Present: Doryjane Birrer (Chair), Chen-Huei Chou, Jon Hale, Lei Jin, Diane Johnson, Gibbs Knotts, June McDaniel, Blake Stevens, Jeff Triblehorn

1. Introductions and thanks
Committee members introduced themselves, and Doryjane thanked Gibbs and Blake for joining the committee as late additions. Gibbs Knotts volunteered to take minutes for the meeting. Doryjane indicated she would take minutes thereafter, noting that these would be limited primarily to funding statistics given the confidential nature of the committee’s funding deliberations.

2. Overview of committee tasks and workload
Doryjane provided an overview of the committee’s annual workload, emphasizing the three rounds of proposals, important dates, and committee work timelines. She also highlighted some possible meeting dates for 2012-2013. Committee members should review dates and get back to Doryjane.

3. Key Information for Reviewing Round One Proposals
Doryjane provided a budget and prior funding history. The annual budget is around $90,000. Based on funding commitments from Round 3 in 2011-2012, about $75,000 is available to award for Rounds 1 and 2 in 2012-2013, and we should limit Round 3 funding to approximately $15,000 to ensure adequate funds for 2013-2014. In 2011-2012, the committee awarded about $20,000 in Round 1, $56,000 in Round 2, and $15,000 in Round 3. We also discussed sabbatical funding requests, stressing that the committee does not fund additional salary for someone on sabbatical. The committee discussed funding priorities and emphasized that funding quality proposals was the primary objective. Beyond this priority, the committee would give additional weight to proposals from junior faculty, as this is the committee’s primary purview. We also discussed the proposal assessment rubric and comments documents. Reviewers will be asked to rank proposals based on quantitative and qualitative measures. Doryjane reminded committee members that examples of successful proposals are available on the Graduate School website. Committee members asked for examples of unsuccessful proposals. There was also some discussion about funding students as research collaborators. In addition, there was some concern that certain disciplines were not represented on the committee. One suggestion was to bring in an outside consultant to help evaluate the quality of a proposal if necessary. Reviewer comments will be synthesized to provide feedback to faculty, particularly for proposals that were not funded. The committee also has the discretion to award full or partial funding to faculty.

4. Society Sharepoint topsite demo
Despite some technology challenges, we got a brief overview of the secure Society sharepoint website. Each round’s proposals will be posted to this secure website. Also, committee members will post proposal rankings and comments here and should review each others’ rankings and comments via this venue before each meeting.