline groundwater quality monitoring to aid future assessments of the Marcellus Shale gas drilling impacts on water quality	$9,160.00	FPDC Award
Theo Light	Biology	The effects of eastern hemlock decline due to hemlock woolly adelgid invasion on headwater stream communities in south-central Pennsylvania	$6,254.00	TRE Funds
David Wildermuth	Modern Languages	Travel to Belarus and Russia to research the German army and the Holocaust	$8,582.00	TRE Funds

Responses to suggested changes in CFEST program

The CFEST Grants Administration Program Review conducted a general survey of SU tenured and tenure-track faculty in spring 2013 to obtain feedback on CFEST grants programs. Fifty-seven SU faculty participated in that survey and provided suggestions for improvement to the CFEST Grants Administration programs and processes.

In terms of the Travel Grants program, the primary suggestions for improvement were captured in the last CFEST Grants Administration Annual Report. These are excerpted below.

- Many respondents made valuable suggestions to improve the CFEST travel grant program, the most common of which was to increase funding and to support more than one conference travel award per year.

- Suggestions to improve the travel grant application process included streamlining the process of applying for a grant and submitting receipts for reimbursement, including moving to electronic submission of proposals.

This year, these suggestions were acted upon. As mentioned previously, the model of funding for Travel Grants was redesigned in accordance with faculty's suggestions. The Travel Grant program was re-introduced this year at a substantially more supportive and flexible level than previous years. Instead of a one grant maximum per faculty member, a total dollar amount per faculty member approach was trialed. Faculty could receive up to $1400 (previously $900), over several trips (previously only one). Additionally, restrictions as to the type of conference (i.e., regional, national, international) were removed. We also began movement to an electronic submission and review process, though this is not complete.

We believe that the changes that were initiated this year substantially increased faculty member's ability to engage in professional travel, increasing their visibility and participation in their professional communities. This in turn serves to enhance their reputation, as well as the University's. It also keeps faculty current in their field and allows them to network with peers. While that enhances a faculty member's professional experience, it also serves our students. Students are being kept abreast of current findings in their area, even if those findings have not been presented in print yet. Networked faculty can better provide entrance into graduate programs and the workplace for our students as well. Therefore, we recommend maintaining the increased limit for Travel Grants to better serve the University, faculty, and students.

To illustrate the change in professional community involvement, the number of faculty funded by CFEST Travel Grants over the last five (5) years is provided in Table 5.

Table 5
Travel Grants Awarded in Last Five Years

Academic Year	Number of Faculty Funded	Number of grants funded
2009-2010[1]	133	176
2010-2011	134	134
2011-2012	132	132
2012-2013	120	120
2013-2014[1]	132	162

[1] Faculty could apply for multiple trips during this academic year.

In terms of the Faculty Training and Continued Education program, a number of suggestions to improve the program were submitted as part of last spring's survey. These are presented below.

- A number of suggestions to improve the FTCE program were made, the most consistent of which was to better inform faculty of the opportunities available via this program.

- A few suggestions were made to improve the FTCE application process, including increasing the funding and reducing the application requirements.

To date, we have not addressed the suggestions for the FTCE program beyond the typical

orientation to new faculty and the workshop for TRE/FPDC presentations. However, we are carrying these suggestions forward from the last CFEST Annual report to keep them active in our planning for these programs.

The primary suggestion for the Teaching and Research Excellence (TR) program is presented below.

- Several suggestions were made to improve the TRE program, including better advertising the program and providing faculty recipients with a monthly report on grant expenditures during the project period.

We agree with these suggestions, but need to explore them further within the context of the timing constraints of the PASSHE FPDC program.

Over one-third of last year's respondents (21 of 57) offered comments on supporting additional faculty professional development needs, including:

- Increasing funding for conference travel
- Providing greater incentives and support services to apply for grants
- Supporting re-assign time for scholarly activities
- Re-instating the University Research and Scholarship Program (URSP)
- Provide a pool of matching funds for extramural grants
- Providing funding for publication charges
- Supporting course assessment

Again, these are being re-presented to keep them in mind as we continually work on improving our processes and programs to support faculty development.

Outcomes of TRE / FPDC grant projects

In spring 2013 CFEST surveyed faculty recipients of Teaching and Research Excellence (TRE) or Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) grants awarded in 2010, providing 3-year follow-up data on the outcomes from these projects. This summary provides an overview of responses from 8 SU faculty to that survey.

The most significant information revealed by this survey is the broader impact of CFEST TRE and PASSHE FPDC grants. The faculty leading the eight (8) funded projects surveyed reported an impressive set of outcomes from their projects, including involving a large number of additional faculty and students in the projects, generating conference presentations and publications from the projects, and leveraging the experience gained from these projects to compete for additional grant funds for ongoing, related work.

Recent history of reduced support for faculty professional development at SU

Over the past several years, faculty professional development programs have suffered significant reductions in budget and support services with a substantial cumulative impact on opportunities for faculty:

- While the CFEST budget allocation saw a slight increase compared to the past 3 years it is still substantially under the 2007- 2010 allocations. (Table 6).

- The participation in CFEST grant programs had been reduced in the past three years (Table 7), reflecting the reduced budget. With the increase in budget limits this year, participation increased substantially. The more faculty participate in the CFEST Grant programs, the more likely it is that 1) faculty will become more competitive for external grants, 2) faculty will become more networked, increasing the number of collaborative opportunities, 3) faculty will be better able to move their students successfully into graduate programs or employment environments (as a result of increased networking and increased knowledge of current opportunities) and 4) the University's reputation will become substantially stronger, attracting more and better students.

- CFEST funding for 2013-14 was expected to increase by $100,000. Unfortunately, this did not happen. However, there should be a focus on restoring funding levels for conference travel and faculty development. This enhances the reputation and quality of instruction and research at Shippensburg University, resulting in enhanced experiences for both faculty and students. That, in turn, will serve to increase faculty and student satisfaction and retention

Table 6
Recent History of Faculty Professional Development Funding at SU

Year	CFEST University and Foundation funding	CFEST carry-over from prior year	Supplemental funding	URSP funding	Total faculty professional development funding (CFEST and URSP)
2007-08	$146,300	$70,000		$100,000	$316,300
2008-09	$140,385	$43,000		$50,000	$233,385
2009-10	$143,968	$60,000		$33,000*	$203,968
2010-11	$133,571	$3,935		$0	$137,506
2011-12	$123,512	$6,168	$26,587**	$0	$159,267
2012-13	$123,512	$6,943	$30,000	$0	$163,455
2013-14	$136,512	$21,535	$40,000	$0	$198,047

* Note that in 2009-2010 the URSP was funded from unspent funds carried over from previous years, not a new budget allocation.
** One-time transfer of URSP remaining balance.

	Travel Proposals Received	FTCE Proposals Received	TRE / FPDC Proposals Received	Total Proposals Received
Table 7 **Recent History of Proposals Submitted to CFEST**				
Year				
2008-09	199	10	13	222
2009-10	184	17	16	217
2010-11	140	5	21	166
2011-12	142	12	9	163
2012-13	117	12	10	139
2013-14	168	17	18	203

Reduced faculty professional development funding and the SU core mission

The CFEST Grants Administration budget – and the support for SU professional development programs more generally -- has been substantially cut over the past several years. This has had a very real impact on faculty professional development opportunities, with fewer Ship faculty participating in conferences, training workshops, and research opportunities. Shippensburg University cannot expect to maintain the high-quality faculty for which it is known without a greater investment in faculty research, training, and engagement in their academic disciplines.

Issues and Recommendations

A few issues arose during the 2013-2014 academic year that should be addressed for clarity and efficiency. Some of those issues also reflect the changing needs of our faculty. These are outlined below, grouped within the relevant grant programs.

Travel Grants

1. Several faculty members have achieved notable status in their fields and have been asked to chair or lead symposia or panels, without submitting an individual paper to be refereed for acceptance. The Travel Grant description does not address these types of situations.
2. On the Travel Grant application form, it asks faculty if they are presenting with students. I believe the intention of this question is to determine if the money is to be taken from the donated pot of money provided by the deans to encourage faculty–student research. However, faculty interpret that question inconsistently. For example, if the faculty member is presenting the paper and the student is a co-author, they might answer yes because the student did research with them. On the other hand, they might answer no because the faculty member is the person doing the speaking at the presentation, even if the student is present. Some faculty responded yes, because they were taking students to presentations, even though the student was completely uninvolved in the research being presented.
3. The Travel Request Forms pose another source of confusion for faculty. They believe this is part of the Travel Grant Application form. There is confusion as to where to put the Registration fees

and how that relates to the overall amount being requested on that form. Additionally, faculty seem to believe that the budget area on the Travel Request Form is the requested budget for the Travel Grant Application.

4. The biggest issue is that many faculty submit Travel Grant Applications after they have traveled. In some cases, this has become expected. For example, many in the field of education attend conferences during late summer/early autumn and have not been notified of their acceptance (a requirement of the grant application) into the conference until early summer. Others simply don't apply until they have the time. They tend to have the view that these are not "grants" per se, but simply reimbursement for professional expenses, akin to a corporate model of reimbursement. After-the-fact submissions have fostered another, more serious problem. Several faculty members submitted Travel Grant Applications, with the Travel Request Form submitted for the first time (see #3 above), after traveling domestically or internationally. This means that the Travel Request Form was not approved prior to their travel. It also means that many faculty traveled internationally without the Travel Request Form and without other required forms for international travel (we note international travel requests and forward them to Chris Wonders so he can collect the international forms required prior to travel).

5. Funding equity may be an issue when the CFEST Travel Grants budget is limited. As mentioned in #4 above, certain departments have the bulk of their conferences in the summer and early fall, while other departments do not have conferences until April and May. That means that certain departments submit much earlier in the academic year, while the pots of money are still full and others are applying much later in the year when the allocations for travel have been substantially depleted.

Recommendations

Issues 1, 2, and 3 above deal with confusion or lack of understanding or confusion about the program and the different forms that are required for travel. Issues 4 and 5 deal with problems with the process. Some recommendations to address these issues are presented below.

In terms of the issues surrounding understanding of the program, first and foremost would be to remove the Travel Request Form as part of the Travel Grant Application (#3). This should be a separate process from applying for a Travel Grant, making it clear to faculty that the Travel Request Form is for all travel, whether they have applied for a Travel Grant or not. The Travel Grant application can ask for a copy of the previously approved Travel Request Form as required supplementary materials to support the socialization process of the Travel Request Form for faculty. CFEST Grants should not be the vehicle of that socialization, however.

Additionally, the instructions and cover page of the Travel Grant Application need to be clarified, specifically addressing opportunities for chairing panels or symposia (#1), research with students (#2), etc. A budget template/form should also be created that indicates the need for details and justifications for expenditures, thereby not allowing faculty to use the budget area on the Travel Request Form (#3).

The recommendation to address process issues (4 and 5 above) involves a change in process that may take some adjustment time on the part of faculty. It is recommended that faculty only submit Travel Grant Applications *before* travel unless they can demonstrate that an opportunity presented itself at a time that did not allow them to respond without missing a submission date (e.g., being asked to chair a panel in late May for a conference in July). If faculty submit after-the-fact and do not have a previously approved Travel Request Form, it is also recommended that they become *ineligible for funding from any source*.

The stumbling block to moving to all applications before travel is that CFEST Grants has always asked for evidence of presentation/paper acceptance as part of the application process. This has made it impossible for those presenting late summer and early fall to submit before the last review in April (that is, faculty often did not have their evidence of acceptance by the last travel grant review of the academic year). And, the view was, if CFEST could accept after-the-fact applications from some faculty, why not for all? If faculty could apply in anticipation of acceptance early, this would address the funding inequity issue (and may also address the problem of submitting Travel Request Forms after travel). Faculty often know well ahead of time when and where their professional conferences are held and they should be able to submit a Travel Grant Application form ahead of those conferences. If CFEST moves the requirement of proof of acceptance/participation of a paper/presentation to the reimbursement phase of the process, this approach can be managed. That is, in order to receive reimbursement for an approved grant, the acceptance and proof of participation must be submitted with the other reimbursement forms (i.e., travel voucher with receipts, final report).

FTCE Grants

1. Several faculty members submit for similar projects/training every year. There should be a way to judge a point of diminishing returns in terms of allocating funds and expecting to see an enhancement in faculty development.
2. In the past several years, there have been one or two cases where someone was offered a wonderful opportunity (e.g., go to Italy to work with the foremost expert in their field to learn a new technique over Christmas break) on short notice and after the FTCE review cycle (and TRE grants will not cover work already done). These types of opportunities are exactly the things that CFEST Grants is to fund, but, instead, faculty bear the full financial costs of "short notice" opportunities.

Recommendations

In the FTCE application, faculty should be required to list previously awarded FTCE grants and clarify the differences between the current request and previous awards if they are similar.

CFEST Grants does not receive as many FTCE applications as Travel Grant Applications. Therefore, in those rare instances where timing of opportunity clearly does not match with review dates, we may wish to review after-the-fact submissions on a case-by-case basis.

TRE/FPDC

Many issues revolving around the TRE/FPDC process might be due to a general unfamiliarity with the nature of the TRE and FPDC programs, especially since FPDC funding had not been available for the previous 2 years. It seems that many faculty, both applicants and those on the CFEST Grants committee might take a very casual view of the program, thinking of it as an easy, local source of funding when nothing else is available.

1. Many faculty who applied for TRE grants often referred to it as "the summer stipend" program. In conversations, they viewed this program as a way to get two months of funding in order to write up their research. Several faculty contacted the CFEST Grants co-Director for the first time the weekend before the grant application was due to ask questions about submission. One faculty

member even stated that she would not get her proposal done in time so she would just send it to PASSHE and bypass the local deadlines. These examples clearly demonstrate the lack of understanding by faculty about this program. FPDC is the driver of this program and it is a very competitive granting program with fairly high demands associated with it. Drs. Taylor and Adams, in conjunction with Chris Wonders, held a workshop to discuss the program and process, but few faculty attended.

2. Another complication, this year, was that the University was closed (snow!) on the due date for the TRE applications. While submission was electronic, which could happen whether the University was closed or not, several applicants had not bothered to obtain the signatures of their chairs or deans prior to the due date and therefore, asked for extensions.

3. Chris Wonders had gotten permission from the PASSHE FPDC to share the intended grant application evaluation rubric with applicants, but was asked not to post it publicly. Dr. Adams emailed the finalized rubric to those applicants of which she was aware. However, there were several (almost half) unanticipated applications and those faculty were not given the benefit of full information prior to their submission.

4. The CFEST Grants committee met for 4 hours on February 4th to review all of the grants. These grant applications were to be reviewed by all committee members prior to the meeting, with individual members assigned as "presenter" for specific grant applications. Of the nine (9) CFEST Grants committee members (the 10th member was on sabbatical), only five (5) attended the meeting. Those five were all prepared and "covered" for the other four, but given the importance of this program in supporting faculty careers, this is not acceptable.

Recommendations

These problems may be a bit more difficult to address given they require a culture and mindset change. The primary approach would be education of the faculty, but providing information is only good if the faculty actually attend or read the information. The first step might be to create a FAQs page about the program, available on the website. This should also include policies regarding deadlines. (Actually, maybe one is needed for each program CFEST Grants managed.) Perhaps, before the FPDC RFP is released, CFEST Grants can sponsor a program presented by previous recipients to alert faculty members to the upcoming opportunity and generate some enthusiasm and excitement about the opportunity this provides. Since the FPDC funding is negotiated in the CBA, perhaps APSCUF would be onboard about this event.

CFEST Grants should also meet with APSCUF to make sure that members appointed to the committee are aware of and willing to take on the duties associated with this committee. The CFEST Grants committee members review a large number of grant applications and make recommendations every month. The TRE/FPDC reviews not only evaluate the grant applications, but outline specific improvements for the authors to make their grants more competitive at the state level. This requires a great deal of time and dedication by every member. This, too, needs to be broadly communicated.

COT

1. The primary issue about the Council of Trustees grant is that the RFP/description is too vague. It is unclear as to what can and cannot be covered. The committee members who reviewed and ranked them all had differing opinions about them requirements.

2. The COT information and process seems to fall between the cracks. CFEST Grants does not manage this program, but only provides the review of the proposals for it and submits those reviews to the President. Therefore, the timing of the posting of this grant is inconsistent.

Recommendations

The RFP/description of the COT grant needs to be re-written and clarified. This is an important program for new faculty and managing the program, including advertising and posting it, needs to become an explicit task on someone's calendar.