**UNL Research Council**

**Architecture Hall**

**November 28, 2011**

**MINUTES**

# *Present:* Professors Ferguson, Ford, Hoff, Kamble, Ladunga, Marx, Sarroub, Shipley, Swearer and AVCR Hamernik

# *Absent:* Professors Bloom, Gonzalez-allende, and Albrecht

# *Call to order:* Swearer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

# *Approval of Minutes, October 26, 2011 Meeting (two sets of minutes):* Marx requested a change to the Nebraska Lecture minutes. There was discussion regarding why we forwarded three nominations to VC Paul for consideration; it was because at one point we were considering having three lectures in one year. Marx was not suggesting we have three lectures per year. With this change, motion was made to accept both sets of minutes. Motion seconded and approved.

***Recommendations for Funding – Interdisciplinary Grants:*** Kamble reported they received 12 applications, all very high quality applications. The subcommittee met as a group and reviewed applications. They recommend funding five. Discussion held on redefining what the Council considers an interdisciplinary grant. Sarroub said the recommendation doesn’t represent a lot of variety of departments across campus. There are none from the social sciences or the humanities. It could be that the sciences have stronger grant writing skills.

***Recommendations for Funding – Faculty Seed Grants Subcommittee 1:*** Hoff said there were a total of 28 applications and subcommittee 1 reviewed 14 with a budget of $52,597. They recommend fully funding five and partially funding one.

***Recommendations for Funding – Faculty Seed Grants Subcommittee 2:***  Shipley said their subcommittee also reviewed 14 applications. They have six very strong proposals that they recommend funding. They had applications from a variety of disciplines, and they tried to give precedence to those that were truly seed grants.

***Recommendations for Funding – Grants-In-Aid:*** Ford said their subcommittee reviewed 20 applications and recommend funding 18. They cut the budgets on several applications. Discussion held on whether or not the applicant can do what they need to do with their project when the budget has been cut so severely. Is it still a viable project. Ford said they would like to fund as many applications as they can even with reduced budgets. They are looking at the quality of the application and funding 18 shows support across disciplines and across campus.

Discussion held on moving funding from Grants-In-Aid to Seed Grants.

Discussion was held on the value of paying hotel expenses vs. funding a research assistant position. Sarroub said if the faculty member has a track record for producing research and publishing, that should be the basis for the award. We should not discriminate against applications because they are requesting funds for paying rent on an apartment; one person traveling to collect data and one staying in Lincoln doesn’t make their project any less worthy.

Ferguson noted that even though we ask that applications be written in lay terms, they are not always written that way. It appears that the majority of the Grant-In-Aid applications are from the humanities, and Seed grants and Interdisciplinary grants are from the sciences. Hamernik asked if there are any successful applications that we can use as an example of writing for a lay audience.

Discussion held on applicants applying to more than one category. We may want to change the guidelines to indicate they can only apply to one category. Several applicants are double and triple dipping. Discussion followed. Hoff made a motion to change the guidelines to state only one application per cycle can be submitted for Interdisciplinary Grants, Faculty Seed Grants, and Grants-In-Aid, with the exception of Visiting Scholars. Motion seconded and approved. Peg will change the wording on the website.

Hamernik asked if we would want to amend our call to say an applicant can be a Project Director on only one Interdisciplinary grant, Faculty Seed grant, or Grant-In-Aid. Then they could still be a co-director on other applications. Council members agreed.

***Recommendations for Funding – Visiting Scholars, Symposium and Distinguished Lecturers:*** Ladunga reviewed the number of Visiting Scholar applications received and they recommend funding 11 Visiting Scholars, 3 Distinguished Lecturers and 1 Symposium. Several of the budgets were cut on these applications also. Discussion held on whether or not they can still have a successful event with the budgets being cut significantly.

***Special Opportunity Fund:*** Ladunga said they have also received a request for Special Opportunity Funds and they do not recommend funding it. Discussion followed. Swearer suggested that it may be more appropriate for these requests to be directed to VC Paul or the Associate VC for Research for consideration. Hamernik noted that if the requests are submitted to the Office of Research, she would still like the Research Council to review and comment on the application, and then make the recommendation to VC Paul for funding. **See Addendum 1.**

Motion was made to approve all of the recommendations for funding from all of the subcommittees during the course of the meeting. Motion seconded and approved.

***Research Growth Plan:*** Swearer asked if everyone received a copy of VC Paul’s Research Growth Plan. If anyone has comments, please direct them to VC Paul.

***Report to the Faculty Senate:*** We will be submitting a revised report to the Faculty Senate with the correct statistical information.

***Nebraska Lecture Series:*** Swearer distributed the spread sheet indicating who the next three lecturers will be. Are there any additional comments regarding the October discussion? Swearer reviewed the time frame for the selected speakers. With this schedule, we are set through spring of 2013. Do we need to do a new call for nominations this spring. It could be problematic when we project forward three semesters. Routinely, we should only select two speakers annually. It was decided to do a call for new nominations in spring 2012 and select one speaker. This will get us back on track for selecting only two speakers per year. Swearer will check with VC Paul about selecting only one speaker in the spring.

***Is a December Meeting Needed:*** There will be no December meeting. Peg will do a doodle poll to schedule the January meeting.

***Adjournment:*** There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

**Addendum 1**
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***Second Request for Special Opportunity Funds:*** A second request for Special Opportunity Funds was received after the Council met as a group November 28, 2011. The request was reviewed by the subcommittee and they recommend funding this request at $1,000. Voting was done via email. The recommendation was approved.