COMMITTEE: Research & Creative Activities

MEETING DATE: October 8, 2014

PERSON PRESIDING: Jay Newhard

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Christy Ashley, Jason Brinkley, Katie Ford, Megan Janke, Sitawa Kimuna, Richard McCabe, Jay Newhard

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ali Al-Sharadqah, Chal Benson, Patricia Crane, Qin Ding, Ernie Marshburn

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: —

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Old Business – The Copyright PRR is approved and contained on the PRR web site. Major changes made by RCAC include: (a) editing the Faculty Manual definitions so that they are the same as the definitions in the PRR; (b) editing the Copyright Committee’s composition based on what is in the PRR; and (c) including a link to the PRR at the beginning of that section of the Faculty Manual. The task of reviewing the sections of the Faculty Manual on copyrights have been added to the agenda of the Committee on Copyrights, and may be sent back to RCAC if there are any issues especially concerning research or creative activities.

Discussion: If revised, make sure that it goes back to the Attorney’s office. It may be sent back to us if there are any issues, but otherwise completed business.

Action Taken: N/A

Assigned additional duties to: N/A

Agenda Item: Announcement of the competition for the 2014-2015 awards

Discussion: Define what “major changes” means on page 2 under “Other Restrictions”. Possibly strengthen the language related to pursuing IRB approval (similar to NSF, NIH) that you have already submitted IRB. It currently states that funding is contingent upon approval (bottom of page 2). Very little leverage after funding received to ensure that this happens. (Marshburn) Move the conditions for this upfront (Tricia) – make the contingency of funding a separate bullet so this stands out.

Issue of return on the investment of effort – on the committee as well as the applicants – given the reductions in the amount of funding due to budget. The rationale for not changing the guidelines has been that the hope is our funding levels will return to previous levels soon. Include East-West grant on
the list of exclusions.

Number of awards – 4 – recommended one per each subcommittee (area) – not committed to this, but if there are good awards from each subcommittee area, we do not want to ignore the needs. The standardized rankings in the whole pool have seemed to work themselves out and this hasn’t been an issue in the past. Budget only considered in terms of how well it is justified – focus is on meritorious work.

This proposal system is for things that may not go to the next area of funding (external grant) – page 4 “B” expected outcomes & benefits. Section “G” – Vita or Biosketch. Discussion about addressing the language in the stipends Section “J” – budget justification (e.g., course buyout, how much make for the time spent on the project, etc) – didn’t want to standardize this – but make sure that they have to justify their stipend even if that is all they request and add a line for this in the budget form (Change research assistants to personnel on item 1).

Due date – Tuesday, January 6th (week before classes start). 1 paper copy & electronic copy of submission required; if submitting a CD/DVD have to provide 6 copies with the paper copy of the proposal; look into Sharepoint for submission management; change page limit on item checklist from 8 to 5 on page 10. Need to change that it goes to “Chief Research Officer” instead of the Office of Vice Chancellor for Research (pg 3).

Add a checkbox of where they think their proposal best fits in terms of the 4 subcommittees (Item #11 on the application cover page)

Subcommittees will stand as listed in Appendix A.

Scheduling information sessions – have 1 or 2 committee members present; possibility of an online session (e.g., Saba Meeting). In the announcement can include the funding success/acceptance rate

Action Taken:

Assigned additional duties to:

NEXT MEETING: November 12, 2014

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED: