University Research Council
September 20, 2022
4:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Approved

Present: Becki Battista, Nicholas Cline, Elaine Berry, Beth Campbell, Megen Culpepper, Karen Fletcher, Reza Foroughi, Marie Hoepfl, Charna Howson, Ann Kaplan, Ece Karatan, Ellen Lamont, Garry McCullough, Andres Tellez, Matthew Thomas-Reid, Jenny Tonsing, Heather Waldroup, John Wiswell, Jason Xiong

Excused: Adam Hege, Christine Hendren

Staff: Kate Hoffman

Guest: Katie Shoaf

- ➢ Ece Karatan calls the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. April minutes will be approved at the next meeting on October 11th. Meetings are mandatory. Please let Kate Hoffman know if you cannot attend a meeting and ask someone in your department to serve on your behalf.

Introductions

- ➢ Faculty Members
    - Nicholas Cline, School of Music, Assistant Professor of Music Composition and Theory, composer, electronic music choir, album in Spring 2023 (1st year at URC)
    - Beth Campbell, Curriculum & Instruction, Associate Professor, collaborative knowledge co-production (1st year at URC)
    - Ann Kaplan, Interdisciplinary Studies, Associate Professor, affiliated with departments of Art, Global Studies, and Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies, contemporary photography, URC funded work exhibited, working on a manuscript for human rights portraits (2nd year at URC)
    - Megen Culpepper, Chemistry and Fermentation Sciences, Associate Professor, analytical chemistry and biochemistry, UNC funding biochemistry course-based research experience project (3rd year at URC)
    - Reza Foroughi, Sustainable Technology & the Built Environment, Assistant

Professor, building science, architectural engineering using adaptive solar shapes (1st year at URC)
    - Adam Hege, Public Health, Associate Professor, health disparities among rural communities, community-based participatory research (2nd year at URC)
    - Ellen Lamont, Sociology, Associate Professor, gender intimate relationships, what causes or stagnates change (1st year at URC)
    - Matthew Thomas-Reid, Leadership and Educational Studies, Associate Professor, affiliated with Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies, philosophy queer pedagogy, trans, binary, and queer archetypes in Mayberry tv show (1st year at URC)
    - Andres Tellez, Applied Design, Assistant Professor, design education and industrial design, (1st year at URC)
    - Jenny Tonsing, Social Work, Assistant Professor, domestic violence, stress, coping, and migration among women and children (2nd year at URC)
    - John Wiswell, Belk Library, Librarian, assists College of Health Sciences and others, research on user experience (2nd year at URC)
    - Jason Xiong, Computer Information Systems, Associate Professor and Acting Director of MS Applied Data Analytics, URC grant recipient, and received an external grant as a result of the URC grant, e-commerce blockchain, integrating graduate program with research (1st year at URC)

➢ Administrative Members

    - Becki Battista, Director, Office of Student Research, Health Science Professor, student research grants, part time faculty member, productivity in kids
    - Elaine Berry, Director, Special Funds Accounting, post award financials, grant expenditures processing, monitors financials of grants and contracts after they are awarded through completion
    - Karen Fletcher, Director, Grants Resources and Services, conducts limited submission and internal grant competitions (including the URC grants), increase competitiveness in grant submissions using professional development (writing grant proposals), the EDIT program for external draft of submissions to volunteer peer reviewers for feedback, and finding funding with use of the PIVOT database of funding opportunity announcements
    - Marie Hoepfl, Interim Dean, Graduate School, graduate research assistantships and mentoring programs, faculty and student grants
    - Charna Howson, Director, Sponsored Programs, external sponsored projects and contracts, material transfer, data use and confidentiality agreements, budget development and proposal submission, new electronic research administration system Cayuse

- Ece Karatan, Vice Provost for Research, Office of Research, URC chair, supports and facilitates the research profile on campus
- Gary McCullough, Associate Dean, Health Sciences and Executive Director of IHHS, research in the college and graduate program development, IHHS research and outreach, interprofessional clinic (9th year at URC and 9th year at ASU)
- Heather Waldroup, Associate Dean, Honors College, mentor research students in humanities and music thesis departments, honors programs and building new programs to assist with mentoring, senior honor thesis (2nd year at URC)

➢ Staff
- Kate Hoffman, Executive Assistant, Office of Research: meeting minutes (9th year with URC)

➢ Guest
- Katie Shoaf, Associate Director, GRS, admin internal grant programs and limited submissions and it includes the URC grant reviews

New Business

Introduction and Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Landscape at App State - Ece Karatan

Ece directs members to URC's Shared Google Drive, and provides a brief overview, using the document URC Introduction 2022-2023, of Office of Research, its units and partners and research overall on campus. Twila Wingrove, Director of Research Data Analysis, is currently on OCSA and will return next semester. Also, Ece explains URC's mission, a summary of last year's activity and plans for the upcoming year (see URC 2021-22 Summary of Activity and URC 2022-2023 meeting schedule). The meeting schedule is a document that will be updated as plans for meetings are adjusted. The URC Orientation Guide 2022-2023 in the Shared Google Drive is helpful to both new and existing members as an overview of the council. Meeting Schedule in draft form and it is updated. AppState's Strategic Plan 2022-2027 has been placed in the drive for reference and use in future meetings.

URC Grant Review Orientation - Katie Shoaf and Karen Fletcher

Katie shares her screen with the URC Reviewer Training slides. These slides have been

updated. Part of the role of the University Research Council is to review submissions and make recommendations to Ece for the URC grant program. AppState is committed to a broad and inclusive definition of research to include creative activities. Facilities and administrative receipts are used to fund the $50,000 allotment per semester, with a cap of $5,000 per grant. Total applications range from twenty to forty-five per semester and voting commences at November and April meetings.

Katie reviews the eligibility criteria. Full-time permanent employees, excluding SHRA, can apply only or serve as a co-applicant (up to five co-applicants) on one proposal at a time. All applicants must seek external funding and must submit a final report. Failure to submit a final report precludes people from applying for future URC grants. Current members of the council may apply, but must recuse themselves from the review of the submissions and voting recommendations. People who have signed a contract with an external entity for publications may not apply to support the work under contract. Refer to the Intellectual Property Transfer Policy. Katie reviews the applications for eligibility.

Katie briefly summarizes the grant competition timeline. The fall deadline for submission of applications is noon on October 18. Department chairs review applications and they are asked for their approval by selecting a yes or no. If a department chair selects no, and is denying approval for the application, an explanation is needed. If a department chair selects no, it warrants a discussion, but does not necessarily deny funding for the application. The review is conducted in the InfoReady System. She converts applications from within InfoReady to PDF in and places it in a Google Folder. Everyone will have InfoReady access and notifications will be sent when applications are ready to be reviewed. Applications are assigned to each panel. There are three panels: Arts and Humanities, STEM and Health, and Social Sciences, Business, and Education. Panel assignments are confidential outside of the current URC membership. Notify Katie immediately to confirm or to recuse yourself of your panel assignment. Reach out to Katie with any questions or concerns. Each of the panel chairs will convene their panel as a group to discuss the preliminary review and make final funding recommendations. Chairs provide the final funding recommendations for their

panel. A spreadsheet of the compiled final scores will be used in the November meeting to discuss funding recommendations on which to vote.

Budgets that exceed $5,000 for URC's portion of the costs are not to be included for funding consideration. Allowable costs include student personnel, travel, and research materials and supplies. Compensating external collaborators or consultants must have a strong justification to be allowed. Examples of unallowable expenses are conference support, theses, employee salary or honoraria payments, outreach initiatives (unless it is specifically related to the research itself), and publication fees.

Everyone must review all attachments and documents of submissions assigned to their panel during the preliminary review that is due by October 31st. Attachments may include CVs, supplemental documents, prior reviews, video links, and sound bites. Reach out to Katie if you cannot access the supplemental documents. Look at all the fillable fields. Applications are scored on a three point scale for each criterion (0 not addressed, 1 acceptable, 2 exceptional). Questions are built into the review matrix. Each panel chair will convene the group to discuss the preliminary review. The group will collectively decide an overall funding recommendation score for their panel's applications of 0 do not fund, 1 maybe fund, and 2 to fund. Write great things in the comment box and include constructive criticism that address each application's strengths and weaknesses. Chairs provide the final funding recommendations for their panel for the final score spreadsheet that will be used in the November meeting to discuss funding recommendations on which to vote.

The review criteria asks why this application is important, meaningful, and timely. Is it understandable to a general audience? Does it have a clear plan, hypothesis, expectations, and goals? Is the project feasible within a one year period? Are the expenses justified, allowable, appropriate, cost effective, and reasonable? It is up to the panels to decide to merit extra weight to submissions that have the potential for external funding. Use the rubric for the review input comments that directly ties the application with the review criteria. This helps with all applications and especially with

resubmissions.

Bias is impossible to avoid, so use the resources provided in the reviewer training guide to minimize it. Use neutral language and scholarly opinions based on the rubric. Read the Nature article. Do not speculate. An awareness of one's implicit bias improves the chance of the review being equitable and fair. Take a reviewer training self-test as peer reviewers and read the NIH document about unconscious bias in the review process. Additional materials are the NSF reviewer training (5-10 min), and the American Heart Association peer reviewer training regarding unconscious bias.

Questions
Is there a standard rate for paying students? The graduate school pays $15 per hour. However, if there is a standard rate of pay from within a department, that rate may be used.

Is the budget reviewed for allowable expenses prior to the applications being shared with the reviewers? The reviewers need to look over the applications for allowable and unallowable budget items. The expenditure requests need to be well justified.

Do unallowable budget items disqualify the applications? No , but the unallowable expenses must be removed.

How many people are reviewing from within each panel? It depends on the number of recusals, but usually there are between three to five people reviewing each application.

What are the grounds for recusal? Are there other reasons for recusals besides current members applying for URC grants during their membership? Beyond a spouse or a partner being on the application, it is unlikely due to the limited number of members. Please look at applications immediately for this type of conflict and. address your concerns to Katie, Karen, or Ece.

Is it acceptable to look over an application prior to the submission deadline if asked? Yes, you may. Panel assignments are confidential.

Karen conducts a brief mock review of two applications as an introduction on what to expect when reviewing a proposal. Think about the significance and conceptualization of the project. Is the project clearly written so that anyone can understand it? What are your first impressions? What's missing? Compare and contrast between the two examples.

Mock Review Example 1

Impressions: Clear and well written. The discipline's connection between campus departments and the international community is appreciated. There are not any citations referenced. Does this work build on any previous work? A reference page can be included as a supporting document. It is encouraged to have a background page.

Mock Review Example 2

Impressions: This example is more technical. It is not written in lay terms. What is the research? This seems like a purchase request instead of a research proposal.

This is a snapshot of what to expect. Karen shares her screen with a view of a sample budget. It is a template with a written justification in the budget narrative. Contact Katie or Karen if you have concerns during the process.

Question: Were they funded? Yes, both examples were funded.

Announcement: Research and Creative Activity at Appalachian Event is October 21st on the 4th floor of the Belk Library. This is a celebration of research on campus. The sessions include oral presentations, posters, art pieces, and performances. Room monitor volunteers are needed to assist with presenter check-in, count attendees, and notifying

IT personnel of technical issues. Please come and show your support!

Adjournment (Fletcher, Waldroup) at 5:30 pm.