

**Annual Report of the Faculty Research and Publication Board (FRPB)
For Fiscal Year 2013-2014**

Background and Membership:

The Faculty Research and Publications Board (FRPB) is a representative faculty board that functions to encourage faculty research, publication, scholarly activities and artistic productions, and to fulfill the duties assigned to it by the Board of Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado as set forth in the Board Policy Manual. FRPB voting membership currently consists of one faculty representative from each college; three additional faculty representatives elected at-large; one faculty representative from the University libraries; one faculty representative selected by the Faculty Senate, and one graduate student representative selected by the President of the Graduate Student Association (GSA). Five non-voting advisory members are also currently named to the board, including the Graduate School Dean or designee, Director of IMT or designee, Representative of Academic Affairs, Academic Dean appointed by CAO, and the OSP Director or designee.

The board is charged with establishing criteria and reviewing applications for some of the internal funding programs available on our campus (see details below). Representatives are also tasked with assisting colleagues in their various colleges, schools or departments in proposal development or revision. In addition, this board solicits nominations, reviews dossiers and votes for the A.M. & Jo Winchester Distinguished Scholar Award, which is presented to the recipient at a banquet held each spring. The board takes the peer review process quite seriously, and works diligently to publicize and apply consistent criteria to a diverse pool of proposals. We are also careful to inform faculty of the board's reasoning in cases where proposals are rejected. Over the past several years both the number and quality of proposals have dramatically improved. The workload has dramatically increased as well. FRPB service has become known as a way to develop skills in proposal development, gain a better understanding of the complex funding environment at UNC, and become familiar with the research of faculty colleagues across the campus. It is one of very few opportunities for faculty to make decisions that directly affect the activity of faculty on our campus.

The FRPB chair during AY 2013/14 was Nancy Matchett from HSS (elected to an at-large seat). The Vice-Chair was Robert Weis (HSS). The other voting members were John Clinebell (MCB), Mark Fetkewicz (PVA), Trent Lalonde (CEBS), Jennifer Leffler (Libraries), Britney McIlvaine (HSS/at-large), Ryan Middagh (Graduate Student Rep), Corey Pierce (CEBS/at-large), Andrew Svedlow (Senate Rep), and Robert Walch (NHS). Non-voting Advisory members were Teresa McDevitt (Acting Assistant Vice President for Research), Karen Turner (Representative Dean), Jeannette VanGalder (Chief Information Officer), and Michele Schwietz (Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs). The Academic Affairs seat remained unfilled throughout the term. FRPB program funds continue to be administered by Sherry May (OSP).

The board has not had an active Academic Affairs rep for several years. We have conferred with Teresa McDevitt and agree with her view that this seat (and the seat held by the Director of Information Technology) can be removed from our advisory membership without any adverse affect on the campus or board. More recently, Michele Schwietz recommended that the OSP administrator (currently Sherry May) be added to the list of non-voting members. This recommendation was made in part to ensure continuity since Dr. Schwietz will be leaving UNC this summer and a new director has not yet been hired. However, Schwietz recommended – and we agree – that the OSP administrator have a permanent non-voting seat on the board (and attend FRPB meetings) since she is the person who works directly with faculty funded by FRPB. The executive committee expects to include these

memberships changes in a list of recommended updates to our bylaws to be presented to the senate in Fall 2014.

The full board has elected Trent Lalonde (CEBS) and Brittany McIlvaine (at-large/HHS) to serve as the Chair and Vice Chair for 2014-15. They have been exemplary members of the committee and have already begun the transition into these roles.

Funding Activity:

The board met eight times over the academic year to discuss and recommend policies related to internal funding, review grants and make awards. Prior to each meeting, each board member reviews all qualified proposals and completes an online survey indicating their views on whether the proposal should be funded, not funded, or needs further discussion. The board then meets to rank proposals from most to least compelling, funding as many as possible. This year, we reviewed a total of 165 proposals and were able to make 99 grants. Details of the awards are included in the tables below. Lists of successful grantees can be seen at the Office of Sponsored Programs SharePoint site.

Awards Distributed by Funding Round 2013-14

Program	# proposals	# awards	\$ requested	\$ awarded
Fall PAT (Provost Award for Travel)	31	27	66,043	56,820
Fall NPP (New Project Program)	4	2	7,224	4,823
Fall RDFD (Research, Dissemination and Faculty Development)	15	8	114,114	63,158
Winter PAT	56	28	114,547	53,406
Spring NPP	5	3	16,922	14,422
Spring RDFD	31	18	77,772	39,062
Spring PAT	23	13	124,772	56,162
TOTALS	165	99	521,394	287,853

Annual Totals for Each Program for 2013-2014

Fund	# proposals	# awards	\$ requested	\$ awarded
NPP	9	5	\$24,146	\$19,245
PAT	110	68	\$305,362	\$166,388
RDFD	46	26	\$191,886	\$102,220

It is important to note that Provost Fund grants (PAT and RDFD) have become increasingly competitive. In AY 11/12 we were able to fund 91% of PAT requests and 77% of RDFD requests. In AY 12/13 we were able to fund 76% of PAT requests and 63% of RDFD grants. This year (AY 13/14) we were only able to fund 63% of PAT requests and 57% of RDFD requests. This is partly due to a \$30,000 decrease in the allocation from the Provost's Office; those funds were set aside for the new Faculty Publications Fund. But it is primarily due to an increase in both the quantity and quality of proposals.

The number of NPP requests has remained relatively stable over the years and those monies (which carry over from year to year) continue to grow faster than our expenditures. After the fall funding round we increased the maximum NPP award from \$2500 to \$5000, which explains the jump in amounts awarded between the fall and spring competitions.

Although we have worked diligently to make our guidelines as clear as possible, there continues to be some confusion among faculty regarding which internal grants are administered by FRPB. Some of this is due to our history. Originally FRPB only administered the small pool of *New Project Program* funds, and these continue to be listed as FRPB funds on the OSP website. Those funds are intended to support brand new projects that might lead to external funding in the future. In 2008 the board began administering the *Provost Award for Travel (PAT)* and *Research, Dissemination and Faculty Development (RDFD)* grants, which are made possible by an annual allocation from the Provost's Office and are intended to support a much broader range of faculty activities. Those grants are separately listed as Provost Fund Grants on the OSP website (though there is descriptive text on the FRPB page stating that we administer Provost Fund grants as well). To complicate matters even further, in the past several years a number of additional internal funding programs (e.g., Summer Stipends and the Fund for Faculty Publications) have also become available. Those programs are described in various places on the UNC website and are not administered by FRPB.

There also continues to be some faculty confusion regarding the purposes of our various programs. Again, much of this is due to our history with respect to the relatively new Provost Fund grants (PATs and RDFDs). The primary purpose of PAT awards has always been to fund faculty travel to present at juried conferences (or the equivalent), and the primary purpose of RDFD awards has always been to support faculty research and professional development (by contrast, our original NPP grant program is intended to support pilot projects or other start-up work in new research areas). However, when the Provost Funds first became available, the board deliberately included some flexibility in the language of the guidelines so that RDFD grants *could* fund travel to present original research (if monies were still available after all high-quality proposals for research and development projects had been funded), and PAT grants *could* fund travel that did not involve a juried presentation (if monies were still available after all high-quality proposals for travel to juried conferences had been funded). In the early days of these new programs, the board was often able to take advantage of that flexibility to fund conference travel that fell "in between" deadlines for PAT grants (by awarding monies as part of an RDFD round), or to fund worthwhile professional development travel even when the faculty member was not presenting (by awarding monies as part of a PAT round). However, we now routinely receive funding requests that far exceed the monies available in our budget, with the result that activities of the sort that standardly received funding two or three years ago are now at best postponed until the next PAT or RDFD round for which they are most appropriate, and are oftentimes rejected outright due to lack of funds. In particular, we are increasingly forced to reject PAT requests from faculty who have papers accepted at juried conferences.

More specifically, there is both confusion and frustration about the procedures related to PAT awards, in particular. Faculty who are travelling to juried conferences must use their *Annual Scholarly Activity and Travel (ASATs)* fund prior to requesting additional funds through the PAT program, but the ASATs provides an automatic \$800 to any faculty member travelling to present juried work and hence is not reviewed by FRPB. OSP tracks ASATs use, and has been very good about alerting faculty when they need to apply for ASATs and reduce their budget accordingly. However, faculty are also required to use any state-funded faculty professional development monies (currently \$1000/faculty member/year) prior to requesting additional monies through the PAT program, and OSP has no way to track those funds. We have been in frequent conversation with the Provost's office about this issue over the years, and our understanding is that the Provost's Office distributes those funds to the colleges, with the expectation that college deans will then make them available to individual faculty. However, informal

reports suggest that the process through which individual faculty members may or may not access those funds varies quite a bit from one college to the next. As a result, some board members argue that colleagues in colleges that do distribute funds directly to faculty are treated unfairly, since colleagues in other colleges are able to “save” their state/college funding for other purposes so long as their Dean signs off on the cover sheet indicating that all other available funds have been spent. IN an effort to mitigate this problem, FRPB sometimes reduces awards by \$1000 when it seems apparent that the faculty member (and co-signers) may have neglected to consider those funds, however we are far from confident about our ability to do this consistently and many board members are sympathetic to faculty colleagues frustrated by the need to secure funds from three different sources to travel to a single conference. We continue to discuss with the Provost’s Office how best to address this issue. As FRPB awards become increasingly competitive, the board is committed to ensuring that its funds are not used in lieu of funds available from other sources.

Board members do our best to stay abreast of all developments related to funding for scholarly activity on our campus so that we can explain the complex funding environment to faculty in our respective colleges who contact us regarding proposal development, and FRPB is generally positive about the overall increase in funding available on our campus. The board has worked especially hard throughout the past year to communicate pro-actively with faculty about the need to adhere very strictly to the published guidelines for each program we administer and to make a compelling case for the value of their activity not only to their own scholarship but to the wider university community; we also frequently refer faculty to other programs as appropriate. The new executive committee (chair and vice-chair) for 2014/15 plans to review all guidelines over the summer and to bring recommendations to the full board so that clearer guidelines are in place by the start of the upcoming academic year. We have also been in conversation with both the Provost’s Office and OSP regarding ways to reorganize the OSP website (and related UNC pages) so that all information about internal funding is presented in a single location, and in particular, to ensure that all grants administered by FRPB be clearly indicated as such. At the same time, several members of FRPB wonder whether streamlining internal funding processes might further enhance faculty productivity, and we have learned that the Provost’s office plans to conduct a thorough review of all funding programs beginning in Summer 2014. We recommend that the faculty senate work with the administration on these issues to ensure that faculty from all disciplines and colleges are equitably treated under any new policies.

Winchester Award Activity

The FRPB is also responsible for requesting nominations and selecting the recipient of the Winchester Award. This year we had three nominations: Steven Anderson (NHS), Robin Macaluso (NHS), and William D. Woody (CEBS). Dr. Anderson was selected as the recipient for 2014, though all candidates were impressive scholars.

Longstanding members of the board have noticed a significant decrease in the nominations over the years. Hence, this year we investigated ways to reverse that trend. With help from Teresa McDevitt and Sherry May, we uncovered the original documents establishing the award, which stipulate that it should be granted on the basis of excellence in original research, and that the awardee must give a campus lecture highlighting that original research. Beyond that, the paper trail does not establish specific criteria for nomination or selection. We also learned that few faculty are aware of the \$1500 stipend accompanying the award, and that at least some are deterred by the effort required to prepare nomination materials. The board plans to include information about the \$1500 stipend in the request for nominations next year. The board also discussed a number of possible modifications to the nomination

process, including adding a requirement that deans forward one nominee/college to the FRPB, and reducing the overall size of the application file to emphasize documents that are most relevant to interdisciplinary peer review, however no firm consensus was reached. The executive committee plans to consider options over the summer and present the board with recommendations in Fall 2014 so that any revisions can be in place for the 2014/15 competition. Since Winchester policies appear in our bylaws, any recommended changes will be sent to the Senate for comment before final approval.

Relationship to the Faculty Publication Fund Board

At the end of AY 2012/13, FRPB was involved in discussions with Teresa McDevitt regarding the need to provide funds for publication charges, which are increasingly required by prestigious journals in some disciplines. After consultation between our board and library faculty who are knowledgeable about publication trends, the Provost's Office decided to set aside \$30,000 of the total Provost Fund Allocation for this purpose (reducing the funding available to RDFD and PAT grants by the same amount). We expect that this allocation (\$30,000 to faculty publications, and \$270,000 to FRPB) will continue in 2014/15.

Although FRPB was initially asked to administer the new publication fund program, the board ultimately declined. This was partly due to the fact that we have a very large workload already. However, the main reason was that the role of FRPB has long been to administer funding through a competitive, interdisciplinary peer review process, and a majority of members felt that such a process would be largely inappropriate for publication charges. The primary worry was that there would be a chilling effect on faculty publications, since faculty members in disciplines where publication charges are increasingly routine would face the prospect of either needing to apply for page funding prior to submitting an article (to ensure that it could in fact be published if accepted) or taking the risk of not being able to publish an article that had been accepted through a peer review process in their discipline, since an interdisciplinary campus committee might later find the research less compelling than other faculty members' work. Hence, the board felt that a more automatic and largely first-come/first serve process would be more appropriate and recommended the establishment of a separate committee for this purpose.

FRPB agrees that funding to offset publication charges should be available to faculty on our campus, and we support the policies adopted by the newly created faculty publication board. We are also working closely with that board to make sure there is no duplication of effort between our programs (primarily RDFD, though NPP grants may be affected as well) and theirs. At the same time, we are aware that in this first year the publication fund spent far less than its \$30,000 allocation, while FRPB was forced to turn away many worthy proposals (proposals that would have been funded if monies had been available). We will continue to work with the Publication Fund Board and the Provost's Office to ensure that all available monies go directly to faculty research in one program or the other. We encourage the senate will stay abreast of these developments too.

The FRPB, on behalf of the UNC faculty, would like to acknowledge the work of the Provost's Office in making funds available for internal faculty awards. These funds allow faculty to develop proposal-writing skills, take the risk of developing new projects, travel to professional conferences, and engage in research and other scholarly activities that enhance UNC. We are also grateful for the excellent support provided by Ms. Sherry May and Dr. Michele Schwiertz from the Office of Sponsored Programs,

who make it possible for the board to function and who coordinate this very needed and useful program. And we would like to thank Ms. Arlene Hansen for keeping our webpage (<http://www.unco.edu/frpb>) up to date.

Respectfully submitted on May 15, 2014

Nancy J. Matchett (submitted via email)

Nancy J. Matchett, PhD
FRPB Chair 2013-2014
Associate Professor of Philosophy
nancy.matchett@unco.edu
Campus Box 126; 970-351-1567