At the end of the last GFGP meeting (cycle), the Committee identified the need to review the Program with the goal to increase its impact. Hence, a 4-hour meeting commenced at 8AM on February 4th, 2013, in the CCIO Office. Items on the agenda included (but were not limited to): re-examine evaluation criteria and their weights; clarify the program parameters; enhance program marketing, and consider feedback to applicants who do not receive an award.

The Committee reviewed the parameters of the Program, which resulted from an EO containing specific conditions (enrollment growth, growth of diversity, student support and career management, improvements in recruitment and retention of faculty, and maintenance of accreditation).

- The Program resulted from a “meet and confer” with the CFA. The Grad Fee Committee was introduced to administer the Program.
- A review of the Program suggests many success stories, including the SAP initiative resulting in a $500K gift, several research publications, and a grant to study and revise the graduate program.
- Problems include too many research-oriented proposals (with varying quality), the composition of the committee (i.e., the same individual being on the committee for many years), and the indirect mechanism (through department representative) of providing feedback to unsuccessful applicants. With regards to the composition of the committee, the committee agreed that it is up to the Department to send a representative, and it is not the responsibility of the GFGP Committee to determine who would represent the Department.

A very detailed discussion addressed the problems with the Program:

**Should the GFGP be a stand-alone committee? Or should it be dove-tailed into the Faculty Development Committee? Arguments for dove-tailing include: 1) sabbaticals, UGP, and awards are handled by the FDC and some of these are included in grant applications (double dip); 2) it would reduce the number of committee assignments; and 3) the FDC is on track to create a workload system for the CBA.** The Committee then returned to the
reasons for a standalone GFGP: 1) the FDC did not want the responsibility for the additional grant program, 2) the GFGP resulted from a meet and confer with the CFA; 3) the workload of the combined committee would be very heavy; and 4) on balance the results of the Program are positive.

**Action:** The FDC will continue to work on a workload system, and the GFGP will continue to administer the GFG Program, with several changes to address its problems (see below).

**Number of applications and deliverables were then discussed. The average awards to date of $7K were proposed as a barrier to success (too low).**

**Action:** The Committee agreed that the award for selected research projects should increase to up to $15K (*equivalent to the new rate for teaching a course in a specialized program*). But the funds will be disbursed in three phases:

- Start of project - $4K;
- Manuscript submission to a journal – $3K (manuscript to be submitted to the GFGP Committee);
- Publication – A-level journal: $8K maximum; non-A-level journal - $3K.

**Action:** Each department will submit, through its representative, a list of no more than 8 A-level journals to assess this deliverable. The committee will cross-check this list with the Financial Times and the UT-Austin lists, which Deans consult when voting for rankings. While the FT and UT lists provide a reference, each department will provide justification for its list of 8 (e.g., external validation or strategic position of the Department).

If a proposal contains multiple PIs, then it is up to them to divide the funds as they see fit. This decision will be made by the PIs when they accept the award.

**The scoring/evaluation criteria were then discussed. Are we evaluating the appropriate criteria, and is the weight on each criterion appropriate? The Committee noted that these were part of the meet and confer system and any change must be approved by Faculty Affairs.**
**Action: Current criteria/score – Eligibility (must satisfy); Significance (30%); Methodology (20%); Management, including deliverables (20%); and Personnel (30%). New evaluation score: Eligibility (must satisfy); Significance (30%); Methodology (30%); Management, including deliverables and publishing plan (30%); and Personnel (10%).**

This change was approved by Faculty Affairs.

**Communication with unsuccessful applicants.** The current system is a very short letter from the Associate Dean with the up/down recommendation of the Committee. Each representative is then available to meet with unsuccessful applicants to discuss the application/decision at their request.

**Action: The unsuccessful applicant will still have the current option as a resource, but the letter from the Associate Dean will contain a brief explanation for the Committee’s specific decision.**

**Action: A final decision of the Committee, to increase the stature of the program, recipients, and a research culture, is that each successful applicant will present his/her manuscript in a Research Symposium.**

**Applicants can still use the proposal to request assigned time for research.**

**Changes to the evaluation of non-research proposals are still unclear.** One major success story is the SAP initiative. After a brief discussion, the Committee suggested two ideas: the call for the March 15th Cycle (now April 1st, 2013) should remind applicants that non-research proposals are welcome, and encourage applicants to address the criteria of the EO. Once the Strategic Plan of the CBA is finalized, all attempts will be made to identify specific projects which would fit this non-research proposal category. The Committee will also continue to work on a rubric to assess non-research proposals.