

**Meeting Date:** October 9, 2008

**Meeting Venue:** Room 286, Holmstedt Hall

**Meeting Time:** 1:50 – 2:40 PM

**Members Present:** S. Arvin (Secretary), A. Chandrasekaran, L. Cutter, C. Klarner (Chair), T. Nesser, N. Nichols-Pethick, D. Polizzi

**Absent:** R. Fitch, M. Miller, S. Phillips

**Executive Liaison:** J. Fine (absent)

**Ex-Officio:** D. Underwood

Members were urged to evaluate submitted proposals by merit first and by budget amount second. Further discussion would occur in the committee meeting after submission of scores. Members were informed that past committees had the option of striking items from requested proposal budgets. Discussion occurred about evaluating research from different disciplines.

Senate Charge #4 " *Review funding guidelines for inconsistencies and also the rubric for evaluations of proposals; initiate changes as appropriate* " was addressed. Klarner explained the scoring sheet and the rubric. Members were urged to assign one score to each proposal. Scores may include decimals. Klarner was asked to revise the score sheet to fit one score per proposal for Spring Semester. Klarner motioned to vote to accept the new Scoring system to assign one score per proposal, which would be aggregated. Alternatively, these scores will also be "z-scored" (be subtracted by their means and divided by their standard deviations) and aggregated for a second set of scores. The reasons behind this change were the same as those explained by Klarner in the September meeting. The motion carried unanimously. Because the scoring method is not part of the URC Guidelines or a Senate document, Senate approval is not needed.

Send grant scores to Klarner by Thursday, October 30. Send the overall evaluation score. Subcomponent scores are not necessary to submit to the committee.

Senate Charge #5 " *Make recommendations regarding the domain of responsibility held by URC* " was addressed. Similarities and differences between university committees were discussed.

Plans to hold two more meetings this semester were presented. The use of a discussion board for changes in committee structure was suggested as a way to minimize face-to-face meetings and maximize the quality of communication and dialogue. Privacy and security would need to be ensured. It was agreed that grant evaluation by the committee would not be appropriately done via discussion board.

Underwood reported that an additional \$7,000 of unspent funds had been added to the URC account, bringing the total funds available for the Fall Awards to \$23-24,000.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.