The meeting was called to order at 3:10 by the Chair, David Lawrence.

The minutes of November 10, 1995 were approved.

There was some discussion of the history of the Grants Committee in terms of the number of proposals historically recommended. In the past about 40% of those submitted were recommended for funding, and 20-35% were actually funded. It was mentioned that we have not had a ruling on a cap. Floor was opened for discussion. It was decided to eliminate Proposals under 65.

Discussion then focused on specific proposals. There was a problem with proposal number 302. The agreement was that number 302 was to be thrown out.

The motion was carried to accept the top 14 which fell in the category of 65 and above. The procedure that will be utilized is: letter will be sent to the Vice chancellor that will include a list of the 14 identifying the department, name of the project and the rank (not the actual scores).

Other business discussed: Changes that should be made in the guidelines and the way the committee evaluates proposals. A number of issues were identified: can students be paid out of these funds? some grant applicants are not following requested format and there is a need for the committee to make guidelines explicit, some grant applicants are not including evaluation sections, missing budget pages, and exceeding the requested number of pages.

There was some discussion about what is legally possible to spend money on. Dorothy will provide the committee with state regulations. There was also discussion about evaluating need and impact, and the final decision was, suggest that the applicants include:
- number of students in the past in the course - if a new course
- what number of students projected
- level of course
- percentage of course
- what other courses may be impacted by the course

Further discussion focused on final reports submitted by funded applicants. It was suggested that next year we use the titles as well as scores of the proposals funded on the list submitted to committee.

Other discussion focused on repeat proposals - someone may get funded more than once. The issue is, do we want to limit the number of times that a person can submit a proposal within a specific period of time?

Other discussion focused on the need for the committee to have at least three evaluation questions that the funded applicants must respond to or provide feedback to the committee so that the committee will have some method of evaluation. Another suggestion was to have each committee member read the evaluations submitted by the funded applicants.

Based on all of the aforementioned, the Chair appointed a subcommittee composed of Joanne Neff, Sherry Sinn, and Jean-Luc Scemama. The subcommittee's primary task will be to make recommendations to the committee regarding the criteria and the guidelines.
Celeste will proof prior to submission to the full committee. The subcommittee will meet in January in preparation for the information to be submitted to the general committee for review and approval.

The final announcement was that committee members are to submit their yellow sheets to the faculty senate and keep the proposals.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15.

Respectfully Submitted by M.S. Jackson