

What We Want (in random order):

- A process that promotes unfettered curiosity, and acknowledges that in an intellectual/educational community like SRJC, disciplinary knowledge and skill is intrinsically valuable

What guidance do you propose for allotting points on a 1-5 scale?

- A process that screens out apps that are incomplete or late

Section 6b1 of the current FFAS guidelines first criterion specifically states "The application form was fully completed and turned in by the deadline."

FFAS does not accept late applications and the online application prevents this from happening. The process is also carefully monitored by the FFAS committee members.

The application form is set up such that all responses are required and where applicants have the ability to provide an incomplete answer (e.g. complete address) they are cautioned that an incomplete answer will result in the application being rejected (not considered)

- A process that allows the faculty member to define for themselves what they need as professional development, rather than imposes specific categories, whether pedagogical or disciplinary or other, but is equally open to all types

How do you propose we award points for this?

- A process that prioritizes new and non-recent recipients over recent and frequent recipients

Section 6b4 of the current FFAS guidelines criteria 1 and 2 (tie-breakers) state that preference may be given to the faculty member who "[Has] Not previously received an FFAS grant" and "Has not recently received an FFAS grant."

The application form requires applicants to indicate if they have received a grant ever before. It also asks applicants to specify prior grants if received.

- A process that gives those proposals that are rejected priority in the next cycle

FFAS committee members oppose this idea. All are welcome to reapply from year to year without prejudice.

- A process that lets the applicant define for themselves what they need as professional development, and evaluates their application on attention to detail and depth of thought, whatever aspect of their job duties they are addressing in the application

We see how attention to detail and depth of thought could be assessed using the rubric, probably in the first or second criteria on the rubric. Again, what guidance would you give us regarding the awarding of points for such a criterion?