University Research Enhancement Committee Report, Spring 2019

* Specifying the formatting of tables in the application narrative

Agreed: tables can be single spaced, page width should conform to 1” margins requirement

Endorsed by Faculty Senate by majority vote

* Should a faculty member listed as a consultant on a proposal also be able to submit a proposal of their own

Agreed: Faculty who are proposed as paid consultants on an REP proposal may not submit another proposal. To enforce, the names of any paid consultants and their affiliation will be requested in the budget justification section.

The FS declined to endorse this recommendation.

* Assigning bonus points to first-time assistant professor PI applications

Discussion items:

* + Are first time assistant professors competitive without bonus points?

OSP will calculate the 2018-19 outcomes without the bonus points for the committee to compare the two sets of results before making a recommendation.

After reviewing the data provided by OSP, the UREC recommended discontinuing the use of bonus points for the next two application cycles and then reviewing how first-time assistant professor applications fared in the review process. The FS endorsed this proposal.

* + Should bonus points be used as a means to address salary compression experienced by associate professors?

The committee agreed that salary compression is a problem that should be addressed, but that it is not appropriate to use the REP as a means to do so and would set a problematic precedent.

* The committee also discussed the items forwarded by the Council on Funded Research (via Alex)

It was pointed out that the council’s purview has always been external funding and there was surprise that it would forward concerns about the internally funded REP, especially because the concerns were based solely on personal perceptions of its members.
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