Teaching Grants Committee

Minutes of February 3, 1995

The meeting was called to order by the committee chair, Prem
Sehgal. The committee Minutes for January 20, 1995 were approved.

The committee discussed the results of the aggregated rankings by
committee members focusing its attention on the top 18 ranked
proposals. Following this discussion, a motion was made and
passed to not recommend funding for the bottom 5 proposals in the
list of the top 18 ranked proposals.

Motion: Recommend funding proposals ranked 1 through 10, 12, and
13. (The proposal ranked 11th was withdrawn by its author.)
Motion passed unanimously.

The committee then discussed how to better inform applicants of
the criteria used to distinguish low priority proposals from high
priority proposals. Several committee members felt that the
committee needs to be sure this information is contained in the
application form or descriptive material provided with the form.
Following a lengthy discussion the following items were
identified as important points to consider in developing criteria
for ranking proposals:

1. Distinguish between creative activity proposals (which
   should go to the Research/Creative Activity Grants Committee) and teaching
   grant proposals which involve some activities that could be designated as
   creative activity.

2. Distinguish between general faculty development for teaching
   and faculty development specifically related to the teaching assignments
   (i.e., is directly related to courses taught) by the applicant.

3. proposals with one-time impact, for example, invited
   speakers

4. product development

5. justification of the budget and the appropriateness of the
   expenses, for example, travel, renting a facility

6. quality and format of the written proposal: clarity, content, organization, following the format rules given

7. inclusion of administrative work in the proposal activities

8. other more appropriate sources of ECU internal funding

9. the involvement of regulatory issues for the unit, for
   example, accreditation, money to bring a unit within certain
   required standards

10. assessment, if there is a direct impact on the applicant's
    teaching

11. all courses must have been fully approved

12. some objective evaluation plan with a clear indication of how
    it will be incorporated into teaching.

It was noted that the pink sheet, Teaching Grants Committee
Evaluation of 1995/1996 Proposals, needs to have the words
evaluation plan substituted for project in the question with
point 4. The question will then read: How will you rate the impact of this evaluation plan on the applicant's teaching? The committee was not able to verify if figures quoted for materials to be ordered and or fees to be paid for 4 proposals in category # 3 were appropriate. This will be indicated in the committee's report of recommendations to the Academic Vice Chancellor.

The committee will meet February 10, 1995 to discuss the criteria for ranking proposals. A subcommittee of Prem Sehgal, Brenda Killingsworth, and Dot Clayton will prepare a draft statement of the criteria for the committee's consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Dot Clayton for Tom Eamon