

SOSA Committee Meeting
October 21, 2015
Meeting Notes

Present: T. Bennett, B. BuSha, J. Kirnan, L. Mawhinney, T. Nakra, D. Papamichail, S. Sen, J. Taylor, E. Teixeira, D. Vandegrift, I. Zake.

1. Minutes from October 7, 2015 were reviewed and approved with corrections.

TB noted that item 2 remains to be done, CFA was moving its recommendation forward (item 3). Regarding item 1, IZ asked that a copy of the document be forwarded to Academic Affairs.

2. Panel and Proposal Assignments

TB and SES discussed the composition of the two panels (Panel A and B). Panel A will be chaired by SS, Panel B by TB. Members of the committee that have applied for SOSA funding will be assigned to Panel A and Panel B will review these applications. In the past, proposals were assigned to panels based on odd versus even numbering assignments but this is not possible because of the way Vibe numbers proposals and because of changes in some of the numbering of several applications.

Due to time constraints, TB, SS, and IZ concluded that the review of proposals should begin on Nov 4, and that the proposals would therefore be separated into two groups – one group being reviewed on Nov 4 and another on Nov 18. Proposals that were reviewed on Nov 4 will be re-evaluated on Nov 18 to ensure consistency between the two evaluation dates. At a third meeting on Dec 2, the two panels will be together to review their findings and develop final composite scores and rankings.

SS distributed Panel A and Panel B assignments. DV noted that the proposal 112 and 61 were collaborative proposals and therefore should be reviewed in the same panel. It was concluded that SES would review all submissions, checking for any additional collaborative proposals and adjust proposal assignments accordingly. Revised panel assignments would be distributed electronically.

3. Review Procedures Discussion

There was discussion on procedures related to proposal review. Items and conclusions are summarized below:

- a) Reviews are not done on Vibe. Applicants should download documents for review, and they should use the SOSA rubric to record scores.
- b) Panel members will be emailed an Excel file to record their scores. This is to be completed and returned to the panel chair on the Monday before the panel meetings (Nov 2 for the first set of proposals; Nov 16 for the second set of proposals).

c) For proposals that are longer than 3 pages, only the first three pages of the proposal are to be reviewed. Proposals with incorrect font size/margins are not to format and will be treated as proposals that exceed the specified page limit. Proposals missing required final reports are incomplete and will not be reviewed.

d) Proposals are to be reviewed based on the information provided. Annotations are important for understanding the importance of the applicant's scholarly record. Panel members can add context regarding the standards of the discipline, where appropriate.

e) The merits of the proposal are scored based on the criteria outlined in the rubric. Reviewers should be mindful of their personal interests/likes and actively work to review proposals in an unbiased manner.

There was some discussion about the possibility of changing the mechanism of chair and dean acknowledgement, removing the approval process on Vibe and having the email confirmation substitute for this confirmation. This item was tabled for future discussions.

SES 10/21/15