



COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY
(CRSCA)

MEETING DATE: Thursday, October 2nd, 2025, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom
[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#)

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Michelle Gravier, Surrendra Sarnikar, Omri Shimron, Benjamin Smith, Jiannan Wang, Ya You, Chandra Khan, Michael Stanton

Guests: Mark Robinson

Absent: Jenny Hazlehurst

1. Approval of the agenda - motion Omri Shimron, seconded Surendra Sarnikar. Approved.
2. Report of the Presidential Appointee (partially closed session)
 - a. [Shutdown messaging](#)
 - i. Business as usual. Only challenge is that we cannot reach or talk to anyone if we have questions about a grant - they are not working.
 - b. 2 new grant awards
 - i. [Think By the Bay](#)
 1. Submitted to Dept of Ed for almost 2.2 million. Huge for our campus.
 - ii. Project IMPACT for Student Affairs, PI Pamela Baird, to support veteran students (\$1.4 M in total funding for 5 years)
3. Approval of [9/18/25 draft minutes](#) - move to approve by Benjamin Smith, seconded by Omri Shimron. Approved.
4. [Land Acknowledgement](#) - read by Benjamin Smith
5. **Reports**
 - a. Report of the Chair
 - i. Welcome, new CRSCA member, Omri Shimron, from Dept of Music! Still have CSCI and lecturer vacancies
 1. Interested faculty should email Mark/Senate and he will forward to ExCom.
 - ii. [25-26 CRSCA 1 RSCA Mini-Grant Call for Proposals](#) sent to Ex-Com following committee approval via email vote and was accepted as an Information Item.
 1. Smith - no reason it can't already be open, since just information item. Will share widely.
 2. Will close on October 30th after which will assign to committee members to review.



- iii. Status of seating RSP: no committee volunteers or emails from other faculty. Reach out again or not seat this year.

1. Smith - since President is putting together so many working groups this year that is already a lot of the things we would be dealing with on this subcommittee, might be worth not seating this year. Sarnikar and Stanton agree. Gravier - OSCAR workgroup might also cover some of potential RSP duties. Maybe task force can help coordinate some of those efforts.

- iv. [WAGS/ProQuest awards](#)

1. 4 categories, can nominate up to 1 recent graduate in each category. 1-page letter of interest due on Monday, final packet due Friday. Smith - is there a reason it has to be Monday? Gravier - could be Tuesday if we don't get any other nominations in a category.

- v. Continue to spread the word about other RSCA events including Drop-in Grant Coaching Hours hosted by Linda Dobb and Sarah Nielson

- b. Report of the Subcommittees

- i. None

6. Business

- a. None

7. Discussion

- a. Any changes to RSCA Support Grant?

- i. [24-25 CRSCA 1](#): Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Support Grant (RSG) Program Call for Proposals

- ii. [Policy on Faculty RSCA Grants](#) Gravier - timeline - try to get call out by November with deadline in January, allow 3-4 weeks for review, then score and discuss in session to develop formal recommendations, put forth to provost, and then send out awards by April in time for appeals since that is when committee is wrapping up and have to hold a special session. We get feedback every year, so these are points of feedback.

- iii. Training for reviewers?

1. Gravier - typically put out a call, and then run an online training session to help calibrate reviews. Suggestion was for additional reviewer training. Considering that it's difficult to recruit enough reviewers given our current policy - we have to have 3 separate reviewers, 1 of whom is in the same college, and 2 from other colleges, randomly assigned. Tend to get a lot of submissions from College of Science so have to get a lot of reviewers from outside the college, for example. Sense is that people wouldn't want to review if there were a lot of extra requirements.



-
2. UDO Wong-Lau offered to lead a training for proposal reviewers to share common psychological biases. Gravier - maybe training could be recorded and available asynchronously? Smith - any requirements should be in the call for reviewers, but don't need to be a specific policy change. This has been floated multiple times, so why hasn't this been done before?
 3. Gravier - not sure that specific suggestion came up last year, but the addition of reviewer orientation and some modifications/clarifications to the rubric were instituted. Smith - we have a hard time recruiting. The more requirements, the harder it will be, but might be middle ground. Have UDO create a video and provide examples that have already been scored and explains why it got a specific score. So, lean towards providing a docket of resources, at least piloting that and see if that helps before we jump into making it mandatory. Sarnikar - agree that it will be a problem if we make people do too many things. Smith - invite UDO to next meeting. Usually topic area bias. Maybe have training for CRSCA about how we review the reviews? Sarnikar - like idea of mandatory training for committee, but optional for reviewers. What about dropping the lowest score for everyone? Smith - would solve problems, but we would need to increase the number of reviewers, and that's not feasible.
 - iv. Include "realistic plan for leveraging proposed activities into future funding from external sources" into scoring rubric (from FSG policy)
 1. Smith - briefly address 4-6 historical context. 4 is legacy inclusion from prior versions of the policy. Has been subject to disagreement, some people feel that this disadvantages types of research that might not have as many funding opportunities traditionally. In the policy, but hasn't been implemented because of the push-back.
 2. Gravier - wouldn't require a policy change since it's in the policy, but language allows it to not be considered in scoring. Sarnikar - maybe it should be in the rubric this year, given the funding environment, since large amount of award funds come from indirects so would address sustainability. Smith - in this climate, since funding is uncertain, what can we consider realistic? Sarnikar - yes, but funding is always uncertain. There can at least be a plan, and judged on how well it's designed, not on probability of success. Stanton - make that part of the instructions, to give examples of kinds of funding. Gravier - maybe we can think of ways that are not directly related to applying for grant funds, but how the award or product would make them more competitive for funding, so "plans for future funding or candidacy for future funding." Smith - as long as it's framed well, could be nice compromise that's likely to reduce bias. Shimron - from arts perspective agree, but should be specific that it can include programmatic funding to put on an event, etc. Stanton - agree, it's another



-
- opportunity to remind people of resources. Sarnikar - don't want adding this to come at the cost of student involvement.
- v. Requirement to review for awardees? Would require 1 year "sit-out" period
 - 1. Smith - dropped from policy because claim that this creates an insular group and biases who gets the awards. Also had hard time enforcing.
 - vi. Change to selection of reviewers?
 - 1. E.g., reviews methods expertise, within/external college
 - 2. Would require a change to FSG Policy item 6.3
 - 3. Smith - this was implemented because of complaints that reviewers from inside the college was introducing bias (specifically, lots of applications from College of Science and reviewers from College of Science). Important to emphasize selection of reviewers to applicants - "must be written for a general audience."
 - 4. Gravier - do we want to change page limits to allow more space for explaining more complex methods. No interest. Adding burden for reviewers.
 - vii. Scoring for student involvement (# of students? Funding?)
 - 1. Gravier - less consistent scoring for considering number of students versus depth of involvement and whether funding was provided for students. Need to clarify what we mean by mentoring plan.
 - 2. Smith - maybe consider it like two categories; number of students and depth of involvement. Is there a way to balance these considerations. Some guidance about what we mean by student involvement. Shimron - reference the mentoring plan perhaps in the rubric because right now it's too general.
 - b. Look at [2028-34 Academic Calendars](#) and note any concerns or suggestions
 - i. Don't need to keep on agenda - will be moving to shared academic calendar.
 - c. Guests to invite?
 - i. Suggestion at first meeting to invite new Director of Grant Administration, Mike Kusiak
8. Adjournment - no longer at quorum