

MEMORANDUM

TO: Committee on Faculty Affairs

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: SOSA Awards

DATE: April 20, 2015

Background:

The attached memo from Ieva Zake, writing on behalf of the Deans Council and Academic Affairs, proposes a change in the awarding of SOSA grants so that faculty can choose between monetary grants or reassigned time.

Charge:

Steering asks CFA to determine if the recommended change should be made to SOSA awards.

Steering suggests that CFA give to the SOSA committee the responsibility for crafting a preliminary recommendation.

In crafting a preliminary recommendation, SOSA should seek testimony from Academic Leaders and from the Faculty Senate. It may gather testimony via email.

Once the SOSA committee completes a preliminary recommendation, it should pass it on to CFA and notify Steering. CFA should then seek testimony on the preliminary recommendation via email to the entire faculty and at least two open forums.

Timeline:

The SOSA Committee should gather testimony and, if it believes the proposed change to the awards is warranted, complete a preliminary recommendation as soon as possible, but no later than the end of this semester.

TCNJ Governance Processes

Step #1 -- Identifying and reporting the problem: When a Standing Committee receives a charge from the Steering Committee, the first responsibility is to clearly articulate and report the problem to the campus community. The problem may have been set out clearly in the charge received from the Steering Committee, or it may be necessary for the Standing Committee to frame a problem statement. The problem statement should indicate the difficulties or uncertainties that need to be addressed through new or revised policy, procedure, or program. The problem statement should be broadly stated and should include a context such as existing policy or practice. Problem statements may include solution parameters but should not suggest any specific solutions. Clearly stated problems will lead to better recommendations.

Step #2 -- Preparing a preliminary recommendation: Once the campus community has received the problem statement, committees can begin to collect data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. Committees should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community through regular updates and the Governance website. At this point, committees typically receive input or testimony through committee membership, formal testimony, and open comment from affected individuals and all stakeholder groups. Committees must be proactive in inviting stakeholder groups (including Student Government, Staff Senate and Faculty Senate) to provide formal testimony. In cases where testimony results in significant and substantive changes to the preliminary recommendation, the new recommendation will be considered to be in step #2.

Step #3 -- Making a final recommendation: Committees must use sound judgment to give the campus adequate time to review the preliminary recommendation before making their final recommendation. Again, committees are expected to be proactive in receiving feedback on the preliminary recommendation. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must resubmit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When, in the best judgment of the committee, the campus community has responded to the proposed resolution of the issue, the committee shall send its final recommendation (with documentation) to the Steering Committee. That final recommendation should include a suggested implementation date. Accompanying the final recommendation shall be a report of how testimony was gathered, the nature of that testimony, and how the Committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

Testimony

The presenting of testimony, prior to both the preliminary and final recommendations, is central to the concept of shared governance. All stakeholder groups will have an opportunity to provide input into governance issues through direct membership as well as invited testimony. Individuals appointed or elected to the governance system are expected to take a broad institutional perspective relative to issues being considered. In contrast, invited testimony will reflect the stakeholder perspective on the issue being considered. Committees are expected to be proactive in inviting stakeholder groups to provide testimony at both steps # 2 and #3 of the process. Committees need to identify stakeholder groups that are interested in each particular issue and invite their testimony at scheduled Committee meetings or hearings. Committees should report in their transmittal memos which groups were targeted as stakeholders, how testimony was invited, the form of the testimony (written, oral, etc.), and the substantive content of the testimony.

To see the Steering Committee's guidelines for gathering testimony and making a final recommendation, see the "Governance Toolbox" at <http://academicaffairs.pages.tcnj.edu/college-governance/a-governance-toolbox/>

TCNJ DEANS COUNCIL, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Suggestion for revisions to SOSA program

Recognizing that SOSA program makes a highly valuable institutional contribution to sustaining faculty's scholarship at TCNJ, Deans Council and Academic Affairs propose to introduce flexibility of SOSA awards in a way that allows faculty to **choose between monetary grants or reassigned time**.

The goal of this change is to meet faculty's needs in situations when money rather than time would be more helpful in advancing their projects. This change will not affect funding made available through MUSE program. It will also not decrease the number of SOSA awards given out every year or the process of evaluation by the SOSA committee.

When submitting SOSA application, faculty will have an option to indicate whether they choose:

- reassigned time for 3 FWH each year for 2 years;
- funding for up to a total of \$8,000 for 2 years (\$4,000 each year).

Applicants selecting the monetary option would submit a budget and justification of expenses along with their SOSA project. Office of Academic Grants and Sponsored Research will support faculty in developing the budget and weigh in on its feasibility.

The following expenses could be included in the budget: travel to research sites, equipment and technology purchases, purchases of datasets and travel to present research results.

Upon approval of monetary SOSA awards, Treasurer's office will create an account for each award and train recipients as PIs to manage their accounts.

Only expenses related to research project described in the SOSA application will be covered by this funding. Adherence to this will be confirmed by OAGSR and approved by the appropriate Dean.