**SOSA Committee**

**Wednesday, February 4, 2015, 1:30pm**

**Loser Room 116**

**Present:** Bennett (minutes), Bush-Wallace (Chair), Cathell, Hustis, Kirnan, Mawhinney, Papamichail,

Van der Heijden, Zake

1. Minutes from December 03, 2014 meeting were approved with one minor addition.
2. Review of Fall 2014 application and award statistics: A spreadsheet was distributed with summary statistics of awardees [59 two-year awards and 6 one-year awards; 3 of the two-year awardees have also accepted sabbatical awards, and will therefore forgo one year of their two-year SOSA awards], including breakdowns of awardees by school/library affiliation and by academic rank. Notification letters to all applicants (awardees and non-awardees) will be sent out this week.
3. Review of 2015-2017 SOSA RFP: The committee began its discussion of suggested changes to bring forward to CFA to assist in its (CFA’s) upcoming substantive review of the SOSA application and evaluation process. Highlights included:
   1. Enhancements to support a more streamlined, fully-online process for submitting SOSA applications.
   2. Removal from the RFP of language concerning the mission and principles behind SOSA; and the composition and processes of the SOSA committee. The application requirements and application process would be the focus of the RFP; supporting information would be incorporated by reference, and easily discoverable.
   3. Modifications to the scoring process (and related evaluation rubric) to give effect to the accepted understanding that applicants are—as evidenced by having been hired into a faculty position at TCNJ—qualified to undertake the proposed scholarly work.
   4. Modifications to the evaluation rubric that would condense the current point scale, which comprises 5 (out of 7) levels of “not-bad”ness.
   5. Combining of two separate, but similar, evaluation categories: “expected scholarly …outcomes” and “potential for the proposed work to yield tangible scholarly …outcomes “.
   6. Separation of one evaluation category that assesses two distinct items [“Importance/significance to the discipline and to applicant’s ongoing scholarly … program…”] into two categories.

A lively discussion ensued.

**Action item:** J B-W will prepare a draft revised evaluation rubric for review and discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50pm