Research Committee Minutes 8/31/17

1. The Committee felt that several things could be done to enhance the grant training workshops
* Enhance promotion as to their value
* Timing could be closer to submissions
* Survey faculty to see what parts of grant writing are needed
* Focus on new faculty
* Have Janice, Carla, Yu Hao, DT (any others) have video sound bites about their value
* Grantsmanship for seed grants or LOI
1. Sri will be in charge of guest speaker/brown bags. Treise will send copy of the approved guidelines for speakers. Sri will send out the call and ask for suggestions and propose speakers he knows, based on a limited budget. Treise will ask Spiro for budget guidelines.
2. The Committee provided excellent suggestions for the College Symposium. The following were proposed:
	1. The prevailing perception is that the Symposium is for grad students only
	2. Suggested dropping the “faculty only” award and encourage grad students, and grad student/faculty collaborations to celebrate collaborations
	3. Work with chairs to encourage faculty participation
	4. Treise will go door-to-door
	5. Sri volunteered his lab for an alternate venue
	6. Other suggestions were for the INC to blend applied and academic research (Treise will check with Randy Wright)
3. Krieger asked that post docs be added to the grad student and faculty listserv so they can keep up with all college activities. Krieger’s students have been added. Waiting for contact info for others.
4. Speakers for faculty research training will be scheduled based on faculty requests. The areas and speakers are/could be:
* Formal training/refresher on experimental designs and stats – Sri, Waddell or Weigold
* Advanced stats and/or new methodologies – Waddell, YH Lee
* SEM - Frank
* Qualitative data analysis software – Treise will find
* Fractional factorial design and data analysis – Janice will reach out to colleague
* Scale development/validation stats – Weigold?
* Advanced mediation, moderation and conditional PROCESS analysis – Janice and Sri will reach out to colleagues (Mary Beth Oliver suggested by Sri)
1. The Committee discussed whether the graduate student member should be present for the discussions of faculty seed money applications. Initially the Committee thought it would be good for the student. However, later discussion suggested it would be uncomfortable for the student if an applicant were the advisee or student on an applicant. Two alternatives were suggested: ask the student to leave during these deliberations, or ask the student to give his/her observations about the proposal and then to excuse him or herself.
2. Treise asked that committee members forward any new or needed issues