

University Research Council

April 26, 2022

4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Approved

Present: Becki Battista, Elaine Berry, Andrew Caldwell, Megen Culpepper, Karen Fletcher, Soo Goh, Adam Hege, Christine Hendren, Marie Hoepfl, Christopher Holden, Charna Howson, Alecia Jackson, Ece Karatan, Mina Min, Deb Paxton, Abhi Ramalingam, Jenny Tonsing, Heather Waldroup, Twila Wingrove, John Wiswell, Rebecca Witter

Excused: Ann Kaplan, Gary McCullough

Staff: Kate Hoffman

- Ece Karatan calls the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.
- Motion 1 (Wingrove, Hoepfl) to approve the minutes from the [March 15, 2022 meeting](#).

VOTE: 12 Approved, 0 Opposed, 2 Abstained. Motion passes.

NEW BUSINESS

URC Spring 2022 Grants Funding Recommendations

Ece shares her screen with the confidential funding recommendations spreadsheet. The rows shaded green are rated “definitely fund” with a score of 14 through 11. The yellow shaded rows are a “maybe” fund with a score of 11, 8, and 6. Three not recommended for funding. All rows in green fund two proposals from each panel for a total of \$41,194. Including the lesser scored yellow shaded rows of submissions with the green shaded rows of submissions amounts to \$51,466. Up to \$50,000 is the usual funding cap. The vice provost for research has the discretion to approve funding above the cap. Each submission gets a declination letter or a funded letter.

Motion 2 (Ramalingam, Wiswell) to recommend funding submissions shaded in green in the amount of \$41,194. VOTE: 15 Approved, 0 Opposed, 2 Abstained. Motion passes.

Award recommendations from the Arts & Humanities review panel:

- Grube, Vicky (Art) - \$4,175 - “Painting at the Easel; Young Children Revealing Their Lives”
- Hopton, Sarah Beth (English) - \$4,923 - “A Usability Study of a Climate Mitigation Beekeeping Application for Women Beekeepers in Vietnam”

- Relyea, Scott (History) - \$4,515 - “1. 'Learning to Be Colonial' & 2. 'Kham as Conduit and Crucible”

Award recommendations from the Social Sciences, Business and Education review panel:

- MacNamara, Maureen and Dakin, Emily and Williams, Kelly Ann (Social Work) - \$4,990 - “Who Lets the Dogs Out and How Does it Benefit Them? Determining the Influence of Pet Ownership on Older Adult Quality of Life”
- Perreault, Gregory (Communication) - \$3,677 – “Moderating Hate: Journalists on Comment Moderation of Digital White Nationalism”
- Zurhellen, Sarah (University Writing Center) - \$2,243 – “Mapping WAC: A Recent History of the Teaching and Learning of Writing at Appalachian State University”

Award recommendations from the STEM review panel:

- Ogwu, Matthew (Sustainable Development) - \$4,532 – “Influence of Alternative Diets on Gut Microbiota and Environmental Well-being Predicted from free-range Chicken Feces”
- Sherman, James (Physics and Astronomy) - \$5,000 - “Measurement-Model Comparisons of Aerosol Hygroscopicity and Radiative Properties at the NOAA/NASA Aerosol Monitoring Sites at AppalAIR”
- Wallen, Christian (Chemistry and Fermentation Sciences) - \$5,000 - “Water-Free Hydrogen Sulfide Coordination: Towards Greener Natural Gas Refining”

Award recommendations from the Health review panel:

- Griffin, Jamie (Nutrition and Healthcare Management) - \$4,993 - “Interprofessional Collaboration Using Novel, mHealth Technology to Improve Health Behaviors, Physical Activity and Biometric Markers to Build Healthy Rural Communities”
- Stickford, Jonathan (Health and Exercise Science) - \$4,998 - “Respiratory and Cardiovascular Function Following Antioxidant Supplementation in Asthmatics with Exercise-induced Bronchoconstriction”

Motion 3 (Witter, Wiswell) to recommend funding submissions shaded in yellow on line 12 for \$3,677. VOTE: 14 Approved, 0 Opposed, 3 Abstained. Motion does pass.

Motion 4 (Ramalingam, Witter) to recommend funding submissions shaded in yellow on line 13 \$4,175. VOTE: 7 Approved, 6 Opposed, 5 Abstained. Motion does pass.

Presentation of the new recommended URC entry for the faculty handbook

Current Faculty Handbook language:

7.5.23 The University Research Council formulates and recommends policies governing research administration at Appalachian State University to the vice provost for research. The council will also: seek and recommend ways to secure internal and external financial support for faculty engaged in research and creative activities; work to create an environment (e.g., reduced teaching load, recognition of work done, etc.) in which the faculty may be encouraged to do research within their specialties; support faculty publications; and develop and recommend University policy related to such research issues as the use of human subjects, care and protection of research animals, and scholarly ethics. Specific duties may include: serve as liaison between Office of Research and the academic colleges/ schools for the purpose of encouraging research and grants activity; recommend the University's competitive research awards (elected members of the council will serve as the committee to recommend these awards to the full council); review and monitor as needed research involving human and animal subjects, as well as issues of scholarly ethics; insure that University research policy is consistent with state and federal regulations; and develop incentive programs for research and grants activity. (Vice Provost for Research).

URC Faculty Handbook update suggestions:

The University Research Council (**Council/ URC**) **advocates for, promotes, and supports an inclusive culture of research, scholarship, and creative activities at** ~~formulates and recommends policies governing research administration at Appalachian State University to the vice provost for research.~~ The **Council will review, and/or formulate policies governing research administration at Appalachian State University and make recommendations to the vice provost for research.** **The Council will** also: seek and recommend ways to **support secure internal and external financial support for faculty and staff** engaged in research and creative activities; ~~work to create an environment (e.g., reduced teaching load, recognition of work done, etc.) in which the faculty may be encouraged to do research within their specialties; support faculty publications; and develop and recommend University policy related to such research issues as the use of human subjects, care and protection of research animals, and scholarly ethics.~~ **This might include, but is not limited to, recommending ways to secure internal and external financial support, helping researchers navigate University policy and procedures for funded and unfunded scholarly and creative activities, and recommending improvements to University policies and procedures to better enable research, scholarship, and creative activity.** The URC will also work to create an environment (e.g., by advocating for reduced teaching load, better recognition of work done, improved student involvement, more meaningful community engagement, and the encouragement of transdisciplinary, and cross-college collaboration etc.) in which the faculty are encouraged to advance research, scholarly and creative activities within their specialties. ~~Specific duties may include:~~

URC members are expected to:

- serve as liaisons between Office of Research and the academic colleges/ schools for the purpose of encouraging research and grants activity,
- review and make funding recommendations for the University's competitive University Research Council awards, (~~elected members of the council will serve as the committee to recommend these awards to the full council~~);
- review and monitor as needed ~~research involving human and animal subjects, as well as~~ issues of scholarly ethics,
- acquire a working knowledge of University policies and procedures for research administration,
- and promote scholarly activity among Appalachian's faculty, ; ~~ensure that University research policy is consistent with state and federal regulations; and develop~~ including recommending incentive programs for research and grants activity.

URC member responsibilities. Ece asks if an URC membership eligibility clause for faculty who are active in their field of expertise is needed. Marie Hoepfl says that it's reasonable. The Council's primary task is to review other people's proposals. However, the members are nominated and elected by the Faculty Senate. What are the logistics involved in creating an eligibility clause? Health Waldroup asks how do we define active? Ece replies that there are loose definitions for each field of study. Will this help define people who want to be on the Council? Maybe an eligibility clause is not needed or relevant. Karen Fletcher suggests that information for why people want to be on the URC be added to the website.

Discussion on three specific topics:

This is an effort for engagement and onboarding of URC members:

- I. Do we need to go back to a [bulleted sheet of updates](#)? Do we include the announcements section at the end of each meeting?

Marie Hoepfl likes the bulleted sheet of updates. Twila Wingrove asks what are we supposed to be communicating? She's not sure if the bulleted sheet is meant to be shared beyond the URC members. Christine Hendren suggests making it fit for the purpose. How is it proliferated for others? Who is the audience? There can be two separate sections based on relevancy to URC members vs all of campus.

- II. How can URC members share information to their departments/ colleges (consider a snapshot prepared by OR and select URC faculty members for everyone to share)?

The Staff Senate prepares a list about what is communicated back to staff. Shall URC do something similar and prepare it at the end of the meetings? Rebecca Witter likes that idea. A bullet point list can be created for external communication.

- III. What do you wish you knew at the beginning of the year/your term? (prior to elections as well as starting as an URC member).

Megen Culpepper wanted a clear description of the role. She knew the URC reviewed grants, but didn't know anything else. Christopher Holden said that he joined in the middle of the academic year to serve on behalf of someone else. He wanted agenda items from previous meetings to be shared with a typical duties list.

Ece replies that work is being done to improve the onboarding of URC members.

Christine Hendren asks if it is useful to include a value proposition for URC members in addition to lists of duties and expectations. Jenny Tonsing agrees. She said that there were so many meetings and that she did not have a full concept of what was involved. Ece replies that time commitments for meetings and beyond meetings can be outlined.

Soo Goh asks if a faculty panel mentorship is useful for new members for reviewing proposals. This is not a big time commitment. The mentor can be a person they can talk to and reach out if they have questions or concerns about the review process. Someone new might find the experience completely overwhelming. Megen Culpepper agrees that faculty panel mentorship will be useful to new members.

Rebecca Witter wants to know the URC's goals for the academic year in advance. It is helpful to know ahead of time what the URC is advocating for prior to joining. What is its vision? An example is time for research. Is the URC going to advocate for that this upcoming academic year? Ece replies that she is striving for a long term agenda. For example, this year's agenda was set and communicated in August and only minor modifications were made.

Recognition of URC faculty members finishing their term.

Ece recognizes the URC faculty members who are finishing their term: Andrew Caldwell, Christopher Holden, Abhi Ramalingam, and Rebecca Witter. She thanks them for their service contributions and engagement.

Adjournment (Wiswell, Ramalingam) at 5:37 pm.