

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY COMMITTEE

- I. Date: May 4, 1984
To: James LeRoy Smith, Chair of Faculty
From: Margie Lee Gallagher, Chair of Research/Creative Act. Com.
- II. Membership:
Susan McDaniel, representative for Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Robert Franke, representative for Vice Chancellor for Inst. Advancement
Joe Boyette, dean of the Graduate School
Collette Dilworth, English
Roger Eldridge, Education
Margie Gallagher, Home Economics
Umesh Gulati, Business
Robert Hause, Music
Ruth Katz, Library Services
Joong Ho Kim, Mathematics
Chia-yu Li, Chemistry
Larry Means, Psychology
Eugene Ryan, dean of Arts and Sciences
Grant Somes, Allied Health
Ken Wilson, Sociology/Anthropology/Economics
- III. Committee meetings
September 27. Lanier, Dilworth, Gowen (on leave), Katz
October 14. No quorum
November 1. Kim
November 11. Dilworth, Means, Li, Somes
November 21.
January 13. Katz, Dilworth, Wilson
February 24.
- IV. The committee reported to the Senate November 15 at which time the Senate approved the revised criteria and March 27 concerning proposals for recommendation to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- V. The Chair of the Faculty asked the committee to write into its charge the administration of summer research stipends. It was the opinion of the committee that Section 4.A. of the revised charge dated October 13, 1981, covers all research funds including summer stipends.
- VI. The committee functioned as a whole in its major task of evaluating and ranking proposals. Every member read and ranked each proposal. To do this effectively, every member had their own copy of the proposals. The committee had two subcommittees for annual review of criteria and evaluation procedures. Ruth Katz chaired the subcommittee which reviewed the call, the criteria, instructions and proposal form. Roger Eldridge chaired the subcommittee which reviewed procedures for evaluation (see comments below). These committees and their chairs deserve recognition for their outstanding work.
- VIII. Outlined below are the actions completed or begun but not yet completed by the Research/Creative Activity Committee in the 1983-84 academic year.
 - A. Annual review of criteria, forms and procedures for soliciting,

evaluating and recommending research/creative activity proposals to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

1. Proposal forms. The proposal form was revised to eliminate extraneous information and to emphasize the limit to length of proposals.
2. Criteria and guidelines. The criteria and guideline forms were revised to separate clearly criteria for evaluation from guidelines for preparing proposals.
3. Call form.
4. Evaluation Form. For the first time, the committee used an uniform evaluation form for all proposals. This form provides a means for obtaining a numerical score from each individual for each proposal. The score is based on the following factors: 1) investigator's experience with new investigators receiving 3 points more than experienced investigators, etc.; 2) criteria of excellence (based directly on criteria previously described); and 3) whether the budget expenditures were supported in the proposal.
5. Calendar for review. In order to facilitate the work of the committee and to get proposal recommendations to the Vice Chancellor's office as soon as possible, the committee adopted a calendar for 1983-84. This procedure worked very well. Additionally, the committee in collaboration with the Teaching Grants Committee has adopted a general calendar so that faculty will know when to expect calls and when to expect due dates.
6. Proposal evaluation was completed using the following steps:
 - a) All proposals were absolutely due at 5:00 p.m. January 23, 1984. (Recommend 4:00 p.m. in the future)
 - b) Committee members had until February 17 to read individually, evaluate and score all proposals. Each member also recommended budget by line item.
 - c) The secretary prepared a summary of all scores, rank proposals with #1 receiving the highest score, etc. The summary also included the average recommended budget by line item.
 - d) The committee met on February 24 to decide if all proposals met criteria and to discuss all proposals. After this discussion, each committee member had until March 2, 1984, to submit final evaluations making changes if they so desired.
 - e) The secretary then ranked all proposals again by score and also averaged budget recommendations.
 - f) All proposals reviewed were recommended by rank to the Vice Chancellor. Action of the committee was reported to the Faculty Senate at the March meeting.
 - g) Each person who submitted a proposal received written notification of the action of the committee. Persons who had proposals reviewed by the committee received written notification of the rank of their proposal, the recommended budget, and a summary of the evaluation. Information was sent only to the investigator; no record of the evaluation summary exists except that sent to the investigator. Persons not reviewed received a letter explaining why.

The committee, for the first time, gave written feedback to persons writing proposals. This process seems to have worked well. The committee also used standard evaluation sheets. The scores on these sheets were used to rank proposals instead of votes in committee. The procedures saved hours of committee time.

VIII. None

IX. Issues to be addressed next year:

- 1) Clarify the meaning of full-time ECU faculty versus full-time faculty status.
- 2) Make it clear that the committee does not fund publication costs. Perhaps delete that line item from the budget.
- 3) What do we do about investigators who receive funding but never spend it.
- 4) Decide how the committee will handle summer stipend proposals.
- 5) Clarify who and when persons qualify for summer stipend. For example, proposal money can only apply to salaries for first summer session. Persons on 12-month appointments cannot apply. Persons teaching full time first summer session cannot apply.
- 6) A motion was made and passed at the September 2, 1983, meeting that the committee report to the Faculty Senate on the distribution and funding of proposals since 1978. Such a report has not been given yet.
- 7) How does the committee handle money reimbursement?

X. Evaluation of the committee

- A. Structure: given the diverse nature of research and creative activity on the campus, it is appropriate for the committee structure to be diverse. It is important that persons submitting proposals to the committee recognize the diversity of the committee. The committee recognizes that each member has a different background on personal bias.
- B. The committee works effectively and conscientiously as it has for the previous years when I have seen it function. However, this year it also functioned effectively which it has not in the past. By using standard evaluation forms and using scores from the forms to rank proposals instead of committee vote, individuals spent their time in evaluating proposals instead of coming to terms and compromises with each other's biases.

XI. The committee must continue to provide as unbiased as possible evaluation of proposals. I have found that not submitting a proposal of my own helps me immensely. Perhaps the committee should restrict proposal submissions from its members.