Members present: Pat Anderson (Alumni), Anne Birberick (Vice Provost), Danny Brouillette (LAS), Jessima Cooke-Plagwitz (LAS), Kitty Holland (LAS), Chris Jones (Honors), Brian Mackie (BUSE), and Sarah McHone-Chase (LIB).

Members absent: Abul Azad (EET), Amanda Cecchi (HHS), Joseph Flynn (EDUC), Kenneth Gasser (UCC/LAS), Billie Giese (VPA), Heather Hanson (LAS), Denise Hayman (CHANCE), Patty Hurney (EET), Mark Mehrer (LAS), and Kathleen Musker (HHS).

Others: Joanne Ganshirt (Recording Clerk/Honors).

This special meeting was convened to discuss proposed changes to the CIUE Summer Instructional Research Grant for 2012. No official business could be conducted due to the absence of a quorum. Birberick thanked everyone for coming to this extra meeting because minor changes to the current forms need to be made.

Mackie said the committee would have time during the spring 2012 semester to look at the previous proposal to split the grant payments for summer grant and see which works best. Most committee members have agreed better assessment is needed to determine if the outcomes of the grants are appropriate for the money awarded. He noted the committee has split the award money in the past giving partial awards to some proposals. He asked if the committee could award part of a $3,500 grant if there is not enough funding. He proposed asking on the proposal form if a faculty member would take partial funding to complete the proposal.

Birberick said no changes were needed for the $1,000 Instructional Research and Improvement Grant, the Microcomputer Software Acquisition Grant, and the Student-originated Instructional Research and Improvement Grant. The type and length of final reports for these are good. The only problem with the student grant is the number applicants. Advertising this needs to improve. Mackie asked if an e-mail blast to all students regarding the grant could be done. Birberick said she is the person to approve such requests so it could be done. She also suggested posting the grant on student-accessible Blackboard pages.

Referring to the summer $3,500 grant, Birberick said a final report and assessment is needed. She would like to split the payment to recipients, giving part of the money for the grant and remaining when the assessment report is completed. The assessment report would need to be more than the two-page report currently accepted. Mackie asked if funding would be available across fiscal years if a faculty member could not complete the project in one year. Anderson
asked if a faculty member would be able to complete the project if only have the money was awarded. Birberick said the $3,500 received is only for salary so she thinks the project could still be completed.

Jones asked what the fundamental goal of these changes would be. Birberick replied the committee has been giving money to faculty members to improve undergraduate education. The two-page report does not tell the committee that this is being done. She noted she would like to see this improved so the committee knows what is being done for the money. To this end, Birberick would like to split the award into two payments with the final payment coming with the completion of the report.

Anderson asked if someone would need to evaluate the reports. Birberick said she thinks the reports will improve because the final disbursement of money is dependent on the report being accepted.

Holland asked how many of these grants were awarded every year. Birberick said the average is seven to 10 $3,500 grants are awarded. Holland said there will be variation in the outcomes of each grant and the committee will not be able to say how detailed the report should be at the beginning because the project is unknown. She asked if separate requests for reports for each project could be made. When the committee knows what should be in each report the grant recipient will know what will need to be included in the report. Birberick asked if that meant that each acceptance letter should include a detailed list of what the report should say. Holland said she did not want to add work but the committee will know what the projects are and so including a detailed list should be easy to do. A statement should be added to the proposal form indicating this will be done. Mackie agreed it should be added to the form. An explanation of the report at the beginning explaining the details of the report would be helpful.

Committee members agreed a statement should be added under “FINAL REPORT” stating “Faculty whose projects are funded will submit a substantial activity report and an expense report by October 30. Details of the required information for the report will be outlined in the award letter.” Birberick said she will write the official sentence to be inserted in the proposal form.

Mackie recommended adding a line indicating $2,500 would be awarded at the time the proposal is accepted, with a further $1,000 being awarded when the report is submitted. Birberick said the split should be $2,000 and $1,500 for an acceptable report.

Holland said a plan is needed for the possibility of the submission of an acceptable report that needs to be sent back for revision. How many times will the recipient get to rewrite the report? Birberick said two submissions should be enough. If the correct information is not included in the first report a second request should be more than enough to get the needed information.

Jones asked who would evaluate the reports. Mackie said the full committee should do this. Holland noted that questions of acceptability should be sent to the committee chair.
Following further discussion the committee decided to add the final report statement and to add a question asking if partial funding will be accepted for completing the proposal. Birberick will write the language and send it to the committee for final approval.

The call for grant proposals should be out by December 1 with a February 3, 2012 application deadline. Priority will be given to faculty members who have not received this grant in the previous two years.