

- 
- Vanessa Crump, Hyan-Ah “Hannie” Fitton, Stephen Fuller, Brooke Miller, Senthil Muthusamy, Laurie Walters.

- 
- To review the charge of the committee.
  - To discuss the following items: the faculty development website, the BOR charge for faculty development, the application and review process for professional development funds, and the development of on-campus faculty development opportunities.
  - To begin revising the process for awarding faculty development funds.

- 
- Crump argued for posting faculty development funds forms online. Miller suggested that examples of completed forms should be provided. Muthusamy asked whether the forms would allow for signing online. Miller agreed to work with Alan Stines in order to get the forms posted.
  - Crump quoted from the BOR charge in order to situate the committee’s work within it.
  - Crump began a discussion of faculty development forms by asking whether the committee should or should not start from scratch in creating a new process. Fuller questioned the extent to which existing forms needed revision. Miller and Crump argued for new, more streamlined forms that would also address applications across MGSC’s five campuses. Crump suggested an emphasis in the forms on narrative justifications for monies and Muthusamy questioned whether the funds would only cover travel rather than other expenses.
  - Crump introduced the idea of bringing in outside speakers for faculty development. Walters agreed with this idea since the money spent would serve the needs of a broad audience. Rigole added that outside speakers were a good option, but they could be more expensive than asking MGSC faculty to contribute.
  - Crump started the revision of existing policies for faculty development by focusing on what should appear on the new forms. All members discussed what qualified as professional development and concluded that two forms, one for conferences (delivering a paper and/or chairing a panel) and one for other types of research, should be created. Miller and Crump took the lead in this discussion.
  - Crump mapped out features for each form based on committee suggestions. Items included a narrative outlining how the proposed development activity related to the applicant’s field of study, the name of the conference (or research), the date, the time,

the anticipated costs, and the significance of the knowledge obtained at the conference. The committee agreed to award funds three times annually, establish priority and secondary dates for submission of applications, require signatures by the applicant and division chair. As chair, Crump offered to accept all submissions.

- Crump proposed a separate form for faculty development carried out at venues other than at conferences. She argued that such development excludes research contributing to obtaining advanced degrees and that priority should go to faculty with a strong research agenda.
- Crump moved the discussion along to focus on the distribution of money. The