

RAC Meeting 10.6.21 Summary

We focused our conversation on developing scoring procedures for the awards offered this year. We began by looking at the awards tracking document Amanda shared with me earlier this month and said that, in the very least, we would focus on two things this year: developing a process for scoring generally and then developing scoring for internal grants. Albert and others noted that we cannot develop a rubric for external/university level awards because that would have to go through other committees. Holly recommended that we develop a scoring process similar to the grant review panel process. This would include panelists (RAC members) reviewing submitted materials ahead of time, scoring those materials, noting “major” strengths and weaknesses in response to guiding questions, and then coming together to discuss and note final scores. We discussed how perhaps one of the reasons when we tried this with CRIF that there were so many ties was that the point spread was too small so that is a change we will have in the future. Holly shared how OSEP panels work (chunking scores into excellent, very good, etc.). For ROSF, we will try this process out with the concept papers. Holly is making a form and will put it in Qualtrics. As a committee, we felt this would be a good experience for several reasons. First, it will help us have a more consistent process. Second, it will mimic the processes more broadly in the field. Third, it will be a space where the committee can provide feedback to novice grant writers. One question we had for Thomasenia was whether we would be able to give our feedback to the authors of the submission after we make decisions. We feel like this is something that has been missing in the past.

For the ROSF, we are planning to have the concept papers meeting on 11/8 so we can return to OER on 11/9. Many committee members were out for conferences the full week before and we want to give ourselves time to review and offer helpful commentary. I will send a doodle poll for times to make sure that date is feasible. Wanli is submitting for ROSF so Mark Pacheco will take his place.

We also discussed what needs to be done in future meetings. Our November time will be devoted to ROSF but we saw (looking at our goals) that we need to think about alignment with the CBA. We are going to have that on the list to tackle in our December meeting.