Meeting Date: November 10, 2004

Person Presiding: Steve Estes

Secretary: Jane Painter

Attendance: Toby Allen, John Collins, Reide Corbett, Seodial Deena, Anne Dickerson, Paul Gares, Elias Katoulis, Jane Painter, Jeff Popke, John Reed, David Rosenthal, Al Schreier, Mark Sprague

Absent: Marieke Van Willigen, Leslie Omoruyi, Francisco Souto, Anthony Overton

Others in Attendance: N/A

Agenda Item 1: One committee member questioned comments and scoring on his grant proposal.

Discussion: Chair of Sub-Committee 1, Paul Gares, read to the Committee the comments in question. There was much discussion not only on this one proposal but of how comments were recorded from each sub-committee. Committee members were reminded of the past Chair’s, Randy Parker, comment that grants should not be submitted if the PI cannot handle any negative feedback. A question arose whether committee members should be allowed to submit grant proposals since that person’s specialty most likely is not present during the committee’s review of that proposal and no one would be present with the expertise to answer any of the committee member’s questions.

Action Taken:
- It was decided that the Paul will re-examine the comments and make editorial changes on the proposal in question, but the scores would not change
- The question on whether committee members can submit a proposal will be added to the next meeting’s agenda.

Agenda Item 2: Full committee met to determine method of finalizing rankings of grants to be submitted to the VC.

Discussion: Comments discussed pertained to the expertise of each sub-committee in relation to reviewing and grading each proposal as well as weighting each sub-committee rankings. It was decided that for this year each sub-committee’s scores would have equal weight and the scores would be merged, averaged, and ranked ordered. There was a consensus of the Committee that this process should be reviewed.

Action Taken:
- Sub-committee chairs will merge scores, calculate mean, and then rank order the proposals.
- Proposal at 3.0 and higher will be forwarded to the VC.
- VC will fund proposals in the order that we recommend and will fund as many as the budget allows
- Method of the final review and ranking of proposals will be added to the next meeting’s agenda

Agenda Item 3: There was a brief discussion whether the Committee should go on and meet next week rather than wait until Spring.

Action Taken:
- Steve will email all Committee members to determine if a meeting next week is possible.

Agenda Item 4: The following is a synopsis of all items that will be discussed at the next meeting:

Grant Proposal Format:
- Consider requesting APA be used for all grants
- Two page limit on references
- Use 12 font Times Roman
- Question on reference pages whether is should be double or single spaced
- No handwriting on any portion of the proposal including title page

https://author.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsonline/rg/rg11_04.cfm
• Should we consider how many times a person is funded through this Committee?
• Should there be a separate proposal guide for art proposals?

**Grading and Ranking of Proposal Process:**
• Need to determine which grants should be scored using the numerical scale on the third round (i.e. only those 3 and above; 4 and above; all of the grants, etc.)
• For the final ranking determination, should each sub-committee’s scores be viewed with the same weight since each group has expertise for their own group's proposals? One suggestion was for primary group to have a .6 weight and the secondary group a .4 weight.
• Is there a better way to collect and dispense comments?

**Miscellaneous:**
• Can committee members submit a proposal?

Next meeting: not yet determined
Respectively submitted,
Jane Painter, Ed.D., OTR/L, Secretary