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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION TAKEN** |
| Discussion of University Research Advisory Group deliberation on earmarks | Meeting was called to order at 8:05 am. Nancy explained that she wanted to have a meeting prior to meeting with the university committee. Six proposals were handed in to the university committee. They were placed in a rank order. There was no discussion at the university level regarding the proposals. There was discussion about how to categorize them so that like proposals could be worked on for the actual earmark submission. The next discussion will occur the week after Thanksgiving. At that time the categories (page 2 of agenda) given today will be discussed. She briefly explained the categories. The categories were discussed. Nancy explained the timeline of these proposals and the discussion that lead to the three categories. Other submissions were reviewed by the group - communication, health informatics. Nancy reported that the university committee had dismissed the autism proposal summarily. The committee consisted of 10-11 people from across the university. Regional campuses were discussed in terms of stem education in rural areas. These were brief and shallow conversations. The committee will be looking for people to work on building a full proposal. Nancy will be looking for people who would be willing to participate. It was stated that STEM work was going on in the urban areas also. It was felt that these would not get support because of political issues. There was discussion on the political aspects of the proposals. Nancy stated that she had talked about underrepresented populations also. Dale Cook stated that they currently have projects in Cleveland and Akron at STEM schools. Nancy will raise this point at the next university meeting. Nancy wanted everyone to take note the proposal from the science education proposal did not come from EHHS even though it states it is in partnership with us. It was stated that several proposals have been brought up in the past trying to get science Ed to work with us and no one would come forward.  It was asked if there was going to be a collaborative effort between colleges. Nancy stated that she thought it would definitely head in that direction, but you have to have people willing to work on these. Copies of the various proposals were distributed. Pam Mitchell she has projects in some of the same areas that would overlap. It was stated that Arts & Sciences sees a lot of reform in K-12 and sees great possibilities for funding. This is an encroachment issue with EHHS. It was pointed out that most of the content areas are in Arts and Sciences. Nancy pointed out how uneven the proposals were with some not having budgets or names associated with them. EHHS is listed on several proposals that did not come from us. Dale Cook suggested Nancy speak with Mike Mikusa regarding current collaborative efforts. Nancy asked if there were any other groupings she should suggest at the meeting. Targeting innovative projects should be focused on. The group was asked to review the information get back to Nancy prior to the university meeting with any suggestions they have in regard to collaborative work. The lack of collaboration with the regional campuses was discussed. Nancy was asked to press the science education proposal. There was no name attached to this proposal. She was also asked to investigate how the proposal for math and science could be a collaborative effort and who had proposed it. It was stated that a math educator and a science educator had tried to be located for a proposal collaborative with Arts & Sciences previously, but no one willing could be found. Faculty had worked on proposals previously that didn’t go anywhere and this could be part of the problem in getting someone to participate. Nancy stated that we should not let anything go out that is science education centered without our names on it. Nancy will speak to faculty prior to the next meeting regarding what they would need to feel supported. She again stressed that they should feel free to email suggestions to her. The group questioned if these were also foundation proposals or strictly government. Nancy stated they were only government earmarks. It was asked if Nancy knew which legislators were being targeted, but she did not have that information. |  |
| Research Brown Bags | Nancy stated that she had sent Lyle’s final report. One of the suggestions had been a series of brown bag meetings. This would be one way to develop a culture of research in the college. Michelle Hoversten & Frieda Boland will be helping her to facilitate this. The group was asked to help with topic suggestions as she would like to roll these out the beginning of next month. It was asked if these should be broad topics to help people in developing proposals. Nancy stated she would like to see the first one be on the Research and Evaluation Bureau and what it is about. Nancy has requested that Deborah Shama-Davis remove the hour restrictions on the bureau for faculty support. This was agreed to until the end of the fiscal year. At that point there will be an evaluation done to determine faculty use of the Bureau. The graduate students will continue to have a time limit. The group thought that this would be helpful. It was suggested that it is important for faculty to learn what it is doing to promote collaborative efforts. Nancy stated that she would like to see presentations planned that people would be anxious to come to in an effort to get more people involved. It was suggested that each could be done by methodologies or broad topics. There was discussion on the value of feedback in addition to building collaborative efforts. This would be helpful for brainstorming for ideas also. It was suggested that there be expectations for discussions and not just presentations. Nancy shared that this is being worked on and the Bureau was going to move into that. Currently the Bureau can be used as an external evaluator on grants. Nancy will put together some ideas for these brown bags. |  |
| Other |  |  |

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 am

Next meeting:

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer, Recorder