Main committee activities:

1. Review and award of faculty research grants.

2. Review and award of faculty travel grants.

3. Make recommendations for changes/improvements in the review process for research grants and in the eligibility criteria for travel grants.

Research grants

A total of 52 grants were received. These are reviewed by 4 experts, recommended by the PI, 2 internal (WVU) and 2 external, who provide written opinions. 2 members of the committee provide an internal review, which involves a synthesis of the expert reviews as well as additional expert review, where possible and appropriate.

Last year (1999-2000) we had a 2nd round call for research grants (because of very poor response to the first deadline). The 2nd call attracted many good grants, which could not all be funded. We allowed anyone who had an unfunded grant in the 2nd cycle of last year to submit the unchanged grant if they wished. 12 grants were resubmitted by this mechanism.

A total of $160,000 was available from the Faculty Senate and this was all allocated to 17 of the 52 grants, based on % ranking. The geographic distribution was:

English 3; Biology 2; 1 each to History; Music; Political Science; Physics; Art; Journalism; Philosophy; Microbiology; Counseling; Forestry; Research Management/Ag Sch; Mathematics.

Of the 12 resubmitted grants, 4 were funded.

Travel grants

Each grant is reviewed by every member of the committee.

We have 5 cycles/yr and so far we have reviewed 4 (final application deadline June 4). A total of $90,000 is allocated.

Cycle 1. We reviewed 52 travel grants. 44 grants were funded either as requested or to the maximal allowable. Total $17,450 allocated.

Cycle 2. We reviewed 36 travel grants. 27 grants were funded. Total allocated on this round $9,909.
Cycle 3. We reviewed 43 travel grants. 36 grants were funded. Total allocated on this round 15,106.

Cycle 4. We reviewed 67 travel grants. 44 grants were funded. Total allocated on this round 18,786.

Funds remaining: $9,810 for the final (5th) cycle.

Reasons for rejection included:

   No abstract and/or information on acceptance onto program (these can be resubmitted);

   Wrong area for funding by this committee (some of these are redirected to Faculty Development).

Recommendations for changes/improvements in the review process for research grants and in the eligibility criteria for travel grants.

Research Grants

Scoring policy

Out of a possible 100 points, a maximum of 20 is allocated based on rank and previous # of awards. Last year, it was decided to eliminate the 7 point penalty for tenure, as being unduly harsh on senior faculty. Current system:

Previous Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>14 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>8 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No awards</td>
<td>6 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One award</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two awards</td>
<td>1 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We propose that this system is retained.

Academic Review

The remaining 80 points are allocated based on the academic review by:

   2 Internal and 2 external expert reviewers, recommended by the PI.

   2 members of the committee provide an additional internal review.
The following problems were identified:

This is a large number of reviews and reviewer time for a small $$ value grant.

Reviews may not be objective since the PI chooses the reviewers.

Many reviews are not very critical, therefore, any negative comments mean that a grant fails.

The committee members who also review, often lack the expertise to make a valid judgement on the grant. This means that the packaging of the grant often becomes more important than the research question.

**After extensive consideration and discussion we cannot come up with a better alternative. Suggest that this is left open for later consideration.**

**Funds available**

In the last 2 years a large # of excellent and very well reviewed grants have not been funded because of lack of resources. We recommend a substantial increase in budget so that grants rated at 80/100 or higher can be funded.

**Suggest an increase from $175,000 to $220,000.**

**Eligibility for research grants**

We discussed whether faculty equivalents, eg. those in the counseling service or medical residents should be eligible to apply for research grants. This was raised for consideration by the Senate Executive. The decision was that if research is a required component of the faculty equivalent position, those individuals are eligible.

**Travel Grants**

The Faculty Travel Grant Program helps full-time (1.0 FTE) faculty attend regional, national, or international professional affairs to present or perform scholarly or artistic works. Funding has traditionally been limited to those who are presenting research or scholarly activity, or who are making an artistic presentation (eg. Art exhibition; musical performance).

We discussed broadening the areas funded by Travel grants to include teaching*, as there is no separate funding source for these faculty.

We decided that we would keep the current limitations but we have recommended to the Senate Executive, that a separate category of travel support be obtained for teaching/outreach activities. This would require additional funds as the available travel funds are already fully allocated.
* Teaching here means a description of a course or a lesson on how to do something; research on teaching methods is eligible for travel funds.