

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY COMMITTEE

- I. Date: April 28, 1986
To: Kenneth Wilson, Chair of Faculty
From: Roger G. Eldridge, Jr., Chair of R/CA Committee

II. Membership:

Trenton Davis, Representative for Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Robert Franke, Representative for Vice Chancellor for Institutional
Advancement
Joseph Boyette, Dean of the Graduate School
John Bort, Sociology, Anthropology & Economics
Roger G. Eldridge, Jr., School of Education
George Evans, Chemistry
Margie L. Gallagher, School of Home Economics
Greg Givens, School of Allied Health & Social Professions
Umesh Gulati, School of Business
Ruth Katz, Library Services
Masao Kishore, Mathematics
Edward Leahy, Geography and Planning
Brian McMillen, School of Medicine
Eugene Ryan, Philosophy
Kim Smith, English

III. Committee Meetings:

September 18, 1985	Davis
October 2, 1985	Givens, Leahy, Katz
October 9, 1985	Gallagher, Ryan
January 15, 1986	Davis, Katz, Kishore
February 12, 1986	
February 19, 1986	
March 5, 1986	Evans, Givens, Smith
April 16, 1986	Bort, Givens, Gulati, Leahy, Ryan, Smith

- IV. The R/CAC reported to the Faculty Senate on October 15, 1985 to provide Senators with the new application form for 1986/87 grants and to announce a workshop for writing grants to be conducted by R/CAC. On April 22, 1986 the R/CAC provided the Senators with a list of recommended grants for funding by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

- V. None

- VI. The R/CAC functioned as a whole in its major task of evaluating and ranking proposals. Each member read and ranked each proposal. To accomplish this task effectively all members received a copy of each proposal. Several subcommittees were formed during the year. Margie Gallagher chaired a subcommittee to re-evaluate Academic Year Grant Proposal Criteria, Guidelines and Evaluation Form for 1986/87. Brian McMillan chaired the subcommittee to re-evaluate the Summer Stipend Proposal Criteria, Guidelines, and Evaluation Form for Summer 1986. Robert Franke chaired the subcommittee charged to investigate the need for a grant writing workshop for faculty seeking R/CAC funds. George Evans chaired a subcommittee that had as a purpose the collection of information about the effects of R/CAC grants given to the faculty from 1980-1985. These subcommittees and their chairs deserve recognition for their outstanding efforts.

VIII. Identified below are the actions completed by the R/CAC in the 1985/86 Academic year.

A. Annual review of the criteria, guidelines, forms and procedures for soliciting, evaluating and recommending R/CA proposals to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

1. Proposal Forms: The Academic Year and Summer Stipend proposal forms were revised to clarify the kind of content needed in the proposals and to simplify the cover page. The Summer Stipend form differs from the Academic Year form only in that the summer form requests no information about budgets.
2. Criteria and Guidelines: The criteria and guidelines were totally reorganized under four categories:
 - a) preparation; b) submission; c) evaluation and d) stipulations of granting. No new criteria or guidelines were added.
3. Call Form: Both Academic Year and Summer Stipend forms were sent out on the same day and both had the same deadline date.
4. Evaluation Form: A uniform evaluation form was used for all proposals. Forms for both Academic Year Grants and Summer Stipends were totally revised this year. Numerical scoring was changed to reflect a greater emphasis on:
 - a) the problem statement and b) the methodology section.

A much less emphasis was placed on the evaluation of the budgets of each proposal. The method for identifying the status of the applicant and the points for the status category were changed.
5. Calendar for Review: To facilitate the work of the R/CAC and to present proposal recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs as early in March as possible, the R/CAC adopted a calendar for 1985/86. This procedure worked well. Additionally, the R/CAC in collaboration with the Teaching Grants Committee adopted a general calendar for call and deadline dates.
6. Grant Writing Workshops: This year the R/CAC conducted two one hour workshop sessions for faculty to explain the reorganized application form and to clarify the procedures and requirements for applying for R/CA funds. The workshops were held on November 6 and 7, 1985. A total of 38 faculty attended the workshop sessions.

7. Proposal Evaluation: Evaluation of proposals was completed using the following steps:

- a) All proposals were due at 5:00 p.m., January 13, 1986.
- b) R/CAC members had until February 5, 1986 to read, evaluate and score each academic year proposal. R/CAC members had until February 12, 1986 to read, evaluate and score each summer stipend proposal.
- c) The R/CAC Secretary prepared a summary of all Academic Year Proposal scores and placed the proposals in rank with #1 receiving the highest score, etc.
- d) On February 12, 1986 the R/CAC met to discuss the merits of the Academic Year Proposals. After this discussion, each Committee member had until February 19, 1986 to submit final evaluations making changes if he/she so desired.
- e) The R/CAC Secretary prepared a summary of all scores and placed the proposals in rank order with #1 receiving the highest score, etc.
- f) The R/CAC met on February 19, 1986 to discuss the merits of the Summer Stipend Proposals. After this discussion each Committee member had until February 25, 1986 to submit final evaluations of Summer Stipend Proposals.
- g) Based on Committee member evaluations, the R/CAC Secretary rank-ordered all the Academic Year Proposals by score and all of the Summer Stipend Proposals by score.
- h) Both Academic Year and Summer Stipend Proposals reviewed were recommended by rank to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Action by the R/CAC was reported to the Faculty Senate at the April meeting.
- i) Each person who submitted either an Academic Year and/or Summer Stipend Proposal received written notification of the action of the R/CAC. Persons submitting academic year proposals received written notification of the rank of their proposal, the recommended budget, and a summary of the evaluation. Persons submitting Summer Stipend Proposals received written notification of the rank of their proposal and a summary of the evaluation. Information was sent only to the investigator. Summary evaluations are on file in the Faculty Senate Office.

The process outlined above worked very well. Again this year, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs did not reveal a total amount of money to be awarded by the R/CAC. A total of 30 Academic Year Proposals were received. The R/CAC voted to fund a total of 20 Academic Year Proposals or 67% of those received. A total of 14 Summer Stipend Proposals were received and four Summer Stipends were awarded.

B. The Chair of the R/CAC was directed by the Chair of the Faculty to form a university-wide committee for the purpose of establishing a research policy statement for ECU. The statement is to be based on existing written policy statements, policy not written but understood, state and federal regulations affecting university reserach, and the development of policy statements for areas in which none presently exist. Ten individuals were appointed:

- a) 2 representatives from the University Administration
- b) 2 representatives of the Medical School
- c) 3 representatives from the Professional Schools
- d) 3 representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences

The Committee met regularly after February 1986 and has formulated a rough outline for the policy areas to be addressed.

VIII. None

IX. Issues to be addressed next year:

- 1) To develop a plan for grant-writing workshops for all faculty members interested in applying for R/CAC grants.
- 2) To refine the data collection process for studying the effects of grants given to University Faculty 1980-85 as concerns publications, presentations, works, shows, etc.
- 3) To develop appropriate categories for grouping the effects data and filing a summary report with the Faculty Senate
- 4) To conduct a re-evaluation of the proposal criteria, guidelines, and evaluation form for the 1986/87 Academic Year and Summer Stipend Proposals.
- 5) To continue the work of the Committee charged with developing policy statements relative to writing and conducting University research.

X. Evaluation of the R/CAC:

- A. Structure: Given the diverse nature of research and creative activity on the campus, it is appropriate for the R/CAC structure to be diverse. Likewise, it is important that persons submitting proposals to the R/CAC recognize and understand the diversity of the R/CAC. The diverse membership does provide for a balance within the University community.
- B. Duties: The R/CAC's task is to accept proposals and to evaluate them so as to provide financial assistance and to encourage researchers to develop meritorious proposals. This year 30 Academic year Proposals and 14 Summer Stipend Proposals were reviewed. The reviewing process proceeded smoothly. The criteria for establishing the call for proposals is set by the Faculty Senate, and the R/CAC attempts to suggest changes to the Faculty Senate that clarify the criteria and enhance the likelihood that quality proposals are being funded. In the past four

years the R/CAC has taken many steps to improve the grant submission process, the review and evaluation process and especially the feedback process. Refinement of these steps is an ongoing process and refinement must continue. The R/CAC also needs to develop more communication with the faculty in terms of announcements about the call and deadline dates and information concerning the application process.

- C. Functions: The R/CAC members work conscientiously. Individuals submitting proposals must realize that evaluation of proposals is based on merit as defined by the current membership of the R/CAC and the diverse orientations to research and creative activity the members bring to the R/CAC. The R/CAC has standardized many of the evaluation procedures such as having all members read and evaluate all proposals and the use of a standard evaluation form. These procedures are attempts to make the granting process fair and just. A beginning has been initiated; further refinement of the evaluation process occurs each year.
- D. Personnel: Individuals serving on the R/CAC work hard, efficiently, and effectively over long hours. Members devote much time to reading and discussing each proposal. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate Office, Sharon Bland must be commended for all the work she does to assist the R/CAC in completing its tasks. Secretary of the R/CAC, Margie Gallagher is to be commended for her tireless efforts to see that all actions taken by the R/CAC are reported and the evaluations of the proposals are tabulated accurately and the rankings calculated precisely. Members George Evans, Greg Givens and Edward Leahy are recognized for their efforts as members of the "effects" subcommittee. They have made initial inroads into the collection and classification of data concerning what faculty members do with the grant monies they receive. Thanks also to Robert Franke for his efforts in listing suggestions for improving the grant application form. His work helped the Committee reorganize the application form. All of the subcommittee chairs have performed commendable jobs to see that the preparations for the call of proposals are efficiently carried out.

XI. Suggestions:

1. The R/CAC must continue to provide unbiased proposal evaluations.
2. Representation of individuals from the Arts (art, music, dance, etc.) for membership on the R/CAC must be maintained.
3. The R/CAC must continue to improve all aspects of the proposal evaluation process as well as work to improve the feedback process to all individuals submitting proposals.
4. The Policy Research Committee must continue its work and be prepared to present its proposal to the Faculty Senate in the 1986/87 year.

Roger G. Eldridge Jr., Chair
Research/Creative Activity Committee