



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

Policy on Mini-Grant review

Policy #: SP 11-14 (supersedes #07-15)

Drafted By: Faculty Affairs Committee 2011-2012: Daniel Lee (Chair), Matthew Cook, Virgil Adams, Bob Bleicher, Minder Chen, Nancy Mozingo, and Luda Popenhagen

Applicability: This policy applies to California State University Channel Islands (CI) full-time lecturers, probationary, and tenured faculty.

Purpose: To create a process for the evaluation and ranking of Mini-Grants.

Mini-Grant review committee (MRC)

The Mini-Grant review committee is charged with reviewing, evaluating merit, and rank ordering meritorious applications.

Duties of MRC:

- The MRC shall meet to establish evaluation criteria, the application process, and procedures for the review, evaluation and rating of Mini-Grants.
- Criteria for evaluating proposals should be clearly specified prior to the annual announcement of the request for proposals. However, the MRC shall have the ability to alter criteria from year to year.
- The MRC shall work with the appropriate administrator to generate announcements regarding availability of awards and deadlines.
- The MRC shall review, discuss, and rate mini-grant proposals and make award recommendations to the appropriate administrator.
- The MRC shall provide a brief written rationale accounting for the ranking it gives to each proposal. If a proposal is deemed to lack merit and is consequently not ranked, a written rationale shall be provided to the faculty applicant.

Evaluation Criteria:

- The MRC shall evaluate the relative coherency, clarity, and general academic quality of each proposed project in the following specific areas: stated goals and anticipated outcomes, contextual significance of research or creative project, research plan and methodology, and anticipated method for disseminating results or measuring a successful outcome.
- The MRC shall evaluate how effectively the grant writer describes how the requested funding will contribute to professional development needs. For example, professional



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

Policy on Mini-Grant review

- development may take the form of publishing scholarly work, participation in academic conferences, improving teaching effectiveness, or other reasonable forms.
- With the exception of probationary faculty, faculty shall be given lower priority for an award if they were granted a Mini-Grant in the preceding year.
 - The MRC shall carefully consider the status of each grant writer (lecturer, probationary, or tenured faculty member) and strive to achieve a reasonable balance across statuses as it establishes a final order by rank. Special consideration may be given to probationary faculty.

Composition of MRC:

The Mini-Grant review committee shall be an Academic Senate standing committee consisting of tenured and probationary faculty and shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty. The Mini-Grant review committee shall include seven members, representing each of the major disciplinary areas within the university: i.e., Arts & Humanities, Math and Sciences, Behavioral & Social Sciences, Business and Economics, Library/Counselors, Education, and one lecturer. The Faculty Development Director shall be an *ex officio* member of the committee. If an area does not have a representative, an at-large representative shall be elected. The election of the MRC shall take place at the same time as the election of other Academic Senate standing committees.

Each member shall serve for a term of one year. Members of the committee are not eligible to apply for Mini-Grants during the term of committee service.

Award Decisions

The appropriate administrator shall allocate available funding for Mini-Grants and announce selected awards based on recommendations from the MRC. If the administrator modifies the rank order as suggested by the MRC, the MRC should be informed of the decision and the rationale for it.

Appendix

While retaining flexibility in establishing procedures from year to year, the MRC may refer to the attached model application form.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

Policy on Mini-Grant review

Appendix: Model Application Form

(DRAFT) Mini-Grant Proposal Application

Deadline for mini-grant submission is Sunday midnight, DATE.

COVER PAGE

Enter TITLE here:

Enter AUTHOR(S) and their disciplines here:

Enter KEY WORDS for INDEXING (Minimum of 2, maximum of 5) here.

Enter ABSTRACT (250 words maximum) here.

Does this mini-grant lay groundwork for a proposal for further external funding ___Yes ___No



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

Policy on Mini-Grant review

BODY OF PROPOSAL – THREE PAGE LIMIT BEGINS HERE. THE LIMIT DOES NOT INCLUDE COVER PAGE.

1. Describe the goals and anticipated outcomes here. Use subheading "Goals and Anticipated Outcomes." After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the evaluative criteria that follows in boxes.

a. The goals of the proposal are well defined

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The anticipated outcomes are consistent with the goals.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

c. The proposal delineates how the project will help the faculty member(s) succeed in the RTP process, or it articulates an instructional improvement project with research to evaluate the effect.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

2. Describe the contextual significance of research or creative project. Use subheading "Contextual Significance." After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the following evaluative criteria.

a. The proposal demonstrates how the project relate to other research/creative activities in your discipline.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. Research is described in a way that others from outside your discipline can understand it.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

3. Describe the research plan and methodology. Use subheading "Research Plan and methodology."

a. The plans and procedures are appropriate for the anticipated outcomes

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The plans and procedures describe the activities of the investigator(s) and any student assistants.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

4. Describe the Professional Development Benefits of the Project here. Use subheading "Project Benefits." After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the following evaluative criteria.

a. The proposal makes explicit the benefits to the professional development of the investigator(s)

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The project describes the benefits to the larger (i. e. campus, local, professional) community.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

5. Describe here how you plan to disseminate the results of your project. Use subheading "Dissemination of results." After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the following evaluative criteria.

a. The proposal clearly identifies how the outcomes of the work will be disseminated and to whom.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The level of dissemination is appropriate for the goals and anticipated outcomes.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CHANNEL ISLANDS ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY

Policy on Mini-Grant review

6. Succinctly provide the timelines for enacting the proposed project here. Use subheading "Timelines." After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the following evaluative criteria.

a. The activities are attainable within the timeline of the proposal.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The work to be conducted during the funded period is clearly outlined.

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

7. Succinctly provide the budget for the proposed project here. Use subheading "Proposed Budget." (Note: Consult Academic Resources for current CI faculty assigned time rate (www.csuci.edu/academicresources/). Use these figures for course release. After you write this section, do a self check of its meeting the following evaluative criteria.

a. The budget justifies the resources requested based on the goals of the project

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

b. The budget request is appropriate and reasonable based on the goals of the project

Persuasively articulated (4)	Articulated (3)	Vaguely described (2)	Not evident (1)
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Be sure to answer the following. If your project needs IRB approval, apply for that approval as soon as possible. Items below are not part of the rating but must be completed prior to award of mini-grant.

Are human subjects involved? ___ Yes ___ No
If "YES," has IRB approved the project? ___ Yes ___ No