

Annual Report of the University Research Committee: A Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate

Members

Doug Martin (English) – Chair (Fall only)
Rick Fitch (Chemistry) – Secretary (Fall), Chair (Spring)
Yeujian Peng (Mathematics and Computer Science)
Tom Nesser (Physical Education)
Mary Sterling (Family and Consumer Sciences)
Shelley Arvin (Library) – Secretary (Spring)
Carl Klarner (Political Science)
Shawn Phillips (Geography)
Gary Stuart (Life Sciences)
Susan Kray (Communication/Women's Studies –Spring only)

Julie Fine (Liaison to Faculty Senate Executive Committee)
Dawn Underwood (Sponsored Programs, Ex-officio)

Meetings. The committee met four times during the fall semester (10/2, 10/16, 11/2, 12/4) and five times in the spring (1/25, 2/8, 3/21, 3/28, 4/4).

Proposals/Awards. Eight proposals were considered in the fall, of which four were funded for a total of \$20,026.00. Ten were considered in the spring, of which five were funded for a total of \$22,817.97.

Guideline changes. There was significant discussion of the guidelines at the beginning of the year, mostly to clarify points. Two primary and two secondary changes were deemed necessary. The major issues surrounded allowance of summer stipends for spring proposals and inclusion of student stipends as a defined allowable expense. The minor issues were clarification of two points regarding what the URC will not support (textbook writing and dissertation/thesis work), which simply stated that these cannot be the primary purpose. This issue was brought to the Executive Committee and then to the full Senate on two occasions with approval on 3/20.

Charges for 2007-2008

Appoint a representative to the Theodore Dreiser Distinguished Research and Creativity Award Committee. Susan Kray volunteered to serve.

Charges for the coming year. It would be appropriate to take a further look at the guidelines for incongruencies and lack of clarity, especially with respect to what the URC will and will not fund. It would also be appropriate to examine the evaluation instrument and rubric in order to determine if they are adequate or if more equitable ways of assigning merit to proposals is possible. The criteria on the scoresheet are given equal weight and this perhaps overstates technical points relative to substance. It has also been asserted that perhaps a single score from each reviewer might be more appropriate without specific point values given to each criterion.