

# **Evaluation of MEG's**

## **Operating Policy**

January 2006

**Objective:** To provide a ranked list of MEG's from the college to the university

### **Principles**

1. The burden on those performing the evaluation should be minimized
2. Chair input is critical as these grants may have a significant impact on students, faculty members, and on the department
3. Blanket selection of a specified number from each department is not equitable because of the uneven distribution of proposals amongst departments

### **Process**

1. Department chairs and associate chairs will evaluate each proposal from their department in each of three areas: 1) intellectual merit, 2) quality of the mentoring experience, and 3) impact on the faculty member(s) and the department. Each area should be evaluated on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being most favorable.
2. Department chairs will also rank the proposals from their department and provide that ranking to the college.
3. The associate dean will take the evaluations and rankings and assemble a composite list for the college. Typically, the departmental ranking will be preserved in the composite list, although the associate dean will work with the department chair to resolve differences if needed. Relative position will be based primarily on the first two criteria, with the third criterion used as a "tie breaker."
4. Proposals that are non-responsive to MEG program as described online will not be considered for funding, irrespective of department recommendation.
5. Because they are involved in the review process, department chairs are not required to submit letters of recommendation.

### **Concern**

Objective evaluation using the full range of the scales is critical. Non-discriminating high evaluations of all proposals may disadvantage a department.