

Research Advisory Committee (RAC)
Minutes/End of Year Report
Fall 2013-Spring 2014

Members: Amatea, Ellen; Corbett, Nancy; Conroy, Maureen; Crippen, Kent; Kennedy-Lewis, Brianna; Therriault, David (Chair); Swank, Jacqueline

September 5th, 2013:

RAC met to discuss the UF Term Professorship Award applications and made recommendations to the OER.

September 11th, 2013:

During this meeting the committee selected a chair (David Therriault). The committee discussed the role of the RAC and action items to address during the year. Committee members discussed the role of RAC as being a mechanism to obtain feedback from faculty regarding policies related to research, but not having the responsibility to develop policy (without specific guidance/charge from FPC). In addition to reviewing various award applications as they arise throughout the year, the committee will evaluate the guidelines established last year for the CRIF and the timeline for submission and review of proposals. This will include asking for feedback from all the 2013-2014 CRIF applicants. The committee also discussed recommendations regarding requirements for the UF Term Professorship Award. Finally, the committee established a meeting schedule for Fall of 2013: October 9, November 13, and December 4. All meetings will be held at 12 noon in Norman Hall Room 158 and are open to the public.

September 16-19th, 2013:

Provided assistance in coordinating an internal selection process for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for Family Engagement Award. Three candidates were reviewed and committee members provided a rank ordering of applicant's letters (including feedback) to Office of Educational Research. Due to the limited time to complete the work, the review process was completed by the committee through e-mail.

October 9th, 2013:

Committee reviewed CRIF Applicant Feedback for possible revision of award criteria and/or timing of the call. It was decided to change the timing of the award (make it earlier): Feb 1st call, March 1st deadline for applicants, March 30th RAC deadline to review and provide feedback to the applications. We will continue to have a single tier for awards. It was also decided to add language to make clear issues surrounding the committee's approach to budget issues and in-kind contributions. On the first matter, it was decided that applicants could withdraw their application if they felt they weren't sufficiently funded. On the second, the call should clearly state that in-kind contributions from a department are the purview of the applicant and their school (not the RAC committee).

Committee was charged with having a discussion around: What is the policy purpose vs. operational purpose of RAC? Committee agreed that RAC has both purposes. Policy purpose example: revise CRIF guidelines. Operational purpose example: give faculty input regarding decisions about awards

Reviewed Fien Dissertation Applicants and forwarded results to OER. The committee decided on allocating 4 awards.

November 13th, 2013:

Meeting was canceled, no charges were fielded.

December 4-16th, 2013:

The committee was charged with reviewing the college's ROF applications; the college can send three applications forward. These were forwarded from Thomasenia's office for RAC to start review December 4. Three candidates were reviewed and committee members provided a rank ordering of applicant's letters (including feedback) to Office of Educational Research. Due to the limited time to complete the work, the review process was completed by the committee through e-mail.

Jan 15th, 2014:

RAC met to review a draft of the college wide policy addressing IDC expenditures. Please see the email content (below) with respect to the charge. The draft document can be obtained from Thomasenia's office.

Content From Thomasenia: The BAC requested that the deans draft a college IDC policy. I proceeded to do so and presented a draft to BAC. See attachment. BAC provided some feedback in the form of questions and suggestions. See items below. BAC has requested a meeting to discuss the College IDC policy. I am writing to initiate discussion with RAC for RAC's input on the draft and responses to the feedback.

1. Should the COE adopt a target reserve percentage?
2. The COE policy does not include a process for requesting use of funds.
3. Please consider including faculty (such as Research Advisory Committee of FPC as well as additional PIs who generate IDC) in both generation of the policy (currently a draft) and in an advisory role on use of funds at the college level.
4. Who is eligible for college level funds to support doctoral student travel? Is there a process in place? Are doctoral students up posed to go to the school first and use COE if no other funding is available?
5. Should the policy include an annual report to faculty on use of IDC funds?
6. Should PIs first exhaust their personal IDC funds before they request use of college-level funds?
7. Can the list of 11 items on the draft policy be grouped conceptually?

The committee engaged in discussion using the above list. The committee was generally supportive of the draft IDC document. It was agreed that COE could adopt a target reserve but the committee did not want to specify an amount. One idea floated in the discussion was the formation of a specialized committee (i.e., faculty who generate substantial IDC funds) as best placed to address items 2, 3, and 4. It was agreed that PI's should not have to use their personal IDC funds first and that these accounts typically don't carry large balances.

March 12th, 2014:

The committee reviewed and provided a recommendation for UFRF (University of Florida Research Foundation Professorship); applications are forwarded to the University level.

The committee was charged with discussion surrounding which awards should remain the prevue of this committee (charge from Esther follows):

Dear RAC and LSAC chairs and FPC reps,

In an effort to coordinate the reviewing process of the many awards and scholarship applications that we receive annually, we would like ask you to help us take a critical look at the scholarships/awards that are currently on your plate. Specifically, we would like you to consider which of these awards/scholarship truly need to be reviewed by your committee, in light of the charge of the committee as well as policy-making function and role of FPC committees.

What we would like you to do:

- (1) As a committee, could you please identify which of the scholarship/awards listed (see attachment) should definitely be reviewed by your committee (i.e., must be reviewed by RAC/LSAC) and not by an non-FPC committee; and which need to be reviewed by *faculty* but not necessarily by RAC/LSAC. There may be an 'other' category – feel free to add!
- (2) Present the result of your analysis at FPC either on March 31 or April 28. **(Therriault attended the meeting and presented the following RAC response)**

RAC Response:

The committee felt that the RAC's review of research awards (specifically the assessment of the quality of research and subsequent allocation of research support) remains the main charge of the committee and that such awards should always be reviewed by faculty. Committee members were receptive to the idea that, in principle, forming another faculty committee (for review purposes) could potentially reduce the workload of RAC to attend to other research issues. However, the committee felt that we currently attend to such research policy issues, as they arise, and that the formation of another committee would strain an already overdrawn pool of volunteer faculty (i.e., we would have difficulty constituting yet another ad hoc committee).

We identified the following awards as those that we recommend still be reviewed by RAC (although there may be new research awards that surface of which we are unaware or others for which it is an off-cycle year [B.O Smith]). The committee agreed that RAC was not well positioned to review graduate-level, teaching, and service-oriented awards.

RAC Award Review List:

- Fien Professorship
- UFRF Research Professor
- COE College Research Incentive Funds (CRIF)
- B. O. Smith Professorship
- UF Foundation Term Professor
- Opportunity Incentive Seed Fund Awards (ROF)
- Excellence Awards for Assistant Professor
- William T. Grant Foundation Applications

Finally, the committee reviewed two candidates for the Excellent Assistant Professor Award (providing a recommendation to OER).

April 16th, 2014:

The committee was charged with reviewing the college's CRIF award applications; recommendations were provided to the OER.