

**Research/Creative Activities Committee**  
**Notes from meeting on 2/3/16**

**From:** Richard D McCabe <[mccaber@ecu.edu](mailto:mccaber@ecu.edu)>  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 3, 2016 at 4:14 PM  
**To:** Research/Creative Activities Committee <[RGC@ECU.EDU](mailto:RGC@ECU.EDU)>  
**Subject:** Electronic R/CA Committee Meeting Now Open

Dear colleagues,

We had 4 regular members (8 needed for quorum) and about 4 ex-officio (with vote) so the committee worked on the issues at hand:

GRANT APPROVAL:

1. No disagreement was found with the 4 first choices made by the sub-committees. Therefore, a motion is made:

**Motion 1:** Accept the four proposals, as modified by any subsequently approved motion. (#12, #15, #16 & #19, as per the prior email)

2. As per a prior email, the approved grants left a \$2,192 surplus. The committee considered several ways of using the surplus to fund a good 5th proposal.

In discussing strategy it the committee decided to first ask for additional funding for one grant, to choose a grant that was truly competitive as well as in the lower cost range, where the amount asked for would half or less of the amount needed, in the best hopes of success. This was based on input from administrative members who felt that would be the best strategy given the present funding constraints. It was also decided to select a grant that could likely be trimmed to amount at hand in case no additional funds would be available. It was also noted that there would be less chance of getting funds for a fifth grant if any of the first four were over the \$6,250 maximum, as strongly recommended in the instructions. Administrative faculty felt it would decrease our likelihood of success to get matching funds if the committee funded proposal in excess of the maximum recommended. Therefore, a motion is made:

**Motion 2:** Reduce any grant proposal exceeding the maximum recommended amount to the maximum amount.

In effect, this motion cuts one proposal (#15) from \$6,500 to \$6,250, making the matching fund, making \$2442 available for matching.

In reviewing the grants proposals were found that met the criteria. One of these (#11) was the Health Sciences Sub-committee's second choice and it was further noted that this committee had the most assigned proposals (9) of any sub-committee, and therefore the least chance of funding or applicants. Finally, the committee reviewed the budget. Although deemed appropriate, the committee felt that the Kindles proposed for patient communication and incentive for participation (presently on sale at Amazon for \$49, usually \$79) might be reduced and, if needed, substituted by shared electronic equipment. Therefore, a motion is made:

**Motion 3:** To ask for matching funds to support this a 5th proposal or, failing that, to ask the the proposal author to accept a lessor amount, as available, or, failing that, to return the funds in hopes of getting it put back in next year.

SPACE REALLOCATION POLICY:

In this policy the committee felt that the policy needs to be disseminated widely to faculty. Therefore, the following is proposed:

**Advisory:** It is recommended that each committee member distribute the policy to their constituency to prevent a sense that the faculty had no voice.

I ask that input received from the faculty be summarized and sent to the entire committee.

It was also generally agreed that we ask that a clearly defined appeals process be included in the policy. Therefore a motion is made:

**Motion 4:** Suggest inclusion of a clearly defined appeals process in the policy.

Let's tentatively give a month for input, voting, considering electronic motions.

Thanks,

Richard McCabe