1) News and Announcements - None

2) Updates:
   a. AP research report has been forwarded to EC. It may take them a little while to discuss it.
   b. Budget – additional $8,000 granted from the Dean, but that’s likely it for this year.
   c. Brownbags – Jennifer will send Kirstin the e-mail from Dan about who was at the research showcase. Beth will put possible dates on the calendar.

3) Those present voted in favor of funding the current application under review.

4) Discussion on award review criteria and dispersal of funding. The following are rough ideas that were discussed at the meeting

   • Should people get multiple RPC awards?
   • Only one RPC fund per project?
   • Double check which applications might be more appropriate for Research Board funding – require this before funding (during application?)
   • Cap of $5,000? What about $4,000
   • Unternureds can get XX per year, tenured can get XX per year?
   • What about emeritus funding?
   • Take a lead from the research board – what about external grant funding
   • What are the needs that we are trying to face and
   • How do we prioritize with rolling application review
   • We have a peer review process, sorta.
   • What is the mode for amounts
   • One pot dedicate to rolling applications and one chunk dedicated to larger proposals
   • Could we portion out the budget over the budget year?
   • Could we just plan to expend our funds by April and not wait until summer. – just changing how we promote and the fact that funds are typically spend out by Feb/March and that there typically aren’t funds left for May/June
   • What about funding emeritus?
   • Need to encourage external funding sources – including sites outside of the university NEH digging into data, NEH digital humanities, Microsoft Fdn, Gates
Fdtn, some people apply to RPC b/c it’s easy and fast $$, but with a little bit of effort, other options might be more appropriate and be better dossier fodder.

- Beth, Jennifer, Jim Hahn, Kathie V and maybe others could work on a summer forum on small grant opportunities. Grants within different professional organizations?
- OVCR – proposal development office under construction – the campus is working on this too, so help is coming from the campus level. Picture may change in our favor soon.

In general, the committee felt that the most approach would be to announce that we plan on spending out our funds by April of each year and that any funds available after that are not guaranteed. If that approach alone does not alleviate the draw on our funds, we should consider some approach to limiting the amount of funding to individuals, but will need to consider how this might be applied with respect to joint application.

5) Policy on abstentions:
   The following instances were agreed to be common reasons for a committee member to abstain from discussion and voting on an application, however, abstention is at the request of the committee member and is never obligatory.
   - Direct Supervisors or close co-workers
   - Personal Relationships
   - Peer Review Committee members

6) Website review is largely completed, but Lisa and Jennifer need to discuss how best to update the “outcomes” page.

Parking Lot

   a. Review/Update RPC forms