Library Faculty and Professionals Association (LFPA)
Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities
Annual Report, 2009-2010

Members: Lyn Wolz (chair), Julie Buchsbaum (secretary), Julie Petr (LFPA Exec liaison), Tami Albin, Whitney Baker, Rich Ring

We had a productive year as we awarded most of our research support money. We also made further progress in documenting our policies and procedures.

GRF Report to the Faculty Senate Research Committee

One of the committee’s special charges this year was to complete our report on the results of GRF awards within the last four years. Normally this would have happened last year as part of a pattern of regular triennial reports; however, because the senate committee did not request a report last year due to internal faculty challenges, this report was actually a quadrennial one.

CRSA (Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities) members solicited reports from all library staff who had received Libraries’ GRF awards since 2001. When compiled, the Libraries’ list of outcomes was impressive. Lyn Wolz turned CRSA’s report in to Lori Vachenal, chair of this year’s senate research committee, in February. (For the text of the full report, see Appendix A.)

In June, CRSA received the Faculty Senate Research Committee’s final GRF report which recommended a continuation of the current amount of funding for the Libraries’ portion of the GRF—$6,044. (See Appendix B for the full text of the FSRC’s 2006-2009 GRF report.)

Program

The members of CRSA arranged one program this year. It was titled “How to Find $$$ to Support Your Research” – we were hoping that the dollar signs in the subject line would entice people to look at the email and to attend! The program was held on Wednesday, February 24th from 10:00 to 11:00 am in Watson Conference Room A and consisted on the members of CRSA and others who have expertise in various areas of library administration answering questions from the audience about all aspects of financial support for research and other scholarly activities. Between twelve and fifteen people attended and everyone agreed that it was a worthwhile event. Here is the text of our invitation:

“Join us for a short informal program designed to familiarize library faculty and unclassified professionals with the types of funding available to support research and other scholarly activities. We will describe what kinds of projects we are able to fund and how to apply, explain the differences between LRF and GRF awards, and answer questions you might have about any other aspect of university and outside funding for research projects.”

Manual

Because the fiscal responsibilities of this committee and the chair’s complex duties are different from the responsibilities of most other LFPA committees, Lyn Wolz started compiling an administrative manual three years ago. She continued to make progress on the document this year.
Culture of Scholarship Discussions

This spring we asked Beth Warner, chair of the Mentoring Committee, to meet with us concerning the ideas CRSA has been discussing about how to create a culture of scholarship among the Libraries' staff. In March, we had a substantial and fruitful talk about the issues and came up with ideas we thought might be worth pursuing.

Since there is so much overlap between the two committees, we next scheduled an open discussion between all the members of the CRSA and the Mentoring Committee. The good attendance at this event demonstrated the amount of interest among the library faculty and staff. The consensus of the members of both committees seems to be that, rather than creating yet another committee or task force, we should be able to continue our discussions among already existing groups to come up with an action plan. Since the meeting took place towards the end of the spring semester, we have not yet taken any further action to pursue our goals. We recommend that his coming year's committees include this topic in their agendas next year. (See Appendix C for the notes from these two meetings.)

Administration of Funds

CRSA’s primary responsibility is to distribute funds to library faculty and unclassified professional staff who need financial support for their research. CRSA administers two funds—the KU Libraries’ General Research Fund and the Libraries Research Fund. (See Appendix D for a comparison table of LRF and GRF parameters.

Libraries’ General Research Fund Recipients

This year, the Faculty Senate Research Committee allocated to CRSA the same amount for the Libraries’ GRF awards as we had received each of the previous four years -- $6,044. We first set the deadline at March 12th, later extending it in order to give library staff additional time to turn in applications. This happened several times in past years, with the approval of Patti Steffan, our KUCR liaison. We still only received two applications. After using our new rubric, i.e. evaluation form (see Appendix E), to make sure both projects met all the criteria and in our estimation were worth funding, we returned the budget sheets to the applicants and suggested further legitimate expenses they could include in their applications. In this way, we were able to award our entire allocation to these two interesting and worthwhile projects.

Shiferaw Assefa
Shiferaw Assefa’s project is called "The Verbal System in Amharic," one of the languages of Ethiopia. His academic background in linguistics is key to his program of research; for this project, he will interview native speakers in Africa.

Whitney Baker
Whitney Baker's proposal related to her successful application for a sabbatical in the fall. She titled her project "Bumper Stickers -- Preserving the Message." She will be working with archivists and conservators in Washington, D.C. and other locations to develop standards for preserving bumper stickers and other adhesive media. Her academic background in chemistry is a major asset for this project.
Library Research Fund Recipients

During the course of the fiscal / committee year, CRSA awarded only $4163 out of this year’s $10,000 allocation from the Dean of Libraries. We had fewer applications than usual for LRF money this year, probably because not as many library staff members attended conferences to give presentations, partly due to the reduction in the Libraries’ individual professional development fund allocations and partly because of the recession in general.

Each year CRSA must attempt to spend all of the money allocated to the LRF in order to ensure that the Dean of Libraries will feel justified in allocating the same amount of money—or larger. Towards the end of the fiscal year, we began to give more substantial amounts of money to those applying for travel assistance than we had usually awarded in the past. As it turns out, we could have given more to those who applied, but we had no crystal ball to tell us how many people would apply in June, our usual “rush” time.

Tami Albin

“Under the Rainbow”
Hire students to time stamp and transcribe oral history interviews

Shiferaw Assefa

“A Structured Approach to Agricultural Libraries in Africa”
Printing—poster / handouts for a poster presentation at a conference

Karen Cook

“Comparing Utility of Analog Original versus Digital map Images for History of Cartography Research”
Registration fees—“Essentials of Color Science” course

Amalia Monroe

“Recruiting and Retaining Millennial Members in Library Associations”
Travel—present a paper at Mountain Plains Library Association conference

Sara Morris

“Women as Farmers in 1970s Indiana”
Travel—present a paper at the Agricultural History Society conference

Brian Rosenblum

“Evaluation of Digital Repository Development in Eastern Europe”
Travel—to the Ukraine for research and a conference
LFPA Administrative Issues

Charges

We recommended one of CRSA’s charges be dropped altogether from the Code & By-Laws because the procedure outlined there was no longer being followed:

3.3.9.3
The Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities shall compile and maintain documentation on the Libraries’ requirements for research and scholarly activities. The Committee shall review this documentation and update it annually to reflect the current faculty requirements. This documentation shall be made available to all Library Faculty members.

We also recommended that LFPA Exec change the location of the charges common to all committees--such as sending in their meeting minutes to the LFPA secretary to be put on the website within two weeks and reviewing their web pages and charges each year--to the list of standing charges rather than special charges. See the LFPA Exec notes on the Intranet for more information on these changes.

Guidelines and Forms

This year we revised the GRF rubric, the LRF guidelines, the LRF application form and instructions, and the GRF instructions. (All except the first appears in Appendix F. The rubric is attached as a separate file to the email distributing this document.)

One major change is that the committee revised and updated the instructions for both the LRF and GRF application forms. In years past, applicants had to send six signed paper copies and one electronic copy of their applications to the chair of CRSA. This year Lyn Wolz checked with Patti Steffan at KUCR and with Shannon Royer at the Libraries to see if this was still necessary. They both said that it wasn’t which is why the new instructions say that the applicant needs only to send an electronic copy to the chair.

Possible Future Charges for CRSA

>>> Create Mechanisms to Promote Continuity of Knowledge and Leadership

Because CRSA has more types of responsibilities than most other LFPA committees do, it would be helpful for the new chair of CRSA to meet with the old chair at the beginning of each committee year. The previous year’s chair should also make it easy for her successor to contact her for information and advice any time during the next year, especially if the new chair has not previously served on CRSA.

>>> Continue Efforts to Create a Culture of Scholarship

Continue working with the members of the Mentoring Committee, the Library Sabbatical Leave Committee, and other committees and task forces as appropriate to develop initiatives that will support and encourage the research projects of the library staff. One important step will be to bring members of the Libraries’ administration into the discussions, particularly concerning issues of lack of support for individuals from their supervisors, one of the most cited challenges to those attempting to participate actively in research, presentation, and publication opportunities. The administration also needs to be involved in developing ways to recognize and acknowledge those library staff members who actively participate in research.
Possible Future Charges for CRSA  (cont.)

>>> Continue Compiling and Updating the CRSA Administration Manual

New committee members will need to write or update several sections of the CRSA Administrative Manual. Bold pink type indicates these lacunae in the manuscript. The committee also needs to decide where this “book” can be “located” and who will keep it up to date.

>>> Promote Follow-Through on Reports from Award Recipients

The GRF and LRF guidelines and application forms contain language that requires anyone who receives money from these two funds to send a report to CRSA indicating how they spent the money, what the results were, etc. If the committee members find language that does not already reflect this requirement, they need to add such notice. The committee should also make explicit in all documentation what the consequences for not following through on this requirement will be. For example, one consequence might be that anyone who applies for a GRF or LRF award will be asked to list all previous awards they’ve received and state what they accomplished with those previous grants. If someone does not follow through on previous awards, it would count against them in the committee’s evaluation of their current award application.

Recommendations to LFPA Exec

>>> Make It Easier to Update Websites

We would like to see the Libraries acquire Jumla or similar software that would allow committee members to update and maintain their own section of the Libraries’ intranet within the parameters of the KU website template and under the control of the Libraries’ webmasters. While we don’t want every committee chair or secretary to have to learn how to use new software, it would be much easier to develop a website that would be truly useful if each LFPA and administrative committee or task force had its own website that the members could quickly and easily update.

>>> Create a Permanent Online Archival Home for LFPA / Other Groups’ Materials

Consider what kind of historical record committees and task forces should keep, what documents should be included, and what purpose(s) this record would serve for future committee members. Also, consider who should receive the reports so that they will be easily accessible in future. Indeed, all LFPA and Libraries’ administrative committees and task forces should tackle this charge. It’s not only a question of where to archive our materials but also how to organize them for easy access. There is so far no consensus in the Libraries about any aspect of this question. Should we all be saving our committee information on the Hawk Drive, the G:\ drive, in a Wiki? Should we print out paper copies of all our information to deposit in the KU archives in Spencer? (This would insure preservation but access would be problematic.) How should we handle emails? It is the consensus of this committee that work group, task force, and committee leaders and members could be much more effective in accomplishing their duties if there were such an easily accessible and searchable archive for committee records and other needed documents.
Recommendations to LFPA Exec

>>> Reinstate the Position of Research Coordinator

More than a decade ago, the Libraries had a half-time position with the title of “Grants Coordinator.” The person in this position was dedicated to coordinating support for all individual library faculty members or groups of library faculty engaging in research and other scholarly activities. One of the primary duties for the position was giving information and advice about financial and other kinds of support available to pre-tenure faculty. From 1995 to 2000, that person was Kathleen Neeley. Later, George Gibbs took on the duties as one quarter of his full-time position with the Libraries. Since 2007, no one has taken on these responsibilities, though many of them fall to CRSA by default.

It seems to this committee that with the importance of mentoring, especially for pre-tenure faculty, the library administration should reconsider creating this type of position. There is a vast amount of information that has to be kept up to date as well as distributed and there are many specialized contacts that need to be developed in order for a person in this position to be effective in promoting a culture of scholarship among library staff.

Perhaps a recommendation from LFPA Exec or a vote by the LFPA members will carry more weight than the CRSA recommendations that appeared in the last five CRSA annual reports.
Appendix A


Submitted to the Faculty Senate Research Committee by the KU Libraries’ Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities

I. Goals and Criteria

A. Our Unit Goal Statement

The Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities (CRSA) of the KU Libraries seeks to encourage every library faculty member to develop a program of research and to consider applying for the GRF money that is available to them to further their research goals.

Naturally, one of the major fields of research for librarians is their own discipline of librarianship. However, because many librarians and archivists also have subject expertise, they can carry on research in a broad range of academic fields. Library staff members’ research projects provide them with professional growth and development opportunities, enabling them to better support other faculty at KU, as well as encouraging them to lead / participate in local, state, regional, national, and international organizations in both their professional and subject fields.

We also encourage those who receive GRF awards to produce and share their research results with others in their profession(s) through both presentation and publication, though librarians in general put more emphasis on sharing information with their peers through presentations at professional meetings rather than through publishing books or journal articles.

Over the years, Libraries’ GRF award recipients have used their awards for many different purposes including:

- Supporting travel for research, presentation, collaboration, and interviewing purposes
- Paying fees for copying / scanning archival materials that cannot be loaned
- Hiring students to develop databases, input data, and run reports
- Hiring students to transcribe, time stamp, index, and digitize oral history recordings

Since FY03, the Libraries’ Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities has approved approximately twenty-five GRF awards for research projects proposed by library staff members. These awards have resulted in at least the following outcomes so far:

- 2 books (including one award-winning, nationally recognized online reference book)
- 2 book chapters
- 3 articles in collections of conference papers
- 5 articles in peer-reviewed journals
- 8 articles in non-peer-reviewed periodicals
- 33 presentations made at local, state, regional, national, and international events
- 5 poster sessions presented at local and national conferences
- 1 major oral history collection created, videorecorded, and digitized for KU ScholarWorks
- 2 scholarly web sites developed

Most library faculty members are evaluated 80 - 90% on their professional performance, 5 – 15% on service, and 5 -15% on research activities, so we think this is a substantial output. Please keep in mind that additional presentations and publications resulting from GRF-funded research are currently in the pipeline while there likely have also been quite a few outcomes of which we have no record due to retirements and other staff changes.
I. A. Our Unit Goal Statement (cont.)

While the Libraries have always encouraged their faculty to participate actively in research, librarians overall have had problems in finding outside funding sources to apply to for financial support. We think this might be true for several reasons:

Most librarians have their master’s degree in Library Science, the terminal degree for our profession. Many of us also have a second master’s degree in a subject area, but most of us do not have a PhD, which is often a prerequisite for being a principal investigator for grant purposes.

Librarians as a profession tend to favor humanities and social sciences where outside funding is generally more difficult to find.

Though most of us have worked with Kathy Porsch, the KU Center for Research, and the Hall Center for the Humanities to find outside funding opportunities, we have not had much success.

Many of us also receive regular alerts through the COS service, but have found few leads.

Most of us have little time to research leads and apply for outside funding because of our 80 - 90% time commitment to our professional duties.

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to explain some of the differences between the library faculty and other faculty, which put our outcomes information in context. We feel that the support of the Faculty Senate Research Committee and the KU Center for Research through General Research Fund allocations to the Libraries has enabled the library faculty to contribute to their profession and to garner additional recognition for the University of Kansas in local, state, regional, national, and international venues. (For a list of citations to all library faculty publications and presentations that were outcomes of Libraries’ GRF-funded research awards, please contact the chair.) The members of the Libraries’ Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities would like to see the library GRF allocation continue at current levels, if possible considering the current state and university budget situation.

I. B. Policies and Procedures for the Libraries’ GRF Competition

1. Eligibility of Applicants

All library faculty members on the Lawrence Campus payroll (including Regents Center Library staff) are eligible to submit one GRF proposal as the principal investigator each fiscal year. Note: Faculty members who are within their first 24 months as KU faculty are strongly encouraged to apply to the New Faculty General Research Fund grant before, or concurrently with, the Libraries’ GRF.

2. Composition of the Committee

The Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities administers the GRF monies allocated to the Libraries by the Faculty Senate Research Committee through the KU Center for Research. The Library Faculty and Professionals Association’s Executive Committee (LFPA Exec) appoints CRSA members they choose from among volunteers. There are five members on CRSA and an effort is made to include a representative from each of the three ranks of librarians. If a member of CRSA submits a GRF proposal, that person does not participate in the review of any of the proposals for that year’s GRF competition.
I. B. Policies and Procedures for the Libraries’ GRF Competition  (cont.)

3. Evaluation Criteria
   a. Major Review Criteria
      i. Merit and significance of the project
      ii. Importance of the project to the discipline or to interdisciplinary efforts
      iii. Innovation, creativity, scholarly approach
      iv. Will this project likely lead to a publication, presentation, or other form of outcome?
   
b. Research Plan
      i. Are the research objectives clearly stated and addressed?
      ii. Does the plan describe research methods adequately?
      iii. Does the plan reflect adequate knowledge of related literature?
      iv. Is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion within the stated time, budget, and facilities limitations outlined?
   
c. Additional Review Criteria
      i. Applications of faculty early in their careers will be given additional weight.
      ii. Renewals / continuations of worthwhile projects on which sufficient progress can be documented will be given additional weight.

4. Evaluation Procedures
   a. Applicants turn in one electronic copy of their application form to the chair of CRSA.
   
b. All applications are due by 5:00 pm on the day of the announced deadline.
   
c. All applications are read by all committee members (except committee members who apply for a GRF during the current competition year). The evaluation criteria outlined above are used to make final decisions. (A copy of the evaluation form used is attached to this report.)

5. Notification Procedures
   a. Applicant(s) and necessary library administrative staff are notified of the results.
   
b. The library staff is notified of successful applicants and what their projects entail.
   
c. All applications are kept in CRSA’s paper / online documentation with reasons for funding / not funding / percentage of requested amount funded.
   
d. All successful applications are put on CRSA’s GRF website to be used by future applicants as examples. These records will also form a permanent “public” record of library research supported by GRF money.

6. Rules for Spending Library GRF Award Money

Because librarians are on 12-month appointments, KU Libraries’ GRF money cannot be used for library staff salaries. Budget items that will be considered when justified in the application include payments to consultants, reprint costs, travel costs (including transportation, lodging, per diem or meal costs, etc.) and costs of certain types of equipment, supplies, or other resources that will later be donated to the Libraries (if not completely used up, in the case of consumables).
II. Evidence – How Our Unit’s Goals Have Been Met

A. Outcomes from Libraries’ GRF Awards Made FY 06 – FY 09

- Online reference book, 2009
- Oral history project and website (54 interviews online), 2009
- 17 presentations at regional conferences, 2009
- 3 presentations at international conferences, 2009
- Poster sessions, 2008 and 2007
- Map data sets, 2007-2009
- Article in a regional library periodical, 2008
- Article in a conference proceeding, 2007
- Paper at a national conference, 2007
- Article for a library journal, in progress
- Book chapter, in process

B. Outcomes from Libraries’ GRF Awards Made FY 03 – FY 05

- Poster session, 2006
- Index to manuscript collection, 2006; put on website, 2009
- Article in peer-reviewed journal, 2005
- Poster session, 2004
- Poster session and website, 2004
- Paper in conference proceeding, 2003
- Graduate student support, 2003-2005
- Articles for and editing of a reference book, ongoing

C. Efforts to Reach Our GRF-Related Research Goals

The CRSA has sponsored many events and developed materials and programs designed to encourage library staff members to engage in research projects. Here are some examples:

- Offered workshops on how to find / apply for outside funding (at least once a year).
- Organized panels and discussion groups, writing support groups, and other groups.
- Mentored library staff members who are beginning to participate in the scholarly process.
- Put up an internal website to preserve GRF information and make it easily available.

We have also established a group charged with promoting the culture of scholarship within the KU Libraries. This group is devising ways to recognize library faculty for their research and scholarly activities. We plan to organize special events and exhibits and distribute information about library faculty achievements to appropriate university media.

Submitted by Lyn Wolz, Chair, Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities, KU Libraries, 2/19/2010
Appendix B

Report: Review of the General Research Fund FY06-FY09
Submitted by the Faculty Senate Research Committee, April 5, 2010

Members, Faculty Senate Research Committee, FY10
Lorie A. Vanchena, Germanic Languages and Literatures (2011), Chair vanchena@ku.edu
Ivana Radovanovic, Anthropology (2011) ivana@ku.edu
Raj Srivastava, Business (2010) rsrivastava@ku.edu
John Pultz, History of Art (2012) pultz@ku.edu
Jill Kuhnheim, Spanish (2010, on leave Spring 2010) jskuhn@ku.edu
Dongbin Kim, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (2012) dbkim@ku.edu
John Poggio, Psych/Rsch in Education (2012) jpoggio@ku.edu
Keith Diaz Moore, Architecture & Urban Planning (2012) diazmoor@ku.edu
Laura Moriarty, English (2012) lauramo@ku.edu
Barney Warf, Geography (2012) bwarf@ku.edu
Townsend Peterson, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology (fall 2009) town@ku.edu
Michael Crawford, Anthropology (fall 2009) crawford@ku.edu
Sean Smith, SPED (fall 2009)

Ex-officio:
Steve Warren, Interim Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies sfwarren@ku.edu
Lucas Keefer, Graduate Student Representative lkeefer1@ku.edu
Joshua Rosenbloom, Associate Vice Provost, KUCR jrosenbloom@ku.edu
Bill Sharp, Director, Research Integrity, KUCR wsharp@ku.edu

Charges to the Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC)

The FSRC was initially given the following GRF-related charge for FY10:

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 in respect to this charge by 03/09/10.

In fall 2009 committee members recognized that last year’s GRF subcommittee of the FSRC had not issued recommendations for the reallocation of GRF funds made necessary by the creation of the School of the Arts within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, nor had the subcommittee completed the three-year review of the GRF required by governance. The FSRC consulted Lisa Wolf-Wendel, President of the Faculty Senate, who subsequently charged the FSRC with making recommendations for reallocating funds due to the creation of SOTA. The FSRC submitted its recommendations on GRF reallocations to FacEx on December 1, 2009; the recommendations were approved.

The Faculty Senate also charged the FSRC with completing a GRF review for FY06 – FY09, which would entail evaluating reports submitted by each entity, outlining the degree to which each entity had met its GRF-related research goals, and recommending GRF allocations for the next three-year period. The original deadline for submitting our report was March 9, 2010; it was changed in early spring to April 5, 2010 in order to accommodate entities that had difficulty completing their GRF reports on time.
FSRC Activities

The FSRC took several steps to prepare for the GRF review:

- The FSRC learned from Joshua Rosenbloom, Associate Vice Provost, KUCR, that the online database created for the most recent GRF review (FY06) and the data it had contained were no longer available. A new database could not be created in time for the current GRF review.

- The chair of FSRC consulted with Douglas Huffman, who had chaired the GRF subcommittee in FY06. He provided a rubric that had been used in FY06 for evaluating individual entities, the “call to entities” he had sent out in December 2005, and information on the procedure his subcommittee had followed for reviewing the GRF.

- Kathy Reed in the Governance Office searched through archival material and found FSRC reports for GRF reviews conducted in FY00 (for FY97-99) and FY03 (for FY00-FY02). She also found the FSRC’s “call to entities” from December 2002 and information confirming the guidelines adopted by the Faculty Senate in FY00 for reviewing the GRF.

- The Office of Research and Graduate Studies (RGS) provided a spreadsheet that included information on GRF recipients for the past five years (faculty name, awarding department, date of award, award title, and award amount).

- The FSRC discussed at length the best way to request information from individual entities as well as the type of information that should be requested.

Review Process

In mid-December 2009, the 15 entities listed below were sent initial information concerning the upcoming GRF review. A follow-up e-mail in early January 2010 provided final details on the reporting process.

School of Architecture, Design & Planning  School of Education
School of Business  School of Engineering
School of the Arts (CLAS)  School of Journalism
Behavioral Sciences (CLAS)  School of Law
Humanities (CLAS)  School of Music
Life Sciences (CLAS)  School of Pharmacy
Physical Sciences (CLAS)  University Libraries
Social Sciences (CLAS)

Entities were given the three criteria, specified by governance, that the FSRC would use to evaluate each entity’s progress toward meeting its GRF-related goals during the FY06-FY09 review period:

A. Has the entity made sufficient progress toward achieving the goals specified in its application for funds?

B. Has the entity continued to demonstrate a commitment to enhancing the research, scholarly, and creative activities of its faculty through the use of the GRF?

C. Has the entity and its faculty made appropriate efforts, reasonable for the discipline, to secure external support for faculty scholarship?
Each entity was asked to include the following information in its report:

I. Entity’s goals and criteria for GRF funding procedures.
II. A statement on how GRF goals and criteria were met.

Part II was to consist of three parts:

A. Outcomes and efforts to secure external funding for awards received FY06-FY09.
B. Outcomes and efforts to secure external funding for awards received during the previous review period, FY03-FY05. For example, a faculty member’s journal article published in 2007, resulting from a GRF award received in 2005, should be included.
C. Brief narrative statement summarizing the entity’s efforts to achieve its GRF-related research goals.

Parts A and B were to include the faculty name, year of award, outcomes, and efforts to secure external funding for that GRF project. Outcomes could be stated briefly, with dates (Peer-reviewed article, 2007). Efforts to secure external funding could also be stated briefly (Grant proposal, American Philosophical Society, 2007, funded).

Entities were asked to list all significant outcomes of GRF awards, which could include but not be limited to peer reviewed articles, non-peer reviewed articles, books, book chapters, graduate student support, presentations or performances, conference attendance, patents/licenses, newsletters or other media writings, artwork, exhibition curated, receiving additional grant funding, or submitting grant proposals.

The initial deadline set by FSRC for submitting GRF reports was Friday, February 12. The deadline was extended to Monday, February 22. A Blackboard site was created for posting entity reports and facilitating the GRF review process. The FSRC then formed four review teams, each of which was assigned specific entities to evaluate; everyone used the same evaluation rubric. No one evaluated his or her home entity. Each committee member reviewed his or her entities individually and then met with team members to devise a joint evaluation. The team evaluations were then discussed by the entire committee. The FSRC met several times to discuss GRF reports. The chair of FSRC followed up with individual entities whenever clarification was needed. The evaluation rubric can be found at end of this report.

**Recommendations for GRF Allocations**

Based on the entity reports submitted and extensive discussion—the results of which are provided in the next section, Evaluation Summaries of Entity Reports—the FSRC recommends that the following adjustments be made to GRF allocations:

**Decrease Life Sciences and Physical Sciences by 7% ($7,461 and $6,815 respectively) = $14,276**

Distribute $14,276 among six entities—Behavioral Sciences, Engineering, Law, Architecture, Pharmacy, and Education—increasing each of their allocations by 10%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>$2,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>$3,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>$2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture, Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>$1,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>$2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$14,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference of $57 ($14,333 - $14,276) should be taken from Pharmacy, thus reducing its increase from $1,793 to $1,736 (9.6%).
Evaluation Summaries of Entity Reports

School of Architecture, Design & Planning
This entity’s GRF report clearly states the School’s goals and criteria. It also provides clear documentation of the School’s success in fulfilling its goals and criteria. During the current review period, 21 GRFs were awarded; the varied outcomes included multimedia exhibitions, solo exhibitions, publication of accompanying brochure for solo exhibition, national and international conference presentations, photography books, photos in newspapers and magazines, peer-reviewed journal articles, articles in progress, a brochure for Kansas local governments, participation in panel discussions, commissioned artwork, and gallery talks. To its credit, the School has committed its own funds to supplement GRF awards. This support is especially significant in view of the fact that GRF awards have been comparatively small in recent years (average $2,188), smaller even than some of the research awards available for graduate and undergraduate students. GRF recipients have applied for numerous external grants, several of which have been funded, including an Education Initiative Grant ($198,225) and a Kaufmann Foundation Education Grant ($75,000).

School of Business
The GRF report submitted by the School of Business clearly states the entity’s goals and criteria for GRF proposals and documents the School’s success in fulfilling its goals and criteria. During the current review period, 32 GRF proposals were funded; 8 went to faculty early in their professional careers, which is one of the entity’s stated criteria. These awards resulted in peer-reviewed articles; presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; undergraduate and graduate student support; and articles in progress or under review. GRF awards led to three proposals for external funding, one of which was funded (the outcome of the others is still pending). The FSRC would encourage Business to make clear in future reports that, while external funding for faculty members in the School is limited in the “traditional” sense, the research conducted by its faculty members does attract considerable external funding in the form of private and corporate donations.

School of the Arts (CLAS)
Given that SOTA is a new entity with a new GRF budget, with no grants yet conferred through the entity, progress cannot yet be determined. The narrative of the SOTA Associate Dean is a thoughtful consideration of the issues SOTA needs to consider regarding the GRF process and allocations. It seems most appropriate to leave the SOTA allocation set at the level established by the FSRC in fall 2009, with the expectation that the next FSRC review, presumably in 2013, will carefully judge SOTA’s use of GRF funding.
The committee would encourage SOTA to ensure that its guidelines appropriately reflect the variety of research-related activities of its faculty. This suggestion applies especially to the third goal: increase the number of external grants/fellowship applications. This change could include keeping records of funded residencies, funded exhibitions/installations, or other efforts and achievements that offer evidence of external support. In addition, the committee is perplexed by the inclusion of budgetary limits from Social Sciences and Behavioral Sciences in the entity's Guidelines (perhaps the guidelines were adopted from another entity and need further revision for use by SOTA).

**Behavioral Sciences (CLAS)**
The GRF report submitted by Behavioral Sciences clearly presents the entity's particular goals and the manner in which the entity has achieved its goals. Of the 16 GRF grants awarded during the review period, 15 external grant applications were produced; 7 of these applications led to external grants. GRF awards also produced 14 peer reviewed articles, 1 book chapter, 2 papers under review, and 4 working papers, in addition to 44 presentations and graduate student support. The overall productivity seems appropriate given the entity's stated goals. However, it is not clear how GRF money has been distributed to junior faculty or to senior faculty who begin a new line of research, although these are specified goals of the entity.

**Humanities (CLAS)**
Because there are several diverse departments and disciplines in Humanities, performance outcomes differ significantly. For example, a faculty member in history received GRF funding several times with no academic publications, whereas someone in a different discipline received repeated GRF awards only when he or she had published journal articles. It is not clear from the Humanities report what kinds of commitments are being made by the entity to enhance its faculty's scholarly and creative activities. It seems that some disciplines have tried without success to secure external funding and some have had limited success; a few departments have not tried at all. It is not clear from the Humanities GRF report whether external funding sources are not available for those disciplines that made no attempts to secure external funding.

**Life Sciences (CLAS)**
The GRF report submitted by Life Sciences clearly states its goals and criteria for GRF applications and awards. The outcomes correspond to these goals and criteria. Ecology and Evolutionary Biology received 10 GRF awards during the review period; the outcomes of these awards appear limited, however, because 5 recipients in 2008-2009 either did not respond to the entity's request for information or have not yet had any outcomes. Outcomes for the remaining 5 recipients included submission of 2 peer-reviewed manuscripts, gathering preliminary data for a future grant proposal, 8 presentations, funding 3 graduate students, and purchasing necessary equipment. GRF awards also led to 5 external grant proposals, two of which were funded (NSF), 2 of which are still pending.

Molecular Biosciences uses GRF allocations to provide stipends for graduate students; GRF awards are currently used to support 2 second-year graduate students, awarded competitively to individual labs. During the review period, 9 US-born graduate students were recruited, and these students published 5 first-author papers in peer-reviewed journals. Faculty mentors received 7 major new grant awards, ranging from $11,355 to $360,000.

**Physical Sciences (CLAS)**
The absence of a specific narrative for the Physical Sciences entity limited the ability of the FSRC to evaluate it. To judge from the spreadsheet submitted, the entity's goal of enhancing changes for extramural funding was only partially met. Although many grant proposals were submitted, many were unfunded or declined. The recipients of GRF funds have produced significant research outcomes. Block grants to Chemistry were used to recruit and support foreign graduate students essential to faculty research.
Social Sciences (CLAS)
Goals are clearly stated in the GRF report, but the focus has been on increasing the number of grant/fellowship proposals submitted to and funded by outside agencies, and increasing the percentage of GRF awards that lead to grant/fellowship proposals and scholarly publications. No hard data on the FY 03-05 review was given, so it is unclear whether the entity’s goals have been met. However, the entity has demonstrated a commitment to research: chairs and mentors encourage new faculty to apply for external funds, and the most recent review period shows that this commitment has paid off in the form of numerous funded proposals (for graduate students as well as faculty), publications, and presentations. It should be noted that the entity made a strong case for more flexibility regarding shifting GRF funds between Social and Behavioral Sciences.

School of Education
The School of Education awarded GRF monies only to those individuals who have demonstrated success, as evidenced by scholarly publications and dissemination of research through presentations at national and international conferences. The number of journal articles published during the current evaluation period appears to be low compared to the number reported for the FY03-FY06 evaluation, while the number of conference presentations has increased. This decrease in publications is attributed partly to the inability to count the research output of GRF recipients who have left KU since the last review. Although few opportunities for external funding exist in Education, some of those receiving GRF awards have successfully secured external grants.

School of Engineering
The GRF report from the School of Engineering documented a clear focus on utilizing GRF funds to maximize return on investment by stimulating projects having “a high likelihood of Facilities and Administrative costs return.” During the review period, Engineering distributed approximately $148,000 for 23 different awards. These awards produced 54 proposals for external funding, 11 of which were funded; they totaled almost $4 million. The report clearly reflects an emphasis on accountability for these funds and their associated outcomes.

School of Journalism
The School of Journalism awarded GRF grants to faculty who have shown results. Grant recipients have published scholarly articles and books and given conference presentations. However, it appears that the School of Journalism’s objectives for GRF awards are not in congruence with the research objectives of the University, for they emphasize teaching-related efforts rather than research. It appears that most past recipients of GRF grants have been successful in obtaining external support.

School of Law
The School of Law has awarded GRF funds only to those individuals who have demonstrated success. The School’s criteria for GRF applications encourage awardees to continue making progress in their scholarly activities, as evidenced by scholarly publications and dissemination of their scholarship through conference presentations. Also, the School of Law has committed its own funds to support research efforts. Although not much opportunity for external funding exists in the field, some of those receiving GRF grants have successfully sought external funding.

School of Music
The School of Music is a new, independent unit that emerged from the reorganization of the former School of Fine Arts in 2009. As such, the report from Music was understandably embryonic and poorly developed, reflecting an apparently low number of applications and awards for a faculty of 50. Given the substantial allocation of GRF funds to this new School, it is incumbent upon the School to develop clear research goals and criteria for assessing progress in this area.

School of Pharmacy
The report submitted by the School of Pharmacy clearly states that GRF awards are used to “fund promising research at an early stage to enhance the chances of major external funding and offer this support primarily to younger faculty.” To the School’s credit, Pharmacy supplements its GRF
allocations, creating even greater opportunity for its faculty to undertake innovative programs of research. With $107,935 in GRF funds during this review period, Pharmacy has successfully generated $298,595 in external funding directly related to the GRF-funded projects (through 3 accepted proposals). Questions that arise include whether this “per award amount” should be understood as “major” in pharmaceutical research, particularly given that one grant constituted $217,595 of that amount and was stimulated by a GRF to a full professor, not a “younger faculty,” as identified in their goals for the GRF.

University Libraries
According to the GRF report submitted by KU Libraries, the Library’s Committee for Research has not always been able to award all the GRF money allocated to KU Libraries. However, the report pointed out that the entity faces unique challenges with regard to applications for funding: the terminal degree for librarians is not a Ph.D., so they are ineligible for many grants. Also, only 5-10% of librarians’ time is allotted for research: “Though most KU librarians have worked with Kathy Porsch and the KUCR, few have found and successfully applied for outside funding.” Nevertheless, the entity managed to show an increase in outcomes from GRF awards compared with FY 03-05. From FY 06-09, GRF awards for Libraries have led to an online reference book, an oral history project and website, several presentations and poster sessions and map data sets, as well as an article in a regional library periodical, another article in a conference proceeding, and a paper at a national conference.

Additional Observations and Recommendations
Throughout the review process, members of the FSRC emphasized the need to consider broader issues related to the GRF review and the GRF in general. The following is a summary of the issues we discussed, with further recommendations where appropriate.

1. Review Criteria
In the broadest terms, the FSRC has considered whether the current review process is the best approach to determining the effectiveness of the GRF.

Committee members feel that, in order to measure the success of the GRF in the best way possible, new criteria should be devised. We found the three criteria currently required to be ambiguous; moreover, criteria A and B overlap to some degree, as do B and C.

**Recommendation:** Point A should address how well the entity’s use of GRF funds supports the university’s research mission; the entity should be asked to provide its objectives in a way that makes clear how its objectives relate to the research mission of the university. Criteria B should determine whether the entity has clearly stated goals for using GRF monies allocated to the entity and also criteria for assessing its success in meeting its stated goals. Criteria C should then ask the entity to demonstrate, using its stated criteria, whether it has successfully met its goals. (It should be pointed out that these goals and criteria are not the same as those used by an entity to evaluate GRF proposals submitted by its faculty.)

While each entity has its own goals and criteria for GRF funds, the GRF needs to enhance the research mission of the university. A clear statement on the research mission of the university is needed, one in addition to the sentence provided on RGS’s current GRF website: “The GRF is a competitive award program that provides funding for the advancement of the university’s research program.” Moreover, entities’ goals need to be aligned with the stated goals of the GRF.

In the reports submitted this spring, entities tended to provide their goals for using GRF monies allocated to them, but they did not all provide the criteria used for assessing success in meeting their goals. The FSRC needs to make clear that entities need to include both goals and criteria in their GRF reports.
2. Review Process
The FSRC has gathered numerous suggestions during our meetings and discussions with entity representatives for improving and facilitating the review process.

Our review of the GRF has not been as informed as we would have wished, in part due to differences in the quality of reports submitted by entities, for example.

*Recommendation:* The FSRC could be charged in FY11 with utilizing our experience this year to improve both the GRF reporting and the GRF review process. We could provide valuable input to RGS for developing and maintaining on online database, for example, and we can gather information from current entity representatives on how to facilitate the reporting process.

3. Equity and GRF Allocations – Further Discussion Needed
The FSRC discussed the possibility of recommending changes beyond the 10% limit currently required by governance. Committee members have pointed out that we do not know how original allocations were determined (although we have made an effort to find out), and current allocations and the triennial reviews may not reflect factors such as improved performance in GRF outcomes, faculty turnover, changes in availability of external funding, etc.

Some committee members have suggested that, unless a better system is devised for evaluating an entity’s use of GRF monies, a system based on goals and criteria set forth by each entity, then a per-person approach to GRF allocations might serve as a better solution. Such an approach would also address the large discrepancies in funding per faculty member that exist among GRF entities (approximately $166 per faculty in Journalism versus approximately $1630 per faculty in Pharmacy, for example). While these allocations reflect a long history of allocations and adjustments made on the grounds of differential research productivity among the faculty, the process raises questions about whether the submitted reports reflect genuine differences in faculty productivity or differences in the quality of reporting. It strikes some as odd that the highest GRF allocations (per person) tend to go to those units with the greatest ability to procure external funding. The GRF review then becomes about choosing between productivity (or efficiency) and equity. Using a per-person (eligible faculty) basis for awarding GRF dollars would help bypass much of the subjectivity that marks the assessment of research productivity, and it might even spur productivity, as units with previously low levels of GRF funding may enhance their research output if increased funds were made available to them. We were asked to consider the opportunity cost of the current system.

There is competition for GRF awards at two levels: within each entity and among entities. It was suggested that it is easier to trust competition within entities, rather than at the level of the FSRC. Dividing the fund on a per-person basis would help put the competition back at the entity level.

Committee members also discussed the issue of tension that exists between revenue-producing and non-revenue-producing research, i.e. research that brings in external funds versus research for the sake of research.

**Additional questions raised during the review:**
1. Does each entity receive feedback from the FSRC on its evaluation of the GRF?
2. How should we handle faculty members who left KU without reporting on GRF outcomes?
3. Should there be a minimum allocation for entities?
## Evaluation Rubric for GRF Review, 2010

| Ratings |
|------------------|------------------|
| **3 = Yes/Achieved Criteria.** Clear evidence that the entity has met its criteria. |
| **2 = Somewhat Achieved Criteria.** Some evidence that the entity has met its criteria, although there is room for improvement. |
| **1 = No/Did Not Achieve Criteria.** Clear evidence that the entity has not met its criteria or did not properly report accomplishments. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please write specific comments and supply specific evidence that supports your ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Has the entity made sufficient progress toward achieving the goals specified in its application for funds? (circle one)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Has the entity continued to demonstrate a commitment to enhancing the research, scholarly, and creative activities of its faculty through the use of the GRF? (circle one)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Have the entity and its faculty made appropriate efforts, reasonable for the discipline, to secure external support for faculty scholarship? (circle one)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

CRSA Meeting Minutes  Wednesday, March 17th, 2010

Culture of Scholarship Discussion

Our guest Beth Warner is chair of the Mentoring Committee (MC) as well as being the institutional grants coordinator for the Libraries. We invited her to this meeting to help us brainstorm ideas ways to promote a culture of scholarship among the faculty and staff of the KU Libraries.

Beth told us about the new MC website which contains information about Communities of Interest, becoming a mentor, finding a mentor, etc. The MC is also currently working on a Tenure and Promotion Mentoring Plan as required by the Provost’s Office. They will have the Libraries’ proposed plan ready for distribution to library faculty by April 1st. There will be time for open discussion of the plan at the next LFPA meeting. Parts of the plan will be available to the public; parts will be for internal use only.

We discussed possible activities for joint sponsorship between CRSA and MC. (For a list of possible programs on scholarly activities, as well as a detailed list of types of scholarly activities, see the 2005-2006 CRSA annual report: http://lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/annrepfy06.pdf.)

We discussed recommending to Lorraine that she convene a special task force on the culture of scholarship for the Libraries. It’s an idea that’s been discussed in CRSA over the last several years. Beth said that she would prefer the Libraries not create another group, but encourage better coordination between already-existing groups.

Beth reported on the work that the university-wide faculty task force on research engagement has done. Since research engagement is one of the new chancellor’s priorities, we need to keep current with what this group has done and what they end up recommending to encourage research within KU as a whole. There will likely be a big push by the administration in the near future to encourage more research not only at the pre-tenure level, but at all levels. Recommendations will likely include a reward structure for scholarly research production, as well as consequences for lack of adequate research outcomes for individuals and units. They are also discussing how to develop a tracking mechanism to keep a record of all research activities carried out by all KU units.

We described to Beth our previous discussions about how and where to archive all of our “publications” so that everything is permanently available. This, of course, parallels the discussions happening in the chancellor’s Research Engagement Task Force, so we might want to see what this task force recommends and what is actually implemented before deciding what to do for our committee and other Libraries committees. (The possibilities CRSA has discussed so far include – Hawk Drive, COS, and ScholarWorks.)

We talked briefly about long-term issues such as the continuation of faculty status for library faculty and the new Discipline Expectations and Criteria for Ranks documents recently accepted by the LFPA (http://www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA). Beth also told us about her work with a recently convened task force charged with defining the Libraries’ promotion and tenure committee. For example, they are discussing the possibility of there being a review committee to look at tenure and promotion files before those files are sent on to LCPT; this new intermediate review could give candidates feedback before their files are officially reviewed by LCPT, hopefully resulting in more successful applications and better library faculty morale.

Getting back to the topic of how to encourage a culture of scholarship, Beth recommended that we think in terms of defining outcomes or goals during our planning process, then building in assessment so we can see if we met our goals. She reiterated the importance of having actionable goals with time frames for completion and assessment. She also volunteered to help us with our process once we start working on this kind of planning.
We reviewed impediments to research activities among library staff including the lack of support from some supervisors and the inequalities of time available for research and writing. CRSA has discussed working with the Libraries’ administration to encourage support from supervisors, but Beth didn’t feel that this was a fruitful avenue to explore. We didn’t come to any conclusions about positive ways to deal with such challenges.

We talked about ways to ensure reporting of outcomes from past GRF and LRF awards. CRSA has already changed our guidelines and application forms to require applicants to report their outcomes from previous CRSA awards on any future GRF and LRF applications. We also discussed the possibility of making it easier for people to report by allowing CRSA members access to the “public” portion of updated CVs sent in by all library staff during the annual evaluation process. We could suggest that each employee add recent publications / presentations in a brightly colored font to make the ones added since their last annual review stand out, making the information quick and easy to capture. The difficulty for them will be marking which ones are based on research they accomplished with the support of previous LRF or GRF awards.

Ideas for further program development included having more joint meetings between CRSA and the MC, possibly quarterly, which would allow us to experiment with more activities and events tied to research and publication. Ex. What is a program of research? How do you go about developing one?

Would the exhibit committee be interested in developing an exhibit of publications by library staff? Probably not in the major exhibit area where they are trying to work with teaching and research units to develop major joint projects. Are there other areas where such an exhibit could be put?

**CRSA / Mentoring Committee Open Session on Creating a Culture of Scholarship (4-21-10)**

**Discussion Points**

- What does administration expect from library faculty?
- How can we address lack of support from some supervisors?
- We need to discuss norms across units in the library as far as research time goes. The Dean’s Council, Management Council, CRSA, and the Library Organizational Staff Development Council should be involved in these discussions (and maybe others like the Mentoring Committee).
- How can we ensure that an employee’s agreed-upon percent of time for research is honored?
- Employees need to show accountability for how they spend their research time, i.e. either demonstrable progress toward goals or actual accomplishments.
- We need to follow outcomes from the Chancellor’s Research & Engagement Task Force closely.
- We need to keep in mind that the new Provost has questioned faculty status for librarians in his previous positions and be proactive in embedding ourselves as research partners who need our own experience as researchers to help the other faculty in their research and teaching.
- To support this, we need a short description of what makes librarians faculty. The AAUP document called the Red Book might help, as will the LFPA Discipline Expectations.
- We need to ask ourselves “Are we being enthusiastic researchers?”
- We need to be proactive on our own behalf. “Scholarship is our work.”
On the other hand, “Our work is our scholarship.” We need to familiarize ourselves with how to turn professional library projects into scholarship, writing, presentations, and publications. Collaboration and partnerships will be very important in this process.

We should consider ways to work with the University Committee on Libraries to promote library research and outcomes.

We need to publicize our projects / publications / presentations. Some possible methods:
  - Use the Celebration of Excellence as a way to broaden recognition
  - Develop individual library faculty and staff web pages
  - Make CVs accessible online (questions of privacy, etc.)

We need to develop and maintain regular mechanisms for creating bibliographies of publications, presentations, and other research outcomes of library employee projects.
  - Ex. Create an annual list of publications and presentations.
  - Ex. Showcase scholarship products in a unit newsletter to inform library faculty and staff about what their colleagues are doing.

How can we get more library faculty and staff to participate in KU Scholarworks? Suggestion – Use practicum students to write for copyright permissions, scan and upload publications, etc.

CRSA, in cooperation with other groups, could sponsor a brown bag seminar series. Should these be held weekly, monthly, bi-monthly, or quarterly?

Help library staff with presentations by sponsoring presentation practice sessions; presenters would get useful feedback about their presentations in time to makes changes before the actual event.

It would be interesting to host presentations that were given at conferences with the added dimension of a discussion period.

Sponsor discussions of designated readings. We need to provide a space and time to have the “big” conversations on professional issues, new national research reports, and recent hot topics. Ex. Ithaka reports, OCLC report

Offer “lightning rounds,” i.e. short synopses of presentations or publications.

We need to investigate the most effective ways to mentor tenured faculty for promotion, especially Associate Librarians before they apply for full professor (Librarian) status.

Since IS is dissolving, does that provide us with any opportunities?

We need to provide refreshments for whatever kind of kickoff meeting we plan? Food = people!
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CRSA Administrative Manual  Comparison Table – LRF / GRF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>LRF</th>
<th>GRF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money allocated by</td>
<td>Dean of KU Libraries</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Research Committee through the KU Center for Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application date</td>
<td>Any time during the current fiscal year</td>
<td>Between March 1st and April 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Deadline</td>
<td>By the end of the current fiscal year</td>
<td>End of the following fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual award amounts</td>
<td>$50 - $500</td>
<td>$500 - $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of uses</td>
<td>Posters for presentations</td>
<td>Travel for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(some overlap)</td>
<td>Incentives for focus groups</td>
<td>Translation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illustrations for a publication</td>
<td>Subduction for a publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E

New Rubric for Evaluating GRF Applications

See separate file attached to the email delivering this report.
Appendix F

Libraries Research Fund (LRF) Guidelines and Application Form

Background
To encourage a culture of scholarship among KU Libraries’ faculty and unclassified professional staff, the library administration provides money to fund an account called the Libraries Research Fund (LRF). This money is allocated to the Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities (CRSA) which is responsible for distributing the LRF awards.

Purpose
These funds are primarily intended to support small projects that cannot be funded from other sources or to act as seed money to begin a research project prior to its being developed far enough to be eligible for funding from other sources. The money can also be used to cover incidental expenses connected with conducting research.

Eligibility
All library faculty and unclassified professional library staff who participate in research and scholarly activities are eligible to apply for LRF money to support this work.

Guidelines
1. LRF awards can be applied for at any time during the fiscal / committee year (July 1st – June 30th).
2. Recipients are required to spend their LRF money within the fiscal year in which it is awarded.
3. Any portion of awards unspent at the end of the fiscal year will lapse.
4. The committee grants awards on a “first come-first served” basis until the money runs out. At that point, the committee can request additional money from the Dean of Libraries.
5. Recipients of LRF awards are required to file a report with CRSA as soon as possible after spending the money or completing the research project. This report should list the outcomes that result from the funded activities, i.e. research goals accomplished, presentations given, articles submitted for publication, etc. Note: Future funding might be contingent upon reports of past outcomes.
6. Subsequent applications during the same year or the following year for new funding for the same research project are acceptable if evidence of sufficient progress towards research goals is supplied
7. The CRSA has the option to refuse to fund or to only partially fund any request.
8. CRSA generally will NOT award LRF money for the following:
   A. Activities that would usually be paid for in other ways:
      i. Training directly related to specific job responsibilities which would normally be paid for by the Libraries’ administration.
      ii. Class tuition (online, in person at KU, or in person at another institution) which would normally be paid for by the employee.
      iii. The first $300 of registration fees for conferences, workshops, etc. This amount is now paid by the Libraries’ administration, whether or not the employee is giving a presentation.
B. Research and scholarly activities that are not related in any way to the employee’s position responsibilities **EXCEPT WHEN**:

i. The employee already has an established program of education, research, presentation, and publication in the field for which the proposal is written.

ii. The employee continues to be active in the area of their previously established program of research, even though position responsibilities have changed.

**Note:** Anyone applying under these two exceptional circumstances might be asked by the committee to provide additional information as justification for the exception.

**Examples of possible uses for LRF awards (NOT meant to be prescriptive!)**

1. To complement GRF funding or other outside funding.

2. To cover legitimate "out of pocket" expenses directly related to a research project.
   
   Ex. To pay for photocopying costs of materials only available from other locations.
   
   Ex. To pay for the production of slides, overheads, or other aids to accompany the presentation of a scholarly paper.
   
   Ex. To pay for the production of handouts and large posters for poster sessions at professional meetings or conferences.

3. To defray upfront costs demanded by legitimate scholarly publications.

4. To provide incentives for students / faculty to participate in research projects; i.e. focus groups, etc.
   
   **Note:** There are certain restrictions as to how this money can be spent. Please contact the chair of CRSA or Shannon Royer for details before applying for an LRF for this purpose.

5. To cover certain travel expenses. However, please keep the following guidelines in mind:

   **A.** Due to the limited amount of money in the Libraries Research Fund and the many demands made upon it, researchers are encouraged to exhaust the following possibilities **BEFORE** applying for LRF money to be used for travel expenses:

   i. Professional development funds provided to individual librarians and unclassified professionals each year by the administration.
   
   ii. New Faculty General Research Fund for tenure-track librarians within their first two years.
   
   iii. International Travel Funds and other assistance from the Provost’s Office.
   
   iv. The General Research Fund administered by CRSA.
   
   v. Sources outside of KU such as travel money available from professional organizations.

   **B.** LRF money is awarded for travel most often when one or more of the following conditions are met:

   i. The sources outlined above have already been applied for or used.
   
   ii. The amount applied for will supplement other monies already acquired.
   
   iii. The amount applied for is less than $1000.
   
   iv. The opportunity is unexpected and there isn’t time to apply to other sources.
Application Procedures

A. The application form is available at: [www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/LRF_Application_Form.doc](http://www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/LRF_Application_Form.doc) Please apply at least two weeks before the money is needed.

B. Send the completed application form, along with any necessary supporting documentation, as an email attachment to the current chair of CRSA. Find the name of the current chair here: [www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/crsamembers.shtml](http://www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/crsamembers.shtml)

C. The committee chair will send an email acknowledging receipt of the application.

D. The committee chair will notify the applicant of the results of the committee’s deliberations as soon as possible, usually within two weeks.

Using the Money

A. The committee chair will notify relevant library administration personnel about each award.

B. Award recipients should contact the Libraries’ admin office to find out how to deal with payments and reimbursements, etc.

C. Everyone concerned should keep in mind that all LRF money has to be spent within the same fiscal year in which it is awarded.
KU Libraries’ Committee for Research and Scholarly Activities
LIBRARIES RESEARCH FUND APPLICATION FORM

See the Libraries Research Fund (LRF) website (www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/lrf.shtml) for guidelines, examples of successful applications from previous years, etc.

Use as many pages as you need to adequately explain your project—you may even attach supporting documentation if you feel it necessary—but try to keep the total application package as brief as possible.

Date of Application:

Name(s) of Applicant(s):
(Add more lines, if necessary.)

1.

2.

3.

Title and brief description of your project:
(These will be used on the LRF web page listing projects funded in past years, if your application is successful. Maximum 150 words, please.)

Describe the planned result / final outcome of your project:
(i.e. article, book chapter, website, poster session, conference presentation, etc. If possible, include details such as the title of the journal you plan to submit your article to or the event/date/city where you will present the paper.)
Libraries Research Fund Application Form  (cont.)

List previous LRF awards you have received. For each one, summarize what you achieved using that money; e.g. articles published or papers presented.
(You may append a copy of any previous report(s) to CRSA, if you prefer.)

**Explain how you plan to use the funds:**
(Include an itemized estimate of expenses. For reimbursements, provide a list of actual expenses.)

**Give an estimated timeline for the completion of this project:**

If any part of your project is dependent upon a contractual or other financial arrangement with a third party, please provide a copy of the agreement outlining the services to be provided and the estimated cost. (This can be in the form of an additional attachment to this email, if necessary.)

**Procedure**

1. Attach your completed form to an email addressed to the current chair of CRSA. (Find contact information for current CRSA chair at: www.lib.ku.edu/public/LFA/CRSA/crsa_members.shtml.)
2. You will receive an email confirming the chair’s receipt of your application.
3. You will be informed of the Committee’s decision as soon as possible, normally within two weeks.
4. After receiving notice that you have received an award, you will be responsible for contacting the relevant administrative personnel to arrange for spending the award, claiming reimbursement, etc. (Reminder – You must spend the award by the end of the current fiscal year.)

**This portion to be completed by the chair of CRSA**

Funded: Yes No

If partially funded, give amount and reason(s):

If denied, give reason(s):
LIBRARIES GENERAL RESEARCH FUND (GRF)
GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPETITION

OVERVIEW
The General Research Fund was established by the Kansas Legislature in 1951 for the purpose of encouraging and supporting research at the university. The General Research Fund competition provides the opportunity for faculty from each school or college to submit proposals that focus on furthering their scholarly research.

I. ELIGIBILITY
All library faculty and state-funded unclassified professionals of the Libraries on the Lawrence payroll (which includes the Regents Center Library staff on the Edwards Campus) are eligible to submit one GRF proposal as the principal investigator each fiscal year.

New Faculty: New library faculty members normally apply to the New Faculty General Research Fund and use any funds received before applying to the Libraries’ GRF competition. However, new library faculty members can apply for both the NFGRF and the GRF concurrently by describing reasons for doing so.

II. COMPETITION DEADLINES AND FUNDING
A. Submission Deadline – Usually the first Monday in March (unless modified by CRSA in consultation with the contact person at the KU Center for Research).
B. Email one copy of your application to the chair of KU Libraries’ Committee on Research and Scholarly Activities (CRSA). Find the name of the current chair on the CRSA web page.
C. GRF funds are allocated for the entire fiscal year starting July 1st of the same year in which the competition occurs. CRSA will review proposals, determine award recipients, and notify Libraries’ staff of the winners before the beginning of the next fiscal year.
D. All awards are from state funds and are contingent upon approval of the University’s budget by the Kansas Legislature.

III. APPLICATION
A. The proposal must be submitted on the form provided on the CRSA web page.
   1. Page limits must be observed and all instructions followed.
   2. The research plan should be no longer than five (5) pages.
   3. Poor preparation or lack of clarity could jeopardize the success of the proposal.
B. Your expected outcomes and any future funding opportunities from the award must be described on your award application.
C. While additional explanatory information may be included, applicants are not allowed to submit copies of applications sent to other granting agencies instead of this form.
   1. CRSA will not interview the applicant(s) in order to understand and evaluate the proposal. The proposal itself should convey an adequate portrait of applicants’ competencies, interests, achievements, and goals.
2. The application must contain all pertinent information necessary for the evaluation.

3. In the interests of practicality and equity, CRSA will not accept additional information after the members begin their deliberations.

IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A. The CRSA, a five-member committee which represents both faculty and unclassified professionals, will review proposals and make allocation recommendations.

B. If a member of CRSA submits a proposal, that person will not be eligible to participate in the review of any of the GRF applications.

C. In the case of a member or members of CRSA applying for the GRF themselves, the committee will recruit member(s) from LFPA to bring the committee up to five members. These additional recruit(s) will be member(s) of CRSA only for the purpose and length of time necessary to participate in the deliberations and decision-making concerning the awarding of the Libraries’ GRF monies.

V. REVIEW CRITERIA

A. Special considerations concerning library and archival research

A major field of research for library staff is librarianship. However, because many librarians and archivists have subject expertise, research can and will be carried out in a broad range of academic fields. While this research might not be on librarianship per se, it will support the applicant’s professional growth and development and will usually provide service to the profession of librarianship as well. Proposals for research in innovative and improved librarianship/archival techniques will be welcomed, but CRSA cannot support requests for routine revision of library policies, procedures, and/or management information.

B. The primary criterion is the merit of the proposal.

The concept of merit includes more than the scholarly excellence of the proposal. It also includes the benefit to the institution and to the individual, as well as such factors as an applicant’s administrative responsibilities, the need for research support for sabbatical leave, the problems of moving into a new research field, the inaccessibility of funds to younger faculty, etc. CRSA will consider the following additional major criteria to evaluate individual project applications.

C. Major Review Criteria

1. Research Significance
   a. What is the importance of the project to the applicant’s discipline?
   b. Could it prove seminal?
   c. Is it scholarly, original, innovative, creative?

2. Research or Creative Plan
   a. Are the research objectives clearly stated?
b. Does the plan reflect adequate knowledge of related literature?

c. Does the plan describe the research or creative methods adequately?

d. Will this award increase success in competing for external funding or awards?

e. Is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion within the time, budget, and facilities limitations suggested?

3. **Qualifications of the Applicant**

   a. Is the applicant qualified to complete the proposed research?

   b. Has he or she shown evidence of scholarly capability and productivity?

   c. Has past GRF or NFGRF support produced scholarly results?

4. **Evidence of External Submission Activity**

   Has the applicant made attempts to obtain external funding support where such support is available?

   The Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC) recognizes that outside support is less accessible in some disciplines than in others but encourages applicants to investigate funding opportunities and to apply for external funding whenever possible. Applicants who have received prior funding from the General Research Fund must state the results of the two most recent projects. If a renewal is sought, the applicant must report the progress already made and the expected completion date. If a project has been abandoned, the reasons must be stated in detail. Ordinarily, abandoning or failing to complete a prior project without adequate explanation will cause disapproval of subsequent applications.

D. **Additional Review Criteria**

In addition to the major criteria listed above, certain other factors are given consideration.

1. **Faculty Early in Their Professional Careers**

   General Research Funds are relatively modest given the monetary amounts awarded and number of applications received. Because of this, there is a disposition to fund faculty members in the early years of professional development who have not previously received substantial support.

2. **Pilot Projects**

   Pilot projects represent the first step toward large-scale investigations, including the potential for external funding. Thus, proposals for pilot projects are regarded favorably. An applicant who submits a proposal for a pilot project should state the expected source of the outside funding. They must also indicate the efforts that will be made toward securing the funding. Consideration will be given to applications that are submitted concurrently with proposals to outside agencies for funding of the same project.
3. Completion of Projects Funded Elsewhere

If a project was funded elsewhere and requires modest support for its completion or needs funds to match support already provided by the outside grant, the proposal will be given higher priority.

4. Renewals / Continuations

GRF funding in excess of three years for large or multi-year projects normally will not be considered. If additional time is needed, special justification is required from the applicant based on demonstration of progress. If a renewal is sought, general statements that the work is proceeding “on schedule” or is “progressing satisfactorily” are not adequate. It is not CRSA’s responsibility to determine the status of the project and the productive use of previous GRF funds. An applicant’s failure to document specific progress, in understandable terms, might jeopardize the renewal application.

5. Professional Research

Proposals for research in innovative and improved professional techniques will be welcomed, but the Review Committee cannot support requests for routine revision of lecture notes, production of standard teaching materials, or normal preparation for new courses.

6. Readability of the Application

Proposals that CRSA finds difficult to read or that have excessive technical language might be rated lower than other proposals. UCPT will be diverse and not necessarily expert in your specific area of study.

VI. GRF MATERIALS, PRODUCTS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. Property

Title to all materials, equipment, supplies, microfilm, computer files, books, tapes, documents, etc. obtained with GRF funds will rest in the University. When such materials are no longer needed for the project they should be released to either the department or to the University Library for use by other faculty members and students.

2. Acknowledgements and Intellectual Property

All publications, presentations or performances supported in whole or in part by this allocation should bear the following acknowledgment: "This investigation was supported by the University of Kansas General Research Fund allocation #2301__." If works of art or other products of activity supported by this allocation are to be sold or leased or otherwise yield income, you are expected to consult with James Baxendale (864-7783), KU Executive Director of Research Institute Affiliate. Intellectual property developed as a result of the General Research Fund is subject to the intellectual property policy of both the University of Kansas and the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR).
VII. BUDGET PREPARATION

Allocations cannot be made for a period longer than the upcoming fiscal year. These funds are contingent upon the approval of the University’s annual budget by the Kansas Legislature.

Payroll Dates
Employees may be appointed beginning with the first pay period in the fiscal year, but must end on or before the final payroll date for the award’s fiscal year.

Salaries and Tuition for Graduate Research Assistants
Salaries for graduate research assistants must be included at a rate comparable to other GRAs in the faculty member’s department or unit. GRA tuition may not be budgeted; however, GRAs may be eligible to have tuition covered in whole or in part from the GRA Tuition Assistance pool. Please see the Provost’s website for this policy information at http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/graduate/.

Salaries for Faculty Investigators
These salaries can be included if necessary to support research and to maintain continuity of research during the summer. No more than 4 weeks of summer salary can be provided from the General Research Fund for faculty members with nine-month appointments. Generally salaries are limited to the lesser of 4 weeks of salary or $4,600.

Fringe Benefit Costs
The cost of fringe benefits associated with the payment of salary must be included in the budget. Add 28% for faculty and 4% for students.

Consumable Materials
Reasonable amounts of materials may be requested in the proposal.

Budget Items Considered Inappropriate
a. Salary of library faculty members or unclassified professional staff (Library faculty and staff are on 12-month appointments.)
b. Capital equipment (over $5,000)
c. Tuition
d. Payments to consultants
e. Reprint costs
f. Computing costs
g. Salaries for technicians and clerical help
h. Travel and associated cost to attend professional meetings or conferences

VIII. GRF AWARDEE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Applicants whose projects are funded by the GRF must submit a project status report at the close of the competition fiscal year (i.e., if you are an FY 11 awardee, submit at end of FY 11) to CRSA.
The report should be 1-2 pages in length and address the following:

**Did you complete the project during the GRF funding period?**

**A. If YES:**
1. Describe the outcome and submit a copy of your finished product or other documentation that project objectives were met to the CRSA Chair.
2. How did your budgeted expenses compare to your actual expenses? Was the funding you received adequate? Did you underspend your allocation?

**B. If NO:**
1. How does the current project status compare to the project plan as submitted in the original GRF application?
2. If the project timeline has deviated from the original plan—what factors contributed to the change? Will those factors continue to affect the project? What is the new expected date of completion?
3. What do you need in terms of support to complete the project?
4. Do you intend to apply for a continuation or renewal of your current GRF funding?

**Libraries GRF Application Content Guidelines**

**I. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVES** (3 pages maximum, excluding bibliography)

**A.** Describe the project’s scholarly importance in language directed at a non-specialist.

**B.** If you received a GRF award in the past, explain the relationship of the research proposed in the current application to work previously funded by the GRF.

**II. RESEARCH PLAN, SUPPORTING DATA, PROPOSED SCHEDULE** (5 pages max.)

Detail a chronological plan by which the work will be carried out, particularly during the period of proposed funding. (It is acceptable to anticipate completion of the project outside of the funding year, but you must set a date as a goal for completion. Identify at least one measurable outcome, the achievement of which will signal that the project is “complete” for the purposes of GRF reporting. Such measurable outcomes could include submission of a finished paper to a journal, acceptance of the project for presentation at a conference, etc.

**III. CURRICULUM VITAE OF APPLICANT** (Attach; 2 pages max.; emphasize recent)

**IV. FUTURE SOURCES OF FUNDING**

**A.** Has this project or its substantial equivalent already been submitted to another agency for support? If so, please give the name of the agency, title of project, amount, and names of all co-investigators.
B. Are there other sources, prospects, or plans for future support for this project or its substantial equivalent? Be specific about your plans for applications, agencies, schedules.

V. PROGRESS ON PAST GENERAL RESEARCH FUND APPLICATIONS

A. If you were awarded General Research Fund Allocations in the past, please give account numbers for the two most recent allocations:

Account Number:__________________________________________________

Account Number:_________________________________________________________________

B. Total number of allocations provided by General Research Fund

Applicant:_______________________________________________________________

Number of times this person has been awarded a GRF: ___________________________

C. List results of all past General Research Fund allocations in terms of publications, proposals, grants and contracts for outside support. Please list publications in bibliographic format. (This can be attached as a separate document.)

VI. CURRENT RESEARCH SUPPORT

A. Please identify all current research support, including the source, amount, title of project, and the period of the support.

B. To what extent does this request duplicate or supplement your presently funded research or the research program of a collaborator?

VII. UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

Every applicant must complete one research approval form for each application.