COMMITTEE:  Research & Creative Activities

MEETING DATE: January 15, 2015

PERSON PRESIDING: Jay Newhard

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:  Anne Ticknor, Bernice Dodor, Megan Janke, Jay Newhard, Jason Brinkley, Alex Manda, Katie Ford, Christy Ashley, Hanna Jubran, David Conradt

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:  Ali Al-Sharadqah, Chal Benson, Patricia Crane, Qin Ding, Mary Farwell, Ernie Marshburn

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:  

ACTIONs OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Old Business – Dr. Bailey’s email

Discussion: Some of his remarks were about feedback that was given at least a decade ago. The main idea is to provide constructive feedback to the applicants. Write up constructive comments and feedback when reading proposals and present this clearly. Evaluate the proposal for the project rather than the writing-style of the proposal, but balance this with the consideration that the applicants must make a good case for their proposal/project. Could identify “how to improve” proposal in comments rather than ‘weaknesses’ of proposal.

Action Taken: N/A

Assigned additional duties to: N/A

Agenda Item: New Business – Review of award evaluation procedure

Discussion: Scoring: use a 5-point scale (1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is worth funding, 4 is very good, 5 is outstanding/excellent). Score accordingly and accurately. Get the proposals and score overall on a scale of 1 to 5. Next the subcommittee gets together to discuss; aspects that you might not have noticed previously might be addressed – gives an opportunity to change the scores and adjust accordingly. Each subcommittee’s scores are standardized and then they are roughly translated to a general distribution/continuum and that is where the rankings tend to come from overall. The more variation in the scores in the subcommittee, the more ‘true’ the rankings will emerge after the scores are standardized using this scheme. These scores do not go back to the applicants – thus, score them accordingly and accurately. The subcommittees will have a chance to come back after the rankings and discuss the merits of the proposals they evaluated.

Budget: We are not looking for “bargains”, but looking for meritorious projects. Have to make a case for their project and their budget justification is for what they are trying to
accomplish.

Deadlines: Next meeting is February 11th, the subcommittee chairs will need to have the scores back to the chair by February 6th. The subcommittee chair should get each group together beforehand to discuss the proposals in each section.

Action Taken:

Assigned additional duties to:

NEXT MEETING: February 11, 2015

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: RCAC Proposals