The meeting was called to order by Mark Zidon at 3:06 p.m. in 159 Pioneer Tower. B. J. Reed served as recorder. Summer Zwanziger participated in the meeting by (speaker) phone. Zidon asked the AIRC members present to begin funding deliberations by presenting any comments they may have about problems noted in specific proposals.

Zidon brought up the issue of personal name(s) appearing on proposals, contrary to the SAIF grant instructions. Moved (Reed) and seconded (Mahoney) that any proposal with the researcher’s (or scholar’s) name appearing within the proposal beyond the cover page will be disqualified; motion approved. Therefore, the following proposals were disqualified:

- A16 Research in Czech National Library Klementium to compare English and Czech Accounts of John Dee and Edward Kelley’s Alchemical Experiments and Political Contacts at the Court of Emperor Rudolf II
- A17 A Case Study of Reggio Emilia Approach

A comment was raised about a proposal where the narrative did not agree completely with the budget submitted for that proposal. Moved (Reed) and seconded (Monhardt) to limit funding for this proposal to no more than the salary requested in the budget, provided the AIRC committee agrees to provide any funding. Whatever the AIRC decides subsequent to this motion (at this meeting) will take precedence. Motion approved.

The committee moved on the funding deliberations for all proposals (except those that were disqualified). Mahoney suggested that we consider proposals based on the committee’s ratings (submitted before the meeting to Zidon) in appropriate chunks for consideration. The committee agreed. Moved (Reed) and seconded (Mahoney) to fund the proposals with a score of 4.00 to 5 for the full amount allowed (9 proposals @ $4,000 = $36,000); motion approved. The following proposals will receive this funding:

- A9 Fast Gas Chromotography Applications in Scheduled Drug Identification
- A10 Proliferation & Accumulation of Embryonic and Adult Stem Cell Lines for Differentiation Analysis
- A4 Manipulating Signaling Activities to Better Understand Cell Death and Toxic Shock
• A3 Oscillations of a Sphere in a Viscous Fluid in Atomic Force Microscopy
• A14 Assessing Restoration Activities in Streams of Southwest Wisconsin
• A27 Ethnic Humor in Multiethnic America
• B3 Ice Age Sand Dune and Dust History in the White River Badlands, South Dakota
• B1 Improving Global Education at the University of Wisconsin—Platteville

Moved (Mahoney) and seconded (Omachonu) to fund those proposals with a rating of 3.5 up to (but not including) 4.00 for $3,000 (8 @ $3,000 = $24,000); motion approved. This includes the following proposals:
• A15 Identifying Scars on the Landscape from Recent Tornadoes in Wisconsin and the Upper Midwest
• A21 A Visual Essay Series of Representational Paintings and Drawings from the Yucatan Carribbean Coast
• A2 Development of a Lens Characterization Instrument
• A13 Assessment and Structure of Internship Studies in Business Majors
• A6 Updating and Extending the Study of Biotechnology for Further Advanced Scholarly Activities in the Area
• A18 Creating New Repertoire for a New UWP Faculty Ensemble (see note above for earlier, now superceded motion)
• A23 Mothering: A Memoir
• B4 Testing for Nonlinear Interdependence of Financial Markets Using Mutual Prediction Method

Moved (Narayan) and seconded (Mahoney) to fund proposal A8 Modeling and Analysis of Frictional Coupling Mechanism in Multidisk Stepless Transmission for $3,000 and to fund the following proposals for approximately $2,333 each (assigning the rest of the monies set aside for the SAIF program); motion approved.
• A19 The Natural Resource Curse and Choice of Governance: The African Experience
• A20 English Education in China: Articulation Between Elementary and Middle Schools
• B2 History, Memory and Visual Culture: (Re)Visioning Modern Latin American History

All proposals with a rating of less than 3 were not funded.

The committee discussed several issues and will meet again this semester to prepare recommendations for next year’s AIRC.

1) Does the AIRC want to encourage new faculty and faculty who have not received SAIF grants previously to apply? If so, the committee might consider adding these words to the SAIF guidelines: “Preference will be given to faculty/academic staff who have never received SAIF funds.”
2) Does the AIRC want to fund proposals that have been funded in the past, but are ongoing? The committee might consider requesting an abstract from previously funded SAIF proposals (to be attached to the current proposal) and might add the wording: “How is this current proposal different from previously funded SAIF proposal(s)?”

3) Should AIRC review of proposals be blind? What are the advantages and disadvantages of blind peer review of proposals?

4) Do we need to continue funding Category B proposals, with the continuation of the Grant Writing Opportunity Fund?

5) Should we have a workshop for how to develop a SAIF proposal? Kathy Lomax stated this could be done by the Office of Sponsored Programs in the fall, pending a new hire.

6) Lomax suggested an ad hoc committee for responsible conduct of research so UWP can put it’s plan in place for responsible conduct of research, which will satisfy federal grant funding requirements.

7) What criteria does the AIRC want to follow for assigning review of proposals to committee members? To avoid a conflict of interest, not allowing a committee member to review a proposal from his/her department was followed this year. Criteria for assignment could include

- Preference for quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods research
- Preference for research vs. scholarly activity or creative endeavor
- Preference for general areas: science, humanities, etc.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
B. J. Reed, Appointed Recorder