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This report describes the FSRC committee’s activities and actions on each of the charges given by the Faculty Senate, as well as any recommendations the committee wishes to make concerning the charges for FY 2016-17 to the University Governance.

**Standing Charges:**

1. Monitor the administration of the General Research Fund (GRF) and make recommendations, as needed, to ensure its effectiveness and appropriate utilization. Report to FacEx concerning actions taken with respect to this charge by 03/05/16. (FY2016 3 year GRP Review).

This year, the FSRC committee completed the 3-year GRF Review. A report was submitted to Kathy Reed for the University Governance on 29 February 2016, describing the findings and recommendations of the review. A copy of the e-mail with the report is enclosed herewith. The following is an excerpt of the recommendations made in the review report:

“According to our findings, graduate teaching loads, research productivity, and research efforts, as measured here [in the report], appear to show some consistent relationships with GRF allocations made during the last three academic years. These relationships are found despite more persistent disciplinary differences that have existed concerning teaching loads, research productivity, and research efforts. These differences may be the reason why many members of the FSRC believe that GRF allocations are not sensitive to disciplinary differences and that a more prudent method for GRF allocations is necessary.

Since it may take some time for the committee to develop such a method for GRF allocation, the committee does not recommend any changes to GRF allocation for FY 16-17. The committee recommends that one specific charge for the FSRC committee in FY 17-18 should be *to determine a method for GRF allocations that helps overcome a perception of disparity among units, that enhances a more effective way to use of the fund, and that is more dynamic and responsive to changing disciplinary research contexts within and outside the University*.”

1. Monitor the execution of the University’s Restricted Research Policy (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX) in handling requests for exceptions.

As ex-officio, the chair of the FSRC committee was notified via emails on projects requesting exceptions. The FSRC committee reports no issues and makes no recommendations on handling requests for exception.

1. Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.

The FRSC committee did not receive any faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research.

1. Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited.  Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx.

This year the policy on ‘Institutional Endorsement of Proposals when Submissions are Limited by External Funding Agency’ was revised by the Office of Research. Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Torres explained the rationale for the changes made to the policy. The FSRC committee agreed with the changes. There was no approval needed from the committee.

1. Continue working with the ACEC (Academic Computing and Electronic Communications) Committee to process needs for and issues with computing and telecommunications for research, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures and monitoring ongoing and new developments in IT. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx as needed.

Two members of the FRSC committee volunteered to attend the ACEC committee meetings. Based on their reporting, the FSRC committee reports no issues and makes no recommendations.

**Specific charges:**

1. Conduct three-year review of the GRF in Spring 2016.

As noted above, the FSRC committee completed the review and submitted a report describing the findings and recommendations of the review on 29 February 2016.

1. Continue to consider issues related to the use of current systems for external evaluations of the University and internal research evaluations for departments, programs, and faculty.  Explore how these metrics are impacting faculty research, research opportunities, and the understanding of faculty research profiles.

The committee considered the current systems for external evaluations of the University and internal research evaluations for departments, programs, and faculty; and decided to explore how PRO (Professional Record On-line) impacting faculty research, research opportunities, and the understanding of faculty research profiles.

A survey questionnaire for evaluating PRO was developed for departmental chairs (enclosed). The questionnaire may need some revisions to include Libraries as an academic unit. After the revisions, the FSRC committee should use the questionnaire to collect data for evaluating PRO in FY 2016-17.

3. Review how the university’s development of faculty entrepreneurship programs relates to faculty productivity.  Consider how faculty entrepreneurship activities are evaluated.  Report to FacEx by **January 1, 2016**.

The committee members discussed the relationship between faculty entrepreneurship and research productivity in the presence of Vice Chancellor for Research Jim Tracy. After the discussion, the committee took the following consensus view on faculty entrepreneurship activities:

* + At this time, no university policy is required for the university’s development of faculty entrepreneurship programs in relation to faculty productivity.
	+ Given the trends in higher education, the importance of faculty entrepreneurship cannot be ignored as a criterion for faculty evaluation. However, how entrepreneurship activities are evaluated for faculty performance should be left to the discretion of individual academic units.
	+ Each academic unit should make its position on faculty entrepreneurship activities clear in appropriate policies and guidelines on faculty evaluation.

Respectfully submitted,

Mahbub Rashid

(Chair, FRSC)