III. Approval of EUTA/EUIA forms, grant forms and rubrics

The forms were accepted as presented at the September meeting.

B. Approval of Service Learning Language

A service learning component has been added to the Instructional Research and Improvement Grant application to increase service learning opportunities across campus. Referring to proposals that include service learning, Brandt asked if those proposals are moved to the top of the list to get special consideration or will they be treated the same as all the other proposals. Preihs asked if the service learning component would be strictly for work in DeKalb. Changnon said not necessarily. The service learning would be a semester long project with a course

Brandt wanted to know what committee members thought of the definition of service learning submitted by Julia Spears for inclusion in the grant proposal form. Changnon emphasized the two aspects of the service learning—going out into the community and then doing a reflective piece on what the activity meant to the student.

Brandt suggested the committee look at the rubric which is used to evaluate grant proposals. Will this rubric still work or will it need to be adjusted to accommodate service
Giese pointed out the rubric is used for all grants and to change the rubric to accommodate service learning would add points to that grant. Flynn said it probably could not be done for this year, but he suggested the grant dollars be split. If NIU is encouraging service learning they will want to spread the good word about it so why not split the grants so a certain percentage are given to normal grants and the remainder goes to service learning. Brandt said that had not been done before, but she did not see why it could not be done this way. Hayman asked if the university is pushing service learning or is it just developing the idea. Changnon said the university is pushing service learning. It is part of the new initiative. This is being pushed on campus. He added this is his first time on committee so don’t know how the split allocations would work, but does not see why it can’t be done. This was not thought of since it is assumed that all the grants would look the same. Giese said the proposals may look very different for those including service learning. Changnon said he would assume the passion for a project will come out in the proposal no matter what type of project is proposed.

Brandt said this is the first time the committee will deal with this type of initiative. The committee needs to wait and see how many service learning proposals are submitted. Changnon suggested waiting until the proposals are distributed at the February 7, 2011, to decide how the funds should be allocated. That decision may not be made until the committee knows the exact number proposals include service learning. The service learning component may capture a group of people who have been thinking about service learning, but didn’t know how to go about it. This may create an avalanche of proposals.

Referring back to the rubric used to evaluate the grant proposals, Brandt said it appears that it would fit with a service learning proposal. Giese agreed that the criteria be left as is.

Brandt also suggested clearing up the language on the submission of service learning proposals. It should be clearly stated all proposals should first be submitted to CIUE, the CIUE will pass service learning proposals to the Service Learning Committee. There should also be a check box on the proposal form to the inclusion of service learning in the proposal. Giese suggested the language for the check box match the language in the form. *Due to a lack of quorum, the service learning component will be officially approved with the final approval of the minutes by CIUE members.*

Turning the discussion to grant proposals in general, Brandt noted that sometimes proposals for grants that are longitudinal going over several years. Does the committee want to encourage repeat requests? If the committee gave you money last year is that a good thing or do committee members want to encourage new people new applicants? Flynn said the committee needs to fund new people. Giese asked if there were enough resources to give to all grant proposals. If not, the committee needs to encourage new applicants. Flynn said there is a university grant that does not allow for continuing funding of project. He said this is a good idea. It is easy for more experienced faculty to grants. The committee needs to make the money as accessible as possible to all faculty members, particularly those that are non-tenured or junior faculty. Giese agreed that the committee needs to get more faculty involved. Brandt did note that some of the grants that have been awarded repeatedly have been outstanding.
Changnon said he would agree that CIUE needs to push toward junior faculty. Junior faculty need to be shown that the university supports them and funds new initiatives for improving education. If someone is willing to put forth the effort to submit a proposal we need to support them. Brandt agreed with Changnon. NIU rewards research and even though CIUE deals with instruction research does need to be rewarded.

Discussing final reports due from grant recipients at the end of the project, Changnon said he would like the final reports submitted to Ganshirt. A reminder of the need for the report will be added to the award letter.

Before adjourning Changnon said he will check with Earl Seaver, Vice Provost, about having two allocations of funds for grants to split between tenure and non-tenure applicants.

IV. New Business

There was no new business.

V. Announcements

There were no announcements.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned 1:56 p.m. The next meeting will be held February 7, 2011 at 1 p.m. in Altgeld 203.