AIRC MINUTES - October 5, 2010 - Meeting held in 447 Gardner Hall

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m. by the chair Jason Thrun. In attendance were Kris Mahoney (recorder), Abdol Soofi, Zora Sampson, Dennis Ciesielski, Bidhan Roy, Mark Zidon, and Kathryn Lomax.

Moved (Mahoney), seconded (Zidon) and approved to review the recommendations drafted during the AIRC meeting on May 7, 2010:

1. Add this wording to the SAIF guidelines: “Preference will be given to proposals submitted by faculty and academic staff who have not previously received SAIF funding.”
2. Add two questions to the SAIF proposal: “Has this project received SAIF funding in the past? If yes, what does this proposal add that is different from the project that previously received funding?”
3. Should the committee continue to use blind reviews of proposals?
4. Should the committee continue to request Category B proposals?
5. Encourage Sponsored Programs to host a workshop that helps faculty and academic staff prepare proposals for SAIF funding.
6. Create an ad hoc committee for responsible research.
7. Allow the AIRC members to review a specific number of proposals, where at least three AIRC members review each proposal. For the purpose of assigning proposals, allow members to complete a brief questionnaire that designates preferences to review:
   a. Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods research
   b. Research, creative, or scholarly proposals
   c. Areas of interest (could be based on discipline and/or departments), with the caution that no member of AIRC should review a proposal from his/her department or a proposal with which he/she may be involved.
8. Consider creating 3-year memberships for AIRC, with staggered end dates.

Chair Thrun charged the current AIRC to review and update as needed the 2010-11 guidelines with regard to the May 7 recommendations. Discussion was as follows:

Ciesielski was concerned with misleading wording that prevents access to new faculty.

Soofi would like to see two pools of money for old and new faculty and that money be allocated based on the number of submissions.

Sampson commenting on Point 2 of the May 7 recommendations stated that reporting of previous funding is a part of the process.

Ciesielski suggested adding bullet points to under Point 10 to the SAIF Category A guidelines

Roy voiced concerns that the dollar amount for funding is important to complete research.

After discussion, Thrun offered to encapsulate the spirit of Points 1 and 2 of the May 7 recommendations into current guidelines.

Moved (Zidon), seconded (Ciesielski) and approved to add Point 1 of the May 7 recommendations to the SAIF guidelines and to include the wording “encourage newly appointed faculty to apply”

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Kris Mahoney