

ARC Committee Meeting

Minutes

September 19, 2017, Lee Campus I-223

In attendance: Anne Angstrom, Catherine Carney, Timothy Lucas, Larry Miller, Randy Moffett, Heather O'Connell, Stella Egan, Joseph van Gaalen

- J. van Gaalen welcomed and reviewed the agenda with the committee.
- J. van Gaalen shared replacement of dean to the committee – Dr. Larry Miller will be leaving FSW.
 - L. Miller reminded committee that the Dean is appointed by the Provost.
 - L. Miller will submit a letter to the Interim Provost with recommendations.
- J. van Gaalen addressed agenda item – Revision of ARC Diamond and Rubric.
 - J. van Gaalen reminded ARC that a review of the definition of the timeline on the rubric may be necessary given discussions during the decision meeting held in early July, 2018.
 - J. van Gaalen noted that perhaps a clarification of fiscal responsibilities and “one year” time limit may be necessary to avoid ambiguity by applicants or reviewers.
 - A. Angstrom suggested defining what “one year” signifies.
 - J. van Gaalen will add clarification to the website.
 - J. van Gaalen noted a second area which may require a review based on the decision meeting; Literature Review/ Support & Evidence on the rubric.
 - J. van Gaalen suggested revision to include reference list.
 - A. Angstrom suggested revising the phrasing to be clearer, such as “demonstrate for awareness of audience” in the fall.
 - L. Miller suggested sending a copy of the previous grant to the committee when an applicant resubmits an application with a recommendation to the applicant or to use track changes on the “revised” application.
- J. van Gaalen addressed agenda item, Sample of ARC Proposals on Website.
 - J. van Gaalen inquired about what should be included/excluded on the sample proposals.
 - Narrative, amount of award, redaction of some information?
 - R. Moffett suggested redacting award amount or limit only to awards up to \$5,000.
 - L. Miller and A. Angstrom suggested highlighting specific sections of the proposals.
 - A. Angstrom suggested doing a call out to applicants for strong sections in their proposals to highlight.

- J. van Gaalen suggested sending committee members with applicant's approval sections scored 2.5 or higher.

- In light of the earlier conversation, A. Angstrom suggested a more detailed explanation or statement on the Application Packet cover page. Cover page and rubric should match. *(follow up from meeting: in a review of the website by the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research (OSPR), the rubric and application packet requirements already match; this was an important component of the original draft of the rubric when reviewed by the ARC in Fall 2017)*
- L. Miller suggested reporting the total number of grants and the total dollar amount of awards for transparency of committee.
- L. Miller asked if OSPR create a template for submission of proposals for uniformity in grant submissions. J. van Gaalen confirmed this can be achieved.
- J. van Gaalen suggested review of suggested changes at the November meeting once committee has had time to reflect on discussion from today's meeting.

Minutes submitted by S. Egan and J. van Gaalen