Research Committee Meeting
March 12, 2015       3:00 – 3:45 PM
Room 200, Sciences Complex

Minutes (draft!)

Members present: Drs. Kirsten Underwood, William Carney, John Morris, A. Johari, and P.K. Das (Chair).
Members not attending: Drs. Terry Conley and Anton Wohlers

1. The meeting started on time at 3:00 p.m.

2. Approval of last meeting’s minutes
   The minutes of the October 3, 2014 meeting were distributed and read. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Discussions/Deliberations
   The Chair made the members in attendance aware of the principal item on the agenda, namely, reviewing and probably refining the submission criteria for grants (especially those that deal with STEM v. those that deal with scholarly activities). Discussions followed based on the current versions of the guidelines of two categories, i.e., maximum $500 and more than $500. Dr. Morris brought to the attention of the committee the recent additions (underlined) to both guidelines. After some discussion, it was unanimously observed that the updated guidelines and criteria were detailed and reasonable enough. In particular, the inclusion of student collaborative opportunities in more-than-$500 proposals was appreciated. No further additions were considered necessary.
   Dr. Das brought up the question of using separate sets of criteria for STEM proposals and those from non-STEM disciplines (e.g., humanities, music, and business). The committee deliberated that there was no need for such separate sets of guidelines or criteria. Dr. Morris pointed out the ease with which the merits of 11 more-than-$500 research proposals in varied categories was judged the committee using the common set of guidelines.

4. Miscellaneous Items
   a) Dr. Underwood initiated a discussion on innovation as a judging criterion for a research proposal. While innovation was considered to be an important component of proposal, the committee pointed out the caution to be exercised to determine the innovative aspects of proposed research.
   b) Dr. Johari suggested that a well-written research proposal be provided as a model for prospective applicants. The committee concurred with him.
   c) Dr. Johari suggested that new faculty members be invited to attend research committee meeting as observers. The committee concurred with him.
   d) In the light of the possibility that the present meeting would be the last one for the current school year, the Chair suggested that its minutes be approved by the attending committee members by e-mail. The committee agreed.

5. Date for next meeting: No more meeting was anticipated for the current school year.

6. Meeting adjourned – 3:45 p.m.