

## University Mini-Grants and Summer Grants (UMSSG) Committee Report

**Presented to:** Faculty Senate, CSULB

**Report Date:** September 12, 2024

**Committee Chair:**

Laura CEIA, PhD

**2023 - 2024 Application Cycle Overview:**

**Summary of Awards Administered:**

During AY 2023-2024, the UMSSG Committee was responsible for evaluating and distributing the following awards:

- Mini Grants: 8 applications, 5 awards
- Summer Stipends: 68 applications, 32 awards
- CBA 20.37 Awards: 44 applicants in 2023, 53 applicants in 2024. The exact number of awards distributed remains confidential and was not shared with the committee; it is understood that recipients were informed individually.

**Committee Members and Responsibilities:**

The committee was divided into five teams, ensuring diversity in evaluation through representation from various departments and colleges.

**Evaluator Teams:**

- **Team 1:** Ping LIN (Accountancy, COB), Sharon TENG (Health Care Admin, CHHS), Sergio MENDEZ (Chemical Engineering, COE), Yada TREESUKOSOL (Psychology, CLA) – Leader
- **Team 2:** Xuemei SU (Management, COB), Darren Johnson (Biological Sciences, CNSM), Emel DEMIRCAN (Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, COE), Ann Kim (Human Development, CLA) – Leader
- **Team 3:** Joseph AUBELE (Library), Selena Nguyen-Rodriguez (Health Science, CHHS), Mariah PROCTOR (Art, COTA), Lily HOUSE-PETERS (Geography, CLA) – Leader
- **Team 4:** Yang LU (Health Care Admin, CHHS), Shametrice Davis (Educational Leadership, CED) – Leader, Karen ROOS (Kinesiology, CHHS), Xuhui Li (Mathematics, CNSM)
- **Team 5:** Jyotsna Pattnaik (Teacher Education, CED), Jason WANG (COTA) – Leader,

**Chair's Responsibilities:**

The Chair's leadership ensured the smooth functioning of the review process. Key responsibilities included:

1. Team organization and work structure: Forming five diverse evaluator teams to ensure fairness and balanced perspectives.

2. Creating standardizing evaluative criteria: In collaboration with Senate Chair Pei-Fang, rubrics were developed for consistent evaluations across all teams.
3. Communication with the Senate and committee members: Maintaining clear communication with both the Senate and committee members regarding deadlines, instructions, and guidelines.
4. Application review: The Chair personally reviewed all applications to ensure thorough consideration.
5. Facilitating reconciliation discussions: Mediating discussions in cases of significant scoring differences among evaluators.

**Review Process:**

1. Individual evaluation: Committee members reviewed assigned applications independently using the rubric.
2. Group reconciliation: Teams discussed score discrepancies, with leaders ensuring consensus.
3. Final consolidation: Leaders submitted reconciled scores to the Chair for final review and submission.

**Fairness and Evaluation:**

The diversity of perspectives within the evaluation teams, along with the structured guidelines, ensured a fair and balanced review process.

**Conclusion and Future Recommendations:**

Under the Chair's leadership, the UMSSG Committee successfully reviewed all applications in both cycles using transparent and consistent methods. The newly developed guidelines will serve as a foundation for future cycles, ensuring ongoing success.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Laura Ceia, PhD  
Chair, UMSSG Committee

**Addendum: Criteria for Scoring CBA 20.37 Applications 2024**

## Criteria for Scoring CBA 20.37 Applications 2024

### PS 18-02

1. Student mentoring, advising, and outreach, especially as these activities *support underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students; and other practices in support of such students, including those caused by cultural taxation.*
2. The development and implementation of high-impact educational practices;
3. Curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success;
4. Service to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty;
5. Assignment to courses where increases in enrollment have demonstrably increased workload;
6. Other extraordinary forms of service to students.

#### **Criterion i: Impact on Student Success and Support**

Score 1: Shows minimal or unclear impact on supporting underserved or at-risk students.

Score 2: Demonstrates some impact but lacks depth or evidence of significant outreach.

Score 3: Has a clear positive impact on underserved or at-risk students, with effective mentoring, advising, or outreach activities.

Score 4: Shows outstanding service with a broad and deep impact on student success, particularly for underserved *first-generation, and/or underrepresented students and other practices in support of such students, including those caused by cultural taxation.*

#### **Criterion ii: Enhancement of Educational Practices and Curricular Design**

Score 1: Little to no evidence of enhancement in educational practices or curricular design.

Score 2: Some implementation of enhanced practices or curricular changes with limited impact.

Score 3: Good implementation of enhanced educational practices or curricular changes that improve student access and success.

Score 4: Exceptional and innovative enhancement of educational practices or curricular design that significantly improves student access and success.

#### **Criterion iii: Service Beyond Normal Faculty Expectations**

Score 1: Service contributions meet only basic expectations of faculty roles.

Score 2: Contributions slightly exceed normal expectations without significant distinction.

Score 3: Clear evidence of service that goes significantly beyond normal faculty expectations, including community service.

Score 4: Exceptional and lasting contributions that go well beyond normal faculty expectations, reflecting a profound commitment to service.