

**COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES**

Office of the Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs and Graduate Education

**RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**November 22, 2010**

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Aryn Karpinski, FLA; Frank Sansosti, LDES; Tim Rasinski, TLC; Jim Henderson, TLC; Michelle Hoversten, Staff.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Pam Mitchell, HS; Angie Ha, HS; Kelly Cichy, LDES

GUESTS: None

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION TAKEN** |
| Review of the previous RFP and the system for reviewing proposals | The committee reviewed the original RFP for seed grant. The group felt the evaluation criteria seem to be fairly consistent, but needed to be emphasized. There was discussion regarding the evaluation of RFPs outside of the reviewer’s area of expertise. Submitters need to be made aware that the reviewer may be outside of their field and to accommodate for this in their proposal. It was suggested that a page limit be placed on individual sections. The committee felt that the Approach and Innovation portions should be a little beefier. It was suggested that the background section may not be needed as the submitter is required to include their vita. The committee would also like the applicant to include their current line of research in there biosketch. It should also give a good idea of how the RFP fits in with a current line of inquiry or further extend current line of inquiry. The following are the suggested page limits:   * Significance section (#2) should be integrated into the biosketch 1-2 pages * Approach 2-3 pages * Impact and Innovation statement 2-3 pages.   Those awarded the grants for fall semester have agreed to have their grant put on the web.  The budget & biosketch would be appendices. Group requested that perhaps the submission could be entered as separate pages, but open up as one document when the reviewer clicks on it. Applicant will need to make sure that their CV is updated and complete on the web.  It was also shared by a member that the doctoral students were also very excited about the SEED grants.  EVALUATION PROCESS:  The evaluation needs to be more in alignment with the requirements of the RFP. | Nancy will have the review process to the group at the December meeting  Michelle Hoversten will attempt to revise the evaluation to bring it into alignment with the components of the RFP. |
| Discussion of Dissertation Reviews/Awards | There was discussion on reinstituting the dissertation award. Past awards will be reviewed to see what was done. Nancy shared that the last time the awards were given there were only 3 persons nominated. She explained that there needs to be criteria developed in order to reinstitute this award. There would need to be both qualitative and quantitative persons on the review committee. There was discussion on whether students would be interested. Nancy suggested students could submit a manuscript that could later be published. It was suggested that another incentive might be to tie it to an invited address to be given.  The group will consider this and a decision will be made at the next meeting. Nancy suggested that it would be nice if it could be tied into honors week in April. |  |

The meeting was adjourned at 10:

Next meeting: **Dec. 20th 9:30 am, WH, Rm 507M**

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer, Recorder