

University Research Council
October 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes
387 John Thomas Hall
4:00 pm - 5:00 pm
Approved

Present: Rebecca Battista, Suzanna Brauer, Gabriele Casale, Elisabeth Cavallaro, Neel Das, Karen Fletcher, Marie Hoepfl, Charna Howson, Alecia Jackson, Ece Karatan, Gary McCullough, Pam Mitchem, Julia Pedigo, Amy Roberts, Iryna Sharaievska, Caroline Smith, Robin Tyndall, Twila Wingrove

Absent: Maryam Ahmed, Tracy Goodson-Espy, Maurice Meilleur

Staff: Kate Hoffman

Dr. Ece Karatan called the meeting to order and everyone attending introduced themselves. Ece notifies members that future URC communications will be coming from her.

MINUTES: Motion to approve the April 17, 2018 minutes - motion passes

New Business

1. November URC meeting date – Ece Karatan

The Council decided to move the November meeting from November 20th to November 13th from 4:00 pm until 6:00 pm.

2. The University Research Council overview – Ece Karatan

The structure of the URC is made up of appointed administrative staff and faculty and elected faculty, the administrative members and the elected members. Appointed by the vice provost for research, who serves as chair, administrative members are directors of units that report to the VPR, and other campus affiliates vital to the campus research enterprise (IHHS, OSR, Special Funds Accounting and Student Affairs). The twelve faculty members are elected by Faculty Senate (College of Arts and Sciences: one Arts and Humanities member, one Social Sciences member, and one STEM member; one College of Business member; two College of Education member from different departments; two College of Fine and Applied Arts representing different departments; two College of Health Sciences from different departments; one School of Music member and one University Library member).

The University Research Council formulates and recommends policies governing research administration at Appalachian State University to the Vice Provost for Research. The faculty's role here is to inform and solicit feedback from their respective departments regarding URC and

research related issues. This is a safe space to talk without judgement. Everyone gets to voice their opinion in a timely manner. Feel free to share information with me by email karatane@appstate.edu.

The URC is tasked with reviewing internal grant proposals worth up to \$5,000. Awarded proposals total up to \$50,000. The funding comes from collected facilities and administrative receipts. Also, starting this year, the Council will revisit and review research related policies. The intent is to review each research related policy every five years.

The order of the agenda items for future meetings is changing. It will be flipped. The meetings will start with brief announcements first. Members will have more information to provide to their respective units. New programs will be vetted through this group. Existing programs will be discussed as well.

3. The University Research Council Grants overview – Karen Fletcher

The deadline for proposal submissions closed at noon today. There were thirty-one submissions. Review panels were assigned as Arts and Humanities (6 proposals): Maurice Meilleur as chair, Pam Mitchem, and Julia Pedigo; STEM (6 proposals): Gabe Casale as chair, Suzanna Brauer, and Marie Hoepfl; Social Sciences, Business and Education (10 proposals): Twila Wingrove as chair, Neel Das, Alecia Jackson, and Tracy Goodson-Espy; and Health (9 proposals): Caroline Smith as chair, Becki Battista, and Gary McCullough.

Katie Howard will send a link with InfoReady system instructions and timelines. In the InfoReady system there are helpful videos. Every box has a criteria ranking 1-4, but not every box needs to be ranked (just fill in any number in this case). Preliminary panel reviews must be complete by noon on October 26th. Then, Katie will send a compiled breakdown of the reviews to the panel chairs by 5:00 pm on October 29th. Panels have between October 30th and November 6th to meet and compile their recommendations. Final recommendations are due by November 7th at 8:00 am. On November 8th all funding recommendations will be entered. The total funding is \$50,000. Only proposals with unallowable or ridiculous expenses can be cut or reduced. Contact grs@appstate.edu or Katie Howard with any questions.

A member asked if everyone will look at the overall scores. Karen replied that proposal numbers and scores vary per year. No set amount per panel. Panels will recommend. Will look at the raw score if funding is over 50k. Another member said that the URC funded a total amount over \$50,000 last year. Amy Roberts replied that yes, collections back from previously unused funds in other research projects were used to cover the increase approved by the vice provost for research.

4. Research Data Analysis Office Introduction – Twila Wingrove

Please spread the word regarding the department. It consists of Twila and two assistants. RDA helps faculty and staff with design or data analysis: construct designs, methodologically, and power analysis (size of sample of data: justifying data to funding entity). Contact RDA at rda@appstate.edu or email Twila directly wingroveta@appstate.edu.

5. TAG – Karen Fletcher

Technology Advisory Group was created to help prevent purchases of multiple software packages that serve the same purpose. TAG will send Karen a current list of projects and software. See Karen if you have questions or if you think a duplication may exist.

6. Digital Literacy survey – Pam Mitchem

Pam is the Coordinator of the Digital Scholarships Team (DST). DST works with Digital Humanities, and Digital Literacy working groups to help with digital collections and presentations. Pam is interested in conducting a digital scholarship and literacy survey to discover the needs on campus. Office of Research is interested in surveying campus too. Is the URC interested as well? It is better to do one survey instead of multiples. The Library wants to know what kind of digital scholarship is needed, and what tools are being used (IP, open access). The Library directs people to IT or OR as needed. A current search is being held to hire a scholarly communications librarian. Karen is on search committee. The Library has created websites, but is that needed? The survey will help with a Gap analysis. Where is the need and where does the Library fit? Digital scholarship is at the end of the grant life cycle (NIH requirements).

Ece recommends fine tuning this information with Karen and Pam and then discuss it at a future URC meeting. Gabe Casale has concerns that if faculty are not involved a situation where an expensive piece of software like bePRESS is purchased for faculty that is not useful. Gabe recommends forming a URC subcommittee.

Pam replies that she can tell the URC how bePRESS evolved. A number of faculty are interested in publishing journals in open access. No repository currently exists for it. NCDOCS limits file sizes. A rumor that NCDOCS is changing its platform may only be in the discussion stages. UCOMM wants a faculty profile platform. bePRESS is seen as an opportunity to alleviate multiple needs in one application. Mecca is an open source program, but hosting is not included. This is how these conversations started. Dean Ward is familiar with implementing bePRESS and is very happy with his previous experience. Conference attendees who were polled, love it too. UCOMM has bought the expert faculty profile bureau from bePRESS. The Library wants a platform with tools that work. Each platform needs to be vetted.

Ece says yes to the subcommittee. Let's work to find common ground that meet the needs of campus. However, please note that the decision whether to purchase bePRESS is at the Library's discretion. Pam wants to figure out what is most cost effective. What is the best way to get what people need? If a program is purchased, it is not solely for faculty to have a platform, but it is a backend that helps the Library to perform their work. There is a limit to what Library can support in open source. Email Ece if you'd like to participate in the subcommittee.

7. URC member selection in Faculty Senate – Gabriel Casale

Groups are divided into panels and distribute funds based on the funding available (\$50,000). Panels are not aligned with how individuals are elected by Faculty Senate. Modifying the ballot to align with the URC panels constitutes a change in the Faculty Handbook. Gabe asks is there a benefit to align the systems? If so, this is one place to start.

Neel Das asks what are the specific issues that are being resolved with this suggested change? Gabe replies that the award discussions are time consuming. Panels root for their proposals. Ece adds that an example is an unequal proposal distribution per panel.

Iryna Sharaievska asks if having a rolling proposal deadline and competitions is an option. Karen replies that unfortunately that creates an administrative burden and there is currently not enough staff for this at this time. Ece states that this might be an option in future.

Karen states that the URC can decide to change the way the panels are made up and have multidisciplinary panels similar to those of NIH where there is a primary and secondary reviewer tiers. Some options will be presented by Karen at a future meeting.

Ece suggests that the URC continue this discussion after the Fall review. Then, discuss improvements. Pay attention to what works and what does not.

Adjournment at 5:04 pm