

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

**ANNUAL REPORT 2016-20177**

**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 2016-2017 is shown in Table 1. Funds to support these activities are provided by the University operating budget and the SU Foundation (Table 2). In 2016-2017, the academic deans continued to provide \$3,000 to support conference travel for faculty accompanying SU students who had been awarded Undergraduate Research (UGR) grants. The new funds for the 2016-2017 academic year was \$126,512 (the same level as 2015-2016, a reduction of \$50,000 from 2014-2015, returning to 2011-2012 levels) and \$21,225 carried over from previous year. After a lowered award limit significantly reduced faculty participation in 2015-2016, limits were raised slightly in 2016-2017.

**Table 1  
 CFEST Grants Administration Committee, 2016-2017.**

Sally Paulson, co-Director	Exercise Science
Paul Taylor, co-Director	Mathematics
James Johnson	Dean, College of Education and Human Services
John Kooti	Dean, College of Business
James Mike	Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Kate McGivney	Mathematics
Kirk Moll	Library Services
Robert Zeigenfuss	Teacher Education
Kim Garris	Commuation/Journalism
Blake Hargrove	Management/Marketing
Chris Wonders	Executive Director, Institute for Public Service / Sponsored Programs

**Table 2**  
**Sources of CFEST Grants Administration Funding, 2016-2017.**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
SU Provost's Office	\$83,512
SU Foundation	\$40,000
College Deans' contribution to support faculty-student co-presentations (travel)	\$3,000
Reserve funds remaining from previous CFEST budgets	\$21,225
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$147,737</b>

**2016-2017 Committee activities**

In 2016-2017, CFEST Grants Administration continued to use InfoReady to accept and process applications online. The faculty have generally adjusted to using InfoReady, with only a few isolated issues. CFEST manages three different granting programs to support faculty development: the Travel Grant, Faculty Teaching and Continued Education (FTCE), and Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) programs.

Travel Grants - Travel Grants are to support presentations of a paper/poster, required attendance as an elected association officer, or to organize a conference or conference session. After dropping the award limit from \$1400 to \$800 in 2015-2016, it was raised to \$1000 for 2016-2017.

In 2015-2016 UGR travel support for faculty was moved to CFEST. The faculty travel portion of the UGR program was moved to the CFEST Travel program, as a new category. This aspect of the program was continued in 2016-2017. Faculty could apply for \$400, separate from their standard \$1000 limit (the \$1000 and \$400 awards could not be used for a single trip). The \$3000 contributed by the deans was earmarked for this new program, with UGR agreeing to transfer some funds should demand exceed the \$3000 (ultimately, no additional funds were needed from the UGR program).

In 2016-2017, CFEST shifted to a per diem meal reimbursement not requiring receipts. This change simplified paperwork and did not have a noticeable impact on total reimbursements.

In order to reduce the number of faculty applying excessively early (thus frontloading committee work to months early in the academic year), we began requiring an acceptance letter with application (as opposed to allowing it with reimbursement paperwork). An exception was made for summer travel applied for in May. Committee work was still heaviest in October by far, but there were fewer awards which were later declined due to changing plans.

Faculty Training and Continued Education (FTCE) – The FTCE program supports attendance at workshops or other types of intensive training. Supported projects include both training to expand scholarship opportunities and training to enable to methods or areas of teaching. New funding limits of \$1500 per award and \$10,000 total for the program were introduced to manage the lower budget.

Faculty Professional Development Council (FPDC) – FPDC is primarily a PASSHE administered grant program funded through the APSCUF faculty contract. FPDC grants support larger professional development projects. Shippensburg University FPDC applicants who are not funded by PASSHE are eligible for funding by CFEST. The number of projects funded by CFEST each year depends on the remaining CFEST budget in late spring, when the PASSHE FPDC results are announced. CFEST set aside \$10,000 to locally fund projects.

New Faculty Orientation - An orientation workshop for new faculty was conducted in October 2016 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.

FPDC workshop and review - A workshop oriented to FPDC proposals was held in November 2016. 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 Chris Wonders in developing ideas and proposals.

Sub-committees of the CFEST Grants Administration reviewed Travel Grant and FTCE proposals on a monthly basis. The full committee normally meets in February to evaluate FPDC applications. This year, however, our funds were sufficient to fund all applicants.

Council of Trustees (COT) - 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. Currently this is a very small program, as few faculty are eligible due to limited new faculty appointments in recent years. When hiring rates return to more typical levels, we encourage the President and the COT to expand on this important program to include more and/or larger awards.

**CFEST Grants Administration support provided during 2016-2017**

During 2016-2017, the CFEST Grants Administration awarded \$119,168.11 to support a range of professional development activities (Table 3). The total number of proposals funded was 141, including 129 travel grants (including 13 which will apply to the 2017-2018 fiscal year), 7 FTCE grants, and 5 FPDC grants. These numbers are similar to 2015-2016, which represented a significant drop from 2014-2015, when the CFEST budget was \$50,000 higher.

<b>Table 3</b>		
<b>Activities funded by CFEST Grants Administration, 2016-2017.</b>		
<b>Grant Category</b>	<b>Number of Awards</b>	<b>CFEST Funds awarded</b>
Travel Grants	116*	\$99,852.69
FTCE	7	\$6,794.42
Travel/FTCE for 2017-18 fiscal year	(13)	(pending 17-18 limits)
FPDC Grants	5	\$12,205

<b>Total CFEST Grant Support for 2016-2017</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>\$119,168.11</b>
*Includes 7 grants approved in 2015-2016		

We were hoping for a rebound in travel application numbers with the increase in the limit from \$800 to \$1000. We suspect the faculty strike in the fall resulted in some cancelled travel plans, suppressing the numbers.

### **Transfer of UGR faculty mentor travel to CFEST**

In recent years, budget pressures in the UGR program led to reduced support for faculty travelling as mentors to student researchers, as higher proportions of funds were directed to the students. In an effort to restore some of the faculty mentor support and move more of the faculty travel support to one location, CFEST took responsibility for UGR mentor travel support in 2015-2016. This new category of travel would initially be funded by the \$3000 provided by deans, money which was already earmarked to support student research related travel. Should requests exceed \$3000, the UGR program agreed to transfer some funds since this item had previously been under their budget.

This new category was not well utilized in 2015-2016, and this continued to be the case in 2016-2017. This category retained the limit of \$400 (historically the faculty travel reimbursement limit in the UGR program). Most of the funded travel was local. It is likely \$400 is not sufficient to motivate faculty to commit to long distance travel. CFEST is planning to change the program to allow the \$400 UGR funding to be combined with the normal \$1000 on a single trip, in hopes of increase participation.

### **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:

- The budget allocation for faculty professional remains substantially under the 2007- 2009 allocations. (Table 5). Funding in 2016-2017 is approximately half of 2007-2008.
- The participation in CFEST grant programs had been reduced in 2010-2013 (Table 6), reflecting the reduced budget. With the increase in budget limits in 2013-2015, participation increased substantially. When the budget was again reduced in 2015-2016, participation fell dramatically. 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 2013-2015 was well below faculty professional development funding prior to 2009 (CFEST and URSP). CFEST was not able to provide substantial support to research, but faculty participation in the remaining programs was healthy (particularly the travel program). The drop in participation in 2015-2016 indicates a disturbing decline in faculty engagement in scholarship.

**Table 5**  
**Recent History of Faculty Professional Development Funding at SU**

Year	CFEST University and Foundation funding	Dean contribution for student research	Supplemental funding	URSP funding	Total funding for faculty professional development (CFEST and URSP)
2007-08	\$146,300			\$100,000	\$246,300
2008-09	\$140,385			\$50,000	\$190,385
2009-10	\$143,968			\$0	\$143,968*
2010-11	\$133,571	\$2750		\$0	\$136,321
2011-12	\$123,512	\$3000		\$0	\$126,512**
2012-13	\$123,512	\$3000	\$30,000+	\$0	\$156,512
2013-14	\$123,512	\$3000	\$50,000	\$0	\$176,512
2014-15	\$123,512	\$3000	\$50,000	\$0	\$176,512
2015-16	\$123,512	\$3000		\$0	\$126,512
2016-17	\$123,512	\$3000		\$0	\$126,512

Note: the above table represents new funding allocations only, and does not include carryover of unspent funds.

\* In 2009-2010 the URSP still existed, funded from unspent funds carried over from previous years, not a new budget allocation.

\*\* CFEST received a one-time transfer of the URSP remaining balance (\$26,587), not included in the above table since it was not a new budget allocation.

+ Received mid-year, after low travel reimbursement limits were set.

**Table 6**  
**Recent History of Proposals Submitted to CFEST**

Year	Travel Proposals Received	FTCE Proposals Received	FPDC Proposals Received	Total Proposals Received
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	120	12	10	142
2013-14	168	17	18	203
2014-15	209	13	7	229
2015-16	120	11	3	134
2016-17	123	7	6	136

## **Issues and Recommendations**

Many long standing issues regarding application clarity and staffing workload were addressed with the transition to online application. However, a few issues remained or arose during the 2016-2017 academic year that should be addressed to allow CFEST to better serve faculty needs. These are outlined below, grouped within the relevant grant programs.

### **Travel Grants**

1. While the transition of faculty UGR mentor travel support from UGR to CFEST is still considered to be the correct path, the program was very lightly used. CFEST must consider how the program could be changed to encourage faculty to support student research travel.
2. The increase from \$800 to \$1000 did not increase travel as much as expected. The reduced travel is significantly impacting faculty scholarship. Some faculty cancelled their travel plans as a result of the faculty strike.

### **Recommendations**

1. There are limited options without additional funding. One possibility would be to allow faculty to combine the regular travel limit (\$1000) with the UGR mentor funding (\$400) for a combined maximum reimbursement of \$1400 for a single trip, provided they qualify for both programs. In 2016-2017, the two programs could not be used on a single trip.

### **FTCE Grants**

The FTCE program operated well within its limited budget in 2016-2017. Applications were fewer than expected. CFEST needs to consider how to improve faculty awareness of the FTCE program.

### **FPDC**

Many issues revolving around the FPDC process might be due to a general unfamiliarity with the nature of the FPDC programs, especially since PASSHE FPDC funding had not been available for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. In 2015-2016, PASSHE FPDC was once again unavailable since the union contract had expired. CFEST set aside \$10,000 for FPDC grants, with a \$5000 limit; PASSHE also offered \$5000 grants this year, using from remaining from the previous faculty contract.

1. Only 1 of Shippensburg's 6 applications received PASSHE funding. The other 2 applications which we chose to submit for the PASSHE competition did not score well.

### **Recommendations**

1. Each year (usually in November), CFEST Grants hosts an orientation seminar for faculty interested in the FPDC program. However, we still need to do a better job advertising the program to the faculty at large. This general unfamiliarity combined with reduced limits and funding led to a general lack of interest. CFEST must continue to pursue new methods of informing faculty of the program, as well as seeking more funding for locally funded research grants. Once faculty commit to participating, we need to find ways to make the applications stronger. We already work with faculty as they prepare and revise their applications, but we are still underperforming compared to other PASSHE institutions.

2. The CFEST budget, subject to the university's general budget pressures, does not currently have the capacity to fund a significant number of research grants locally. CFEST will try to set aside some funds for FPDC on the assumption there will be no PASSHE program this year. CFEST encourages the administration to increase the CFEST budget to allow for both healthy travel and research programs, as soon as the university budget allows.

## **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 their requirements.
2. The current RFP was created before our current hiring slowdown. It needs to be more flexible to make appropriate awards when very few faculty are eligible to apply.
3. 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. CFEST has made recommendations for improving the RFP in the past, however the program seems to be such a low priority that action has not been taken.