

Submitted by Steve Blair

Present: Chris Hyndman (Art), Kristi Judd (Biology), Tim Brewer (Chemistry), Sam Shen (CMTA), Suchindran Maniccam (Computer Sci.), Wendy Way (DOWL), James Saunoris (ECON). Veronica Grondona (English), Heather Khan (G. and G.), Michael Doan (H. and P.), Steve Blair (Math), Kevin Miller (M. and D.), Marshall Thomsen (Physics), Raymond Rosenfeld (Poli Sci), Angela Staples (Psy), Solanges Simoes (SAC), Beth Currans (WGST), Kathy, Kate Mehuron (Dean), and Jill Dieterle (guest from CAC).

Beth opened the meeting at 3:30pm and introduced a guest (Jill Dieterle) from CAC. Jill distributed a handout with a copy of a memo from CAC to the chair of the URSLC (from 1/7/16) and a record of a CAC recommendation to URSLC from 2/4/16. The CAC recommendation included “that URSLC develop and abide by bylaws that spell out the processes by which the committee works. The processes should be transparent to the university faculty” and “we recommend that a formal method of incorporating college rankings into URSLC be developed (i.e. this should be worth more than the current 5 points out of 100).” She discussed possible inconsistencies between the CCSRL rankings for SRA awards compared to the rankings by URSLC as well as changes in the procedure by which URSLC had previously reviewed applications (note that the URSLC rankings are not yet public but she had partial information concerning them). She discussed the CAC recommendations and asked the CCSRL to consider supporting them as well as making additional recommendations.

The committee began discussing the issue and several members noted frustration and disappointment upon hearing that the college-level rankings contribute so little to the rankings made by the university-level committee. There was also expressed a sense of confusion as to the role of the university committee, specifically whether their role was to merge rankings from different colleges or review all applications from scratch. Beth noted that there were new deadlines this year (likely due to the additional workload caused by inclusion of SRA awards), and that this probably contributed to the change in procedure at the URSLC. In discussion with Jill, members of the committee suggested that the college’s URSLC representatives be selected from CCSRL members (currently only 2 of the four CAS representatives on the URSLC come from the CCSRL).

After more discussion, the following motion was made and seconded: “The CCSRL will ask that the university provide additional funding to ensure that at least the top 25% of SRA applications as ranked at the college-level committees be funded.” The vote for the motion was unanimous. A second motion was made and seconded to support the recommendations made by the CAC to the URSLC (from 2/4/16 as per the handout distributed by Jill). The vote for this motion was also unanimous.

Beth noted that the committee still needs to discuss this matter further, but that no more time was available at the current meeting due to the need to discuss FRF rankings in the two sub-committees. She will look into scheduling another special meeting to continue the discussion of the relationship between college-level and university-level rankings. At 4:20pm Beth had the committee break into sub-committees.