

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND POLICIES IN EVALUATING PROPOSALS

The committee will review and evaluate all proposals it receives (by the due date) in a minimum of two meetings. Any proposals which fail to conform to the requirements specified in the guidelines or that do not fall within the committee's definition of research and the funding categories named above will be rejected. The remaining proposals then will be considered individually for approval of funding. In the review and evaluation, the committee will abide by the criteria published in the most recent Guidelines.

One week prior to the first meeting, the chairperson will supply each member of the committee with one copy of each proposal submitted, for initial reading and review. Using the current Research Proposal Evaluation Form each member of the committee will assign points, on a 5-point scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good), to each of the following major criteria: (1) Presentation of the problem, (2) Importance of the project and its relation to the general field, and (3) Specification of procedures sufficient to make the project clearly understandable and defensible.

For travel awards, each member of the committee will assign points, on a '5-point scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good) based on the importance of the travel to the student's scholarship.

First Meeting. At the first meeting to review proposals, the chairperson will instruct the committee members concerning the eligibility of each applicant (questions concerning eligibility may be raised also at this time by committee members). The committee then will discuss and eliminate any proposals that do not fall within the committee's definition of research and the funding categories described above, or that do not follow the published Guidelines requirements.

Following the above discussion, the committee will consider the merits of each qualifying proposal eligible for review in the order in which they were received. The purpose of the first session is to help committee members gain information that will enable them to reach an informed judgment about the quality of each proposal. Members should focus on asking questions that will enable them to gain additional information about specific aspects of each proposal.

Faculty committee members who are representatives of the field or academic unit from whom a proposal was submitted may provide information to answer the questions raised about a proposal. If the committee desires further information or clarification of any proposal, the faculty field representative on the committee will record the questions to which clarifying information is sought, and discuss these with the proposal author(s) before the second meeting of the committee. In the event that the faculty field representative is not present, the chairperson will act as temporary faculty field representative for that proposal and forward all questions to the proposal author(s). The proposal author(s) will have one week to respond to these questions

verbally or in writing, and the information or clarification will be presented to the committee at the subsequent meeting by the faculty field representative.

Questions regarding budget items may be raised by committee members, and the committee will consider whether adequate justification has been supplied for each budget item. At the discretion of the committee, additional information on the budget also may be sought from the proposal author(s). The committee has the right to reduce or deny budget items (by a simple majority of the quorum of voting members).

Second Meeting. At the second meeting of the committee (usually one week later), the proposals will be reviewed once again and the questions reexamined in the light of responses that may have been supplied by the author(s). After a full discussion of the proposals, each committee member will make a final assignment of points based on the criteria specified above. The total points (maximum of 15) assigned to each proposal by each voting member of the committee will be submitted to the chairperson. The chairperson and one assistant will tally the points assigned to each proposal, and then compute an average score for each proposal.

The proposals then will be placed in rank order according to the average score (3 = lowest). This activity may take place at a third meeting of the committee if another meeting is required to complete the evaluations. All proposals will be funded in order of rank, starting with the highest average score, until the allocated funds for that category have been distributed. A cut-off score will be used by the committee.

In the event that a proposal under review has been submitted by a member of the committee, he or she will represent the proposal in the same way he or she would represent any other proposal submitted from his or her field, but will abstain from any vote concerning approval or funding of the proposal.

Decision Review

Any applicant who fails to receive funding may request a written evaluation of the proposal or a statement of the reasons for its rejection by the committee.

Reconsideration and Resubmission of Proposals

Except in the case of a clerical error, the committee's decision to approve, reject, or not to fund any proposal will be considered final, and no proposal will be reconsidered by the committee. However, any proposal that is rejected or not funded may be resubmitted under any subsequent Call for Proposals that the committee issues. Applicants whose proposals are rejected or not funded may wish to request a decision review in accord with section B, above.