

## **University Research Committee 2022-2023 Annual Report**

1. To encourage and promote scholarship, research, and creative endeavors among all faculty members of the University.
2. The Committee's responsibilities include, in particular, the evaluation of applications for intramural research funds and the allocation of these funds among bargaining unit faculty members.
3. More generally, they include advising and making recommendations to the Chief Research Officer on practices and policies conducive to scholarly activity.

### **Membership**

#### **2021-2023 Faculty Appointments**

Sara Arena (SHS) – Co-Chair

Michael Kranak (SEHS)- Co-Chair

Xia Wang (SECS)

Zissimos Mourelatos - Graduate Council Representative

#### **2022-2024 Faculty Appointments**

Lakshmi Roman (CAS)

Scott Tiegs (CAS)

Hanna Kalmanovich-Cohen (SBA)

Olga Ehrilch (SON)

Vardan Karamyan (SOM)

Shawn Lombardo (UL)

#### **2022-2023 Ex-Officio Appointments**

Dave Stone (Chief Research Officer)

Susan Willner (Research Office) Coordinator

### **Meetings and Actions**

All URC business during the 2022-2023 academic year was conducted online. Three synchronous meetings took place on September 26, 2022, November 17, 2022, and April 17, 2023.

Virtual meetings of the full URC focused on discussing cumulative proposal scores, developing consensus on award recipients, and discussing potential policy changes to better achieve the URC's stated goals. URC co-chairs would like to recognize the outstanding work of all URC members. Each member completed their tasks thoroughly and promptly, allowing URC meetings to proceed quickly and efficiently.

As is custom for the URC, the vast majority of committee work consists of careful reading, evaluating, and scoring proposals for internal funding awards, and URC members complete this work on their own time. Additionally, after several years of consideration the URC agreed to embark upon an extensive review of the committees' procedures and practices to assure alignment with the university's contemporary strategic and research goals. Specifically, the following was addressed: 1) faculty fellowship review process to include external reviews of applications 2) related procedural considerations for other URC funded items, and 3) committee member terms. This undertaking required additional time for committee members on their own time to review and provide feedback on multiple drafts of the proposed changes.

## **Recommendations**

The URC made several changes that focus on modernizing and maximizing the inclusiveness, equity, and value of the university's internal funding opportunities. 1. On January 19, 2023 Senate approval was secured to extend committee members terms from 2 to 3 years

2. On April 17, 2023 the committee voted 8: yes, 1: no, and 0: abstain in favor of a new faculty fellowship review process which is planned for launch in the 2023-2024 academic year. The approved document is included in this report.

Additionally, the following recommendations were suggested for future consideration: 1.

Have a video submission of the abstract for the President's Colloquium application. 2. Reinstitute a campus-wide URC educational opportunity in the Fall of 2023 with focus on the submission of internal grant opportunities.

## **2023-2024 URC leadership**

At our April 17, 2023 meeting, Sara Arena (SHS) and Michael Kranak (SEHS) volunteered to continue serving as Co-Chairs of the URC for the 2023-2024 academic year given the launch of the new external review process. However, committee members who will continue service into the next academic year were encouraged to consider serving as a "chair in training" or "chair in waiting" with the vision of creating a chair mentorship program given the expansion to 3-year terms.

## **Notes**

We are grateful for the expertise and diligence of Sue Willner, the URC administrative coordinator, who managed our submission and review systems and provided other essential support. Sue participated in all URC meetings and is a tremendous source of institutional knowledge. The URC could not function without her assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Arena, Associate Professor of Physical Therapy  
Co-Chair, URC 2022-2023

Michael Kranak, Assistant Professor of Human Development and Child Studies  
Co-Chair, URC 2022-2023

## **University Research Committee - FY23**

### **URC Budget - FY23 Amount**

Balance Carried Forward	36,676
Returned unused funds	3,000
Budget FY23	360,000
<b>Total Budget for FY23</b>	<b>\$399,676</b>
Faculty Research Fellowship Awards	-320,000
Stipend Fringe Charge	-6,665
Faculty Research Grant	-40,000
Faculty Books and Reprints	-2,265

Meadow Brook Hall Conference	-3,000
President Colloquium Series, funded by the President	0
Faculty Research Excellence Award, funded by the Provost	0
New Investigator Research Excellence Award, funded by the Provost	0

**URC Awards -\$371,930**

**Carried Forward to FY24 \$27,746**

**#**

**Awarded %**

**Statistics# Applied**

Faculty Research Fellowship Awards	47	32	68%
Faculty Research Grant	21	20	95%
Faculty Books and Reprints	5	5	100%
Meadow Brook Hall Conference	1	1	100%
President Colloquium Series	6	1	17%
Faculty Research Excellence Award	3	1	33%
New Investigator Research Excellence Award	3	1	33%

**Total 86 61 71%**

**Faculty Research Fellowship Awards – \$10,000**

**Aydas, Osman – Decision and Information Sciences, SBA**

Streamlining Patients’ Opioid Prescription Dosage: A Tree Augmented Naïve Bayes Framework.

**Bae, Junhyun – Decision and Information Sciences, SBA**

Why Do Supply Disruptions Occur and Who Do They Affect? From Supply Chain's Perspective.

**Boni, Rebecca – Nursing, SON**

Starting from the Oncology Nurses’ Perspective: A New Approach to Measuring Oncology Nurses’ Professional Quality of Life.

**Chaudhuri, Malika – Management and Marketing, SBA**

Market Reactions to the Business Roundtable August 19th 2019 Announcement on the Purpose of a Corporation.

**Chaudhuri, Ranadeb – Accounting and Finance, SBA**

Post-Traumatic Stress and Financial Decision-Making.

**Chen, Jingshu – Computer Science and Engineering, SECS**

ePrism: Enabling External Security Monitoring for Resource-Constrained IoT.

**Chen, Jun – Electrical and Computer Engineering, SECS**

Extending Electric Vehicle Driving Range using Artificial Intelligence.

**Figueiredo, Vandre – Biological Sciences, CAS**

Ribosome Biogenesis in a Mouse Model of Cancer Cachexia.

**Gorman, August – Philosophy, CAS**

Behavioral Interpretation and Appraisal as Disability Access Ethics.

**Greer, Katie – Library, OU LIB**

Using Metaliteracy and other Frameworks to Dismantle Conspiracy Theories.

**Kaur, Amanpreet – Electrical and Computer Engineering, SECS**

Ambient RF Energy Harvesting and Wireless Power Transfer for battery-less self-sustaining applications.

**Kiefer, Laura – Chemistry, CAS**

Determining Catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Reaction Mechanisms using Spectroelectrochemistry Techniques.

**Kies, Bridget – English, CAS**

Queering 1980s American Television.

**Kothari, Pratik – Accounting and Finance, SBA**

Assessing Financial Literacy Using Investments Made by Real Estate Mutual Fund Investors.

**Liu, Steven – Management and Marketing, SBA**

Is Sustainability Secondary to Firm Performance? An Examination of Corporate Social Responsibility's Influence on Shareholder Wealth.

**Nuri, Leila - Physical Therapy, SHS**

Characterization of Mechanical, Material, and Viscoelastic Properties of the Patellar Tendon in Children with Cerebral Palsy.

**Piscotty, Ronald – Nursing, SON**

Nursing Care Reminder Types and Usage: A National Survey of Acute Care Registered Nurses.

**Sandhu, Ramandeep Kaur – Decision and Information Sciences, SBA**

Blockchain and Semi-Ontology Mapping System to resolve Security and Semantic interoperability issues in Healthcare Domain.

**Smydra, Rachel – English, CAS**

Contextualizing Place: Meandering the Streets to Explore, Maps, Cartographers, Authorship, and Urban Myths.

**Sosa Jones, Giselle – Mathematics and Statistics, CAS**

Efficient and Reliable Computational Methods for the Simulation of Welding Plates.

**Toeniskoetter, Matthew – Mathematics and Statistics, CAS**

Finitely Supported Monomial Ideals.

**Tonsing, Kareen – Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work & Criminal Justice, CAS**

Mental Health Status of Resettled Burmese in the US: Examination of Beliefs and Attitude about Mental Health and Barriers to Mental Health Help-Seeking.

**Tonui, Betty – Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work & Criminal Justice, CAS**

The Psychological Experiences of Immigrants and Refugees Residing in the U.S.

**VanKooten, Crystal – Writing and Rhetoric, CAS**

Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Embedded Writing Specialists in First-Year Writing.

**Wagner, Nicole – Biological Sciences, CAS**

Harmful Cyanobacterial Bloom Growth, Cyanotoxin Toxin Production, and Elemental Composition Responses to Interactions between Nitrogen Concentration, Nitrogen Form, and Temperature.

**Wang, Yuejian – Physics, CAS**

Ba<sub>3</sub>(ZnB<sub>5</sub>O<sub>10</sub>)PO<sub>4</sub> Under High Pressure.

**Wiacek, Alycen – Electrical and Computer Engineering & Bioengineering, SECS**

Together to Improve Ultrasound and Elastography Image Quality with Deep Learning.

**Wu, Colin – Chemistry, CAS**

Impact of BRCA1 Variants on DNA Damage on Heart Contractile Function.

**Xu, Lanyu – Computer Science and Engineering, SECS**

Towards a Comprehensive Medical Imaging Processing System at Edge.

**Yang, Ankun – Mechanical Engineering, SECS**

Opto-electrochemistry using Microelectrodes: Identify Effects of Lithium Salts in Lithium-Sulfur Electrochemistry.

**Youngquist, Jeffrey – Communication, Journalism, and Public Relations, CAS**

Common Leadership Practices of Viking Rulers.

**Zhao, Shunan – Economics, SBA**

Who Do Exporters Learn From?

**Faculty Research Grant Awards - \$2,000**

**Baillargeon, Claude – Art and Art History, CAS**

The Nation's Capital in the African American Imagination.

**Bianchette, Thomas – Chemistry, CAS**

Wetland Sedimentological Reconstructions in Michigan to Detect Storms and Flood Events on Multi Centennial to -Millennial Timescales.

**Campoy-Cubillo, Adolfo – Modern Languages and Literatures, CAS**

Spanish Imperial Feminisms.

**Chen, Yu-chuan – Art and Art History**

Mapping Mountains: The Travelscape of Wuyi in the Early Modern Era.

**Chung, Dho Yee – Art and Art History, CAS**

Life is Elsewhere: Lost in Virtual Workspaces.

**Dantzler, Alta – Dance, CAS**

Creating a Digital Sound Environment.

**Dinda, Sumit – Clinical Diagnostic Sciences, SHS**

The Effects of Aroclor1254 on Estrogen Receptor Alpha and Tumor Suppressor Gene p53 in Breast Cancer Cells.

**Fails, Matthew – Political Science, CAS**

Pain at the Pump, Pain at the Polls? Global Evidence on Election Timing and Fuel Prices.

**Jiang, Lan – Biological Sciences, CAS**

Role of a RhoGTPase Activator GEF 64 in Tracheal Tube Expansion.

**Johnson, Wendi – Criminial Justice, Sociology & Anthropology, CAS**

Coming of Age in a Carceral Setting: Narratives of Identity, Desistance, and Reentry.

**Jonutz, Thayer – Dance, CAS**

Hammer and Nail.

**Kattner-Ulrich, Elizabeth – Dance, CAS**

Continuation of "Floating Heavily" - German to English Translation.

**Kinney, Zacharias – Chemistry, CAS**

Dynamic Assembly of  $\pi$ -Conjugated Naphthodithiophene-Based Photoactive Materials.

**Li, Yan – History, CAS**

Vsevolod Kochetov and the Translation of Soviet Literature in Socialist China.

**Lynch, Amanda – Interdisciplinary Health Sciences, SHS**

Behavioral and Weight Changes Following Prescription of GLP-1 Agonists: Exploring Patient Perspectives.

**Maisonneuve, Jonathan – Mechanical Engineering, SECS**

Using Salt Power to Produce Clean Electricity and Reduce the Energy Footprint of Seawater Desalination.

**Vonk, Jennifer – Psychology, CAS**

Early Adversity and Attitudes toward Animals.

**Wendell, Doug – Biological Sciences, CAS**

Does Genetic Variability Contribute to Difficulty in Differentiating Native and Invasive Subspecies of Phragmites (common reed)?

**Woerner, Alison – Dance, CAS**

Dance for Parkinson's Disease: Pushing Boundaries, Finding Grace.

**Zeigler-Hill, Virgil – Psychology, CAS**

Narcissism and the Use of Dominance-Based Strategies to Pursue Status: The Role of Zero-Sum Beliefs.

**Publication Awards**

**Goble, Daniel – Exercise Science, SHS**

Six weeks of At Home BTrackS Target Tracking Training Induces Sustained Dynamic Balance Improvement in Healthy Young Adults, \$500

**McDonald, Gary – Mathematics and Statistics, CAS**

Extending Computations for Disparity Testing when Data Sources are Uncertain, \$365

**Raman, Lakshmi – Psychology, CAS**

Do Preschoolers and Adults Think That Academic and Athletic Abilities are Inherited? A Pilot Study, \$400

**Tiegs, Scott – Biological Sciences, CAS**

Coupling Gear Decontamination Trials and Angler Surveys to Minimize Spread of Invasive New Zealand Mud Snails, \$500

**Jamieson, Mary – Biological Sciences**

Genotype, Mycorrhizae, and Herbivory Interact to Shape Strawberry Plant Functional Traits, \$500

**Research Excellence Award**

Vonk, Jennifer – Psychology, CAS \$2,500

**New Investigator Research Excellence Award**

Ma, Marsha – Communication Journalism,  
and Public Relations, CAS \$1,500

**OU Conference Award**

Kattner-Ulrich, Elizabeth – Dance, CAS  
Patterson, Gregory – Dance, CAS  
Data Driven Dance Education, \$3,000

**President' Colloquium Award**

Jonutz, Thayer – Dance, CAS  
Hammer and Nail, \$1,000

<https://ern.oakland.edu/research/quick-links-for-faculty/urc-guidelines/index.html>

# University Research Committee (URC) Guidelines

The University Research Committee (URC) is composed of ten faculty members, including one faculty representative appointed by the Graduate Council. Membership also includes the Vice President for Research as an ex-officio and non-voting member. The charge of the Committee is “to encourage and promote scholarship, advanced studies, and research among the tenured and tenure-track faculty of Oakland University”. The URC’s responsibilities include, in particular, the evaluation of applications for intramural URC research funds and the allocation of these funds. More generally, they include protection and development of practices and policies conducive to URC funded scholarly activity. Scholarship is interpreted broadly and, in particular, includes creative endeavors.

The URC meets throughout the academic year to provide an uninterrupted flow of service to faculty. Faculty bargaining unit members at Oakland University are invited to apply for research support under the categories and conditions outlined in these guidelines. Faculty funded under URC programs must have an active employment contract at the time of the application and during the period of completing their research project. All URC funded projects for faculty are expected to be performed on-campus. Any off-campus research activities must be clearly explained in the proposal and approved by the URC and committee Chair before starting the project. Requests for clarification of these guidelines or eligibility requirements may be obtained from the Co-Chairs of the URC.

### **URC Co-Chairs: FY 2023**

Sara Arena, Associate Professor, Department of Physical Therapy, Human Movement Science, SHS

Michael Kranak, Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development & Child Study, SEHS

### **Application Preparation for Faculty Research Fellowship and Faculty Research Grant**

These general guidelines apply to all the various faculty research grants and fellowships that come under the jurisdiction of the URC. In preparation of proposals, please study these guidelines and then consult the individual sections that follow for more precise information regarding the specific grant application. Proposals must adhere to the limitations given in the guidelines, otherwise they will not be considered.

The composition of the URC includes faculty members from a variety of academic disciplines, and may not have expertise specific to your project. A process for external reviews specific to an applicant’s discipline will be piloted in the 2023-2024 academic year. However, during the pilot and the associated evaluation of the ongoing feasibility of this opportunity it is the responsibility of the faculty applicant to articulate clearly the goals, methodology, significance and impact of the proposed research to the interdisciplinary URC committee without excessive use of technical <https://ern.oakland.edu/research/quick-links-for-faculty/urc-guidelines/index.html>

jargon. It is recommended that the applicant use lay language and minimize the use of acronyms wherever possible.

An applicant may accept funding in only one of the award categories during each academic year. An applicant may, however, be a co-investigator mentioned in more than one funded proposal in one or more categories.

URC faculty members are allowed to submit proposals for any of the offered funding calls during their appointment timeframe. However, written notification of the planned submission and a plan to mitigate bias or conflict of interest (COI) should be submitted in writing to the URC chair(s) two weeks prior to the submission deadline for review and URC committee membership approval. The approved COI mitigation plan will then be added as an addendum to

the application.

Each application must include all applicable items from the following list. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed. Applicants are encouraged to talk to any member of the URC about the proposal preparation process. An information session will be held for prospective applicants annually to review the guidelines.

1. **Application Form** – Application submission is done online through InfoReady. You will be asked either to create an account or to login if you already have an account. Any attachments are to be submitted online with your application. Refer to the Award Time Table on page one for submission deadlines.
2. **Proposal** – The proposal narrative is strictly limited to the equivalent of five 8.5" x 11" pages with one-inch margins on all sides, single-spaced, in Arial 11 point font or larger. The narrative may include figures and tables and these count toward the 5-page limit. The narrative page limits do NOT include the title page, bibliography and supplementary information (budget, CV, current/pending support, etc.). Proposals that exceed the 5-page limit for the narrative will not be considered for funding. A complete proposal will include the elements listed below.

- **Title Page:** This page should include the project title, applicant name(s), affiliation, and a project abstract of 250 words or less. An abstract is a summary of the proposed work, in non-technical language, that includes brief statements about the significance, the goals, the research plan, and expected outcomes.
- **Project Narrative:** This section may not exceed five pages (as noted above) and should, if applicable, include the following sections\*:
  - Background/literature review to introduce the research or scholarly topic,
  - Significance/goals/hypotheses
  - Research plan and methods (explain how you will collect data or other relevant information, how and/or where the research or scholarly activities will occur, how you will evaluate your findings or experiences, etc
  - Plans for obtaining relevant regulatory compliance approvals (e.g. IRB, IACUC, IBC, RSC) or documentation is not required for the project.
  - Proposed outcomes of the funded project, and

<https://ern.oakland.edu/research/quick-links-for-faculty/urc-guidelines/index.html>

- Timetable (provide milestones for the period of the project, weekly, monthly, or other metric)
- \*If your project does not fit with the above format (e.g. creative arts, humanities), please consult with the URC Chair(s).
- **Bibliography** (No more than one page): Select the most relevant literature or other references and be sure to include any that you have contributed to.
- **Budget and Budget Justification:** The proposal file should include a budget for the proposed project, including a breakdown of proposed expenditures (summer salary, student stipend/tuition, supplies, equipment, travel, etc.). The Budget Justification must explain the reason for each line item in the budget, and how you determined or calculated the cost. Please note that the proposed budget and budget justifications will be reviewed by the entire URC for final approval. Any changes in the approved budget will require a resubmission of the entire application for review by the URC again. Please be reminded that the URC will not be responsible for any delay caused by the resubmission of the application (e.g., to the summer of the following year).
- **Vitae:** Faculty applicants must include a current curriculum vitae of no more than two pages. At a minimum, the CV should list the applicant's education, professional appointments, 5-10 most recent or relevant publications (or performances/compositions



for MTD faculty), and any other information that would indicate that applicant is able and qualified to perform the proposed research.

- **List of Current and Pending Grants:** List all current and pending grants. For each grant, please provide the grant proposal title, name(s) of principal and co-principal investigator(s), funding agency, duration, dollar amount requested or granted, and portion of budget allocated to faculty salary. Please also include university-provided start-up funds from the last 2 years. Please explain whether there is any duplication of effort or funds relevant to the URC application, and how these will be handled.

The award may be used in any combination of stipend and research expenses, such as supplies, minor items of equipment, project assistant wages, technical services, and travel expenses. Equipment and travel requests, in particular, must be carefully justified. University regulations on travel reimbursement are to be followed; equipment purchased with expense funds is subject to university property guidelines. There are income tax implications implicit in this allocation.

- Recipients are obligated to undertake a 15-week period of research-focus. This traditionally takes place during the summer term. Please note that awardees may teach nor more than 4 credits or one course during the term that they are conducting their URC funded research. Requests to conduct the full-time research during the academic year may be considered, but applicants are encouraged to consult with the URC Chair (s) in advance.

<https://ern.oakland.edu/research/quick-links-for-faculty/urc-guidelines/index.html>

- The recipients of faculty fellowships will not have conflicting commitments with other research grants during the time that they are conducting their URC-funded research. Recipients are reminded that there are limits to overload compensation, and the addition of a URC Research Fellowship stipend must not exceed these limits.
- Awards will be announced within eight weeks after the closing date for this competition. Each award recipient will be required to file a final report within 90 days of the conclusion of the fellowship period, indicating specific publications, presentations, and other accomplishments that were achieved as a result of the fellowship. The report should be submitted to The Research Office.
- The focus in evaluation of fellowship applications is on the specifics of the methodology, the feasibility and probable success of the research, and the potential to foster future scholarship by the faculty applicant. In cases of substantially equal merit, the URC reserves the right to give preference to those who have not previously held fellowships. Among those who have received previous fellowships, priority may be given to those who have applied for external funding after they have received the fellowship. Applicants will not receive written feedback on their proposals. Those applicants who are denied funding can get feedback from the chairperson of the URC within one month of notification of the decision.

Award recipients are notified by e-mail that an account has been established for expenses related to their projects or programs. After one year, the account will be closed and the remaining funds will revert back to the URC. A final report of the project must be submitted within 90 days of the completion date of the project.

#### **Faculty Fellowship Guidelines**

**Funding Source:** Section 168 of the faculty contract: “Faculty research fellowships and grants

shall be awarded only to bargaining unit faculty members (BUFM) for the support of their research or other scholarly/creative activities deemed appropriate by the University Research Committee.”

**Goal:** To support and advance research and creative activity undertaken by members of the BUFM.

**Summary of Research Fellowships and Grants (Item 168 of the faculty contract):** There shall be available a limited number of research fellowships and grants. The research fellowships and grants will be funded at a level specified by the University Research Committee (URC) up to a maximum determined by Oakland. Application for these fellowships and grants may be made at any time in a faculty member's employment with Oakland. The Committee will establish a system of applications for research fellowships and grants, will referee proposals, and will monitor fellowship and grant activity. Research fellowships and grants are intended to support accomplishment of specific scholarly or scientific projects, and they will be granted on the basis of the judgment by qualified scholars in the discipline of the application as to the value of the proposal and the likelihood of its completion. Faculty research fellowships and grants shall be awarded only to bargaining unit members for the support of their research or other scholarly/creative activities deemed appropriate by the URC

**Deadlines:** Applications for faculty fellowship grants will be reviewed once a year. The deadline is as follows:

- Third Monday of October

**Award:** Up to \$10,000 to support faculty research or a faculty creative activity. Applicants will choose to submit using either the criteria for 1) Research Funding Proposals OR 2) Creative Activities and Project Funding Proposals.

These general guidelines apply to all the various faculty research grants and fellowships that come under the jurisdiction of the URC. In preparation of proposals, please study these guidelines and then consult the individual sections that follow for more precise information regarding the specific grant application. Proposals must adhere to the limitations given in the guidelines, otherwise they will not be reviewed.

The composition of the URC includes faculty members from a variety of academic disciplines and may not have expertise specific to your project. Therefore, beginning in the 2023-2024 academic year the URC will be seeking feedback from reviewers *outside* of Oakland University. However, the URC reserves the right to review all submissions, so it is, therefore, the responsibility of the faculty applicant to clearly articulate the goals, methodology, significance and impact of the proposed research to the interdisciplinary URC committee. Within their application, faculty members should list three individuals from their field who are outside of Oakland University and qualified to review their application. These individuals should *not* have any conflicts of interest with the faculty member (e.g., previous or current collaborator) or be within their direct network (i.e., Oakland University Faculty). Faculty members should list the names and emails of potential reviewers.

An applicant may accept funding in only one of the award categories during each academic year. An applicant may, however, be a co-investigator mentioned in more than one funded proposal in one or more categories.

Each application must include all applicable items from the following list. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed. Applicants are encouraged to talk to any member of the URC about the proposal preparation process. An information session will be held for prospective applicants during September of each year to review the guidelines.

1. **Application Form:** Application submission is done online through InfoReady. You will be asked either to create an account or to login if you already have an account. Any attachments are to be submitted online with your application. Refer to the Award Timetable on page one for submission deadlines.
- **Proposal:** The proposal narrative is strictly limited to the equivalent of five 8.5" x 11" pages with one-inch margins on all sides, single-spaced, in Arial 11-point font or larger. The narrative may include figures and tables and these count toward the 5-page limit. The narrative page limits do NOT include the title page, bibliography and supplementary information (budget, CV, letters of support, current/pending support, etc.). Proposals that exceed the 5-page limit for the narrative will not be considered for funding. A complete proposal will include the elements listed below. Faculty Fellowship Applicants should consider if they wish to apply for either: 1) Research Funding, or 2) Creative Activities and Project Funding and use the appropriate checklist for the application.
  - **Title Page:** This page should include the project title, applicant name(s), affiliation(s), and a project abstract of 250 words or less. An abstract is a summary of the proposed work, in non-technical language, that includes brief statements about the significance, the goals, the research plan, and expected outcomes.
  - **Project Narrative:** This section may not exceed five pages (as noted above) and should, if applicable, include the following sections\*:
    - Background/literature review to introduce the research or scholarly topic
    - Significance/goals/hypotheses/aims of project, research or project plan, and methods
    - Plans for obtaining relevant regulatory compliance approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, IBC, RSC) (*\*Research Proposals Only*)
    - Proposed outcomes of the funded project
    - Timetable (provide milestones for the period of the project, weekly, monthly, or other metric)
  - If your project does not fit with one of the above formats, please consult with the URC Chair.
  - **Bibliography (no more than one page):** Select the most relevant literature or other references and be sure to include any that you have contributed to.
  - **Budget and Budget Justification:** The proposal file should include a budget for the proposed project, including a breakdown of proposed expenditures (summer salary, student stipend/tuition, supplies, equipment, travel, etc.). The Budget Justification must explain the reason for each line item in the budget, and how you determined or calculated the cost. Please note that the proposed budget and budget justifications will be reviewed by the entire URC for final approval. Any changes to the approved budget after the fellowship has been awarded will require a resubmission of the entire application for review by the URC.
  - **Vitae:** Faculty applicants must include a current curated or selective curriculum vitae of no more than two pages. At a minimum, the CV should list the applicant's education, professional appointments, 5-10 most recent or relevant scholarly products (e.g., publications, performances, compositions), and any other information that would indicate that applicant is able and qualified to perform the proposed research.
  - **List of Prior, current and pending Grants:** List all prior, current and pending grants. For each grant, please provide the grant proposal title, name(s) of principal and co investigator(s), funding agency, duration, dollar amount requested or granted, and portion of budget allocated to faculty salary. Please also include university-provided start-up funds from the last 2 years. Please explain whether there is any duplication of effort or funds relevant to the URC application, and how these will be handled.
  - **Ethical & Regulatory Compliance:** If the proposed project involves the use of human subjects, animals, or hazardous materials, approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), Institutional Biosafety

Committee (IBC), and/or Radiation Safety Committee (RSC) must be obtained. The Principal Investigator (PI) is allowed to submit the compliance approval after the application is submitted to the URC. The PI must state the plans for compliance approval in the application. Confirmation of compliance approval is required before funding is disbursed. However, regulatory compliance approval does not need to be approved or in process to submit a funding application. The investigator is solely responsible for submitting the compliance approval to the URC before starting the project. For assistance, contact the Director of Regulatory Support at (248) 370-2762.

- **Final Report from most recent URC grant:** Faculty applicants who have received a prior fellowship from the URC should include a copy of the most recent final report that they filed with The Research Office. Please note that each award recipient will be expected to file a final report with The Research Office indicating specific publications, presentations, and other accomplishments that were achieved as a result of the grant. This report is due within 90 days of the conclusion of the grant-funded activity or the fellowship period.

Application Deadline: Third Monday of October

Award Announcement: Second week of March

Final Report Due: Within 90 days of conclusion of the funded work

## **Research Funding Checklist for the URC Faculty Research Fellowship**

(\*\*Research Funding Proposal only)

Title Page includes the project title, applicant name(s), affiliation, and a project **abstract of 250 words or less.**

Abstract

Narrative is **no more than five 8.5" x 11" pages** with one-inch margins on all sides, single spaced, in Arial 11-point font or larger. Page limit includes figures and tables, if any. Must include:

Background/literature review to introduce the research or scholarly topic

Significance/goals/hypotheses/aims of research

Research plan and methods

If data collection is off-campus, justification is provided

Plans for obtaining relevant regulatory compliance approvals (e.g., IRB, IACUC, IBC, RSC) or indicate not applicable

Proposed outcomes

Timetable (milestones for the period of the research, weekly, monthly, or other metric)

\_\_\_\_\_ Letters of support (i.e., letter from Chair, Program director or Dean confirming Oakland University space/resources will be made available for this work (if applicable), support letters from collaborators or community partners integral to completing this work, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Name, title, contact information (email, phone number and/or address) of **three** potential outside reviewers (not Oakland University employees) who have the knowledge, skills and expertise to review this application for its intellectual merit and broader impact.

Bibliography (**No more than one page**)

Current curriculum vitae of **no more than two pages**. Includes:

Applicant's education

Professional appointments

5-10 most recent or relevant publications or scholarly products

Other information that would indicate that you are able and qualified to perform the proposed research.

List of Current and Pending External and Internal Grants-last 2 years only. **(This is a question in the application itself, so this information does not need to be repeated in your proposal.)**

Grant proposal/ Project title, name(s) of principal and co-principal investigator(s), funding agency, duration, dollar amount requested or granted, and portion of budget allocated to faculty salary.

Explain whether there is any duplication of effort or funds relevant to the URC application, and how these will be handled.

Final Report from most recent URC grant (or not applicable)

Budget and Budget Justification **(This is a separate attachment in the application.)**

Reason for each line item in the budget is provided, and how you determined or calculated the cost(s).

## **Creative Activities and Projects Checklist for the URC Faculty Research Fellowship**

**(\*\*Creative Activities and Project Funding Proposals only)**

Title Page includes the project title, applicant name(s), affiliation, and a project **abstract of 250 words or less.**

Abstract

Narrative is **no more than five 8.5" x 11" pages** with one-inch margins on all sides, single spaced, in Arial 11-point font or larger. Page limit includes figures and tables, if any. Must include:

Background/literature review to introduce the project or scholarly topic

Significance/goals/aims of project

Project's design and work plan

If work is off-campus, justification is provided

Proposed outcomes

\_\_\_\_\_ Potential project feasibility and impact

Timetable (milestones for the period of the project, weekly, monthly, or other metric)

\_\_\_\_\_ Letters of support (i.e., letter from Chair, Program director or Dean confirming Oakland University space/resources will be made available for this work ( if applicable), support letters from collaborators or community partners integral to completing this work, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Name, title, contact information (email, phone number and/or address) of **three** potential outside reviewers (not Oakland University employees) who have the knowledge, skills and expertise to review this application for its intellectual merit and broader impact.

Bibliography **(No more than one page)**

Current curriculum vitae of **no more than two pages**. Includes:

Applicant's education

Professional appointments

5-10 most recent or relevant scholarly products (i.e., performances/compositions for MTD faculty)

Other information that would indicate that you are able and qualified to perform the proposed project.

List of Current and Pending Funding-last 2 years only. **(This is a question in the application itself, so this information does not need to be repeated in your proposal.)**

Grant proposal/ Project title, name(s) of principal and co-principal investigator(s), funding agency, duration, dollar amount requested or granted, and portion of budget allocated to faculty salary.

Explain whether there is any duplication of effort or funds relevant to the URC application, and how these will be handled.

Final Report from most recent URC grant (or not applicable)

Budget and Budget Justification (**This is a separate attachment in the application.**)

Reason for each line item in the budget is provided, and how you determined or calculated the cost(s).

<b>Budget Template - URC Faculty Research Fellowship</b>		
	You may request:	(1) 100% stipend (2) any portion of the \$10,000 as stipend with the remainder for expenses (3) or zero stipend, where all funding will be used for supplies and other expenses.
<b>Amounts Requested</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Budget Amount</b>	<b>Description</b>
Stipend		Wages
Grad/UG Students		Hiring students to assist with your research
Equipment		Equipment purchased with grant money reverts back to the unit/dept at the end of the research period.
Materials & Supplies		Describe details below
Travel		Total of all travel expenses, provide detail below
Other		Describe details below
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<b>Summary (auto-filled)</b>		
Stipend	\$0	Stipend payments will be made May 31 of the following year
Expense Items	\$0	A fund will be set up in February for this portion
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	Total should not exceed \$10,000.
		<b>Budget Justification is Required:</b>

	type in box at right:	
--	--------------------------------	--

## **Oakland University Faculty Fellowship Scoring System and Procedure** (*\* Modified from the NIH Scoring system and associated instructions*)

The Oakland University (OU) Faculty Fellowship scoring system was designed to encourage reliable scoring of applications by discipline-specific external reviewers. External reviewer names are put forward by the investigator as a component of the application process. While granting of a Faculty Fellowship award is ultimately decided by the Oakland University Research Committee (URC), the external reviewer scores and associated comments are key elements of the funding decision process. Therefore, external reviewers are requested to carefully consider the rating guidance below to improve the fidelity of their scores as well as their ability to communicate the scientific impact of the application reviewed.

### **SCORING**

#### **Summary**

- The OU Faculty Fellowship application scoring system uses a 9-point scale for both overall impact scores and scores for individual review criteria.
  - o For both types of score, ratings are in whole numbers only (no decimal ratings).
  - o OU URC expects that scores of 1 or 9 to be used less frequently than the other scores.
- For the overall impact score,
  - o the scale is used by assigned external reviewers
  - o 5 is considered an average score.
- For criterion scores,
  - o the scale is used by the assigned reviewers to evaluate five individual criteria (e.g., Significance, Methodology, Innovation, Feasibility, and Investigator Potential).

o reviewers should consider the strengths and weaknesses within each criterion. For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses.

- For information and guidance about scoring, see the "OU Faculty Fellowship scoring guidance document."

## Reviewer Scoring and Guidance

- The assigned reviewer determines a score for each of the five review criteria and a score for the overall impact
- The impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall evaluation, not a numerical average of individual criterion scores
- Reviewers should consider the full range of the rating scale and the scoring descriptors in assigning preliminary and final scores
- An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major impact
  - o For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative, but may be essential to advance a field
- Reviewers must enter the criterion scores into the provided fillable scoring sheet and email to Sue Willner, Oakland University Research Office Grant and Contract Officer, willner@oakland.edu by the date indicated in the email correspondence.
- The "OU Faculty Fellowship scoring guidance document" provides a guide for reviewers when assigning an overall impact score and the individual criterion scores. Additionally, reviewers should consider the following when scoring the criteria and overall impact: **1=Exceptional, 2=Outstanding, 3=Excellent, 4=Very Good, 5=Good, 6=Satisfactory, 7= Fair, 8= Marginal, 9=Poor.**

1

- Overall impact, for a project, is the project's likelihood to have a sustained, powerful influence on the discipline involved.
- Each review criterion should be assessed based on the strength of that criterion in the context of the work being proposed
  - o As a result, a reviewer may give only moderate scores to some of the review criteria but still give a high overall impact score because the one review criterion critically important to the research is rated highly; or a reviewer could give mostly high criterion ratings but rate the overall impact score lower because the one criterion critically important to the research being proposed is not highly rated.
- An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major impact, e.g., a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.
- A score of 5 is a good, medium-impact application.
- The entire scale (1-9) should always be considered.

## Criterion Scoring

- Five individual criteria are scored
- Criterion scores are provided for all applications
- Criterion scores are intended to convey how each assigned reviewer weighed the strengths and weaknesses of each section
- Providing scores without providing comments in the review critique is discouraged
- The impact score for the application is not intended to be an average of criterion scores

## Impact Score

- The impact score for an application is based on the individual external reviewer's assessment of the scored criteria and the overall impression of the project's impact.
- Reviewers are guided to use the full range of the rating scale as appropriate for the reviewed application.
- Reviewers should ensure that their scoring choices and opinions of the proposal are made explicit, clear and understandable for the URC by fully describing rationale for



scores in the descriptive text section provided.

- Reviewers should feel free to assign the score that they believe best represents the impact of the application, and not feel constrained to limit their scores to the upper half of the score range if they do not feel such a score is warranted.
- Reviewers will score an application as presented in its entirety, and may not modify their scores on the assumption that a portion of the work proposed will be deleted or modified after the review process is completed.

2

# Overall Impact:

The likelihood for this research or project to exert a sustained,

**High Medium Low**

powerful influence in the field.

**Evaluating Overall Impact:**  
**1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9**

Consider the 5 criteria: significance, methodology, innovation, feasibility, and investigator potential (weighted based on reviewer's judgment)

e.g., Successful completion of the aims will make a **contribution of high importance** to the field. May have some or no weaknesses.

e.g., Successful completion of the aims may make a **contribution of high importance** to the field, but weaknesses bring down the overall impact to medium.

e.g., Successful completion of the aims may make a **contribution of moderate importance** to the field, with some or no weaknesses.

e.g., Successful completion of the aims may make a **contribution of moderate/high importance** to the field, but weaknesses bring down the overall impact to low.

e.g., Successful completion of the aims may make a **contribution of low or no importance** to the field, with some or no weaknesses.

\*Modified from the NIH Office of Extramural Research for the purpose of Oakland University Faculty Fellowship external reviews

Project Title:

Applicants Name:

External Reviewer Name and Credentials (Optional):

*The "OU Faculty Fellowship scoring guidance document" provides a guide for reviewers to assign overall impact scores and individual criterion scores. Additionally, reviewers should consider the following when scoring the criteria and overall impact: 1=Exceptional, 2=Outstanding, 3=Excellent, 4=Very Good, 5=Good, 6=Satisfactory, 7= Fair, 8= Marginal, 9=Poor.*

Criterion	Score (1=highest, 9=lowest)	Reviewer feedback and rationale for assigned score
-----------	-----------------------------	--

Significance		
Methodology		
Innovation		
Feasibility		
Investigator potential		
<b>Overall Impact</b>		