May 12, 2011
Victoria Steinberg
President, UTC Faculty Senate

Dr. Steinberg,

Please consider this document as the annual report of the Faculty Development/Research Committee. As you know, this was the first year that the Faculty Development and Faculty Research Committees were combined in to a single committee. As such, the committee considered several possible strategies for forming sub-committees to review faculty proposals, For example, one idea was to form a sub-committee that would review Faculty Development proposals, and another that would review Faculty Research Proposals. However, the overwhelming consensus among committee members this year was that the full committee should review both. The view was that the benefit of the combined committees was that the reviewers would be aware of all proposals in order to have a fuller understanding of the overall portfolio of proposals that would be funded.

The committee began this year with a budget of $93,635.43 for both Faculty Development and Faculty Research grants. We received 83 Faculty Development Proposals, 24 Faculty Research Proposals, and 13 Faculty Research Summer Fellowship Proposals. The total amount requested was $202.917. The committee recommended 58 individual Faculty Development proposals, 4 group Faculty Development proposals, 13 Faculty Research proposals, and three Faculty Research Summer Fellowship proposals for funding. This amounted to $93,635 in funding. A spreadsheet that lists faculty who received funding is attached.

The committee has several recommendations for next year:

1. **Rubric for evaluating research proposals.** Committee member Anthony Steinhoff proposed a plan for more specific criteria for evaluating Research Grants. The committee discussed this plan, and piloted the rating system during the spring round of Faculty Research Grant evaluation. Committee members have left their comments following this experience on the organization blackboard site. The committee recommends that next year's committee further evaluate this system. One idea is that the majority of committee members would continue to review both Faculty Development and Faculty Research proposals, but that a small sub-committee be formed from committee members who will focus only on the Faculty Research Proposals and finalizing this evaluation system.
2. **Application forms.** This year the committee members discussed the current application forms, instructions, and cover sheets. One possibility is to develop an application form that would serve for all proposals. One major concern is that very different information is necessary to review Faculty Development and Faculty Research proposals. It is recommended that these discussions continue, and that these especially focus on clarity for faculty in directions for submitting the proposals, including information about how the proposals are evaluated. Future committees may

wish to consider handbook revisions to better communicate the application process to faculty.

3. **Provost Student Research Awards.** One of the benefits to combining the Faculty Development and Faculty Research committees was that the funding for both committees came from a single source, and so having a single committee allowed for better oversight in how those funds would be used. The Provost Student Research Awards are funded for a separate account, and so do not seem to be logically connected to the Faculty Development and Faculty Research grants. This year, the committee recommended 23 Provost Student Awards for funding. It is the belief of the committee that combining the Faculty Development and Faculty Research Committees has increased the load on faculty who are committee members in reviewing proposals. Because the Provost Student Research Awards are not directly related to the other grants, the committee feels that future Faculty Development and Research Committees should not evaluate the Provost Student Research Awards. Our recommendation is that a small committee for the purpose of evaluating the Provost Student Research Awards should be formed, perhaps through the office of the Assistant Provost for Research and Engagement.

As chair of the committee, I want to think the members of the committee for their dedication and service. This is a committee that involves a great deal of work for the committee members, and the faculty who comprised this committee took their role very seriously and were very diligent and conscientious in their reviews. I very much appreciate all of their hard work. Records of received proposals and ratings can be found on the organization's blackboard site, and it is our hope that these benefit future committee members. I also appreciate the support of the University's administration and the UC Foundation who make possible this funding to support faculty scholarship at UTC.. The committee received a large number of extremely good proposals, which reflects the commitment of UTC faculty to their scholarship.

Thank you,

Darrell Meece