

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

1-30-2003

Proposed Revisions to the Grant Competition Guidelines Faculty Research Committee 1-30-2003

Karen McCurdy
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McCurdy, Karen, "Proposed Revisions to the Grant Competition Guidelines Faculty Research Committee 1-30-2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 432.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/432>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate:

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President:

Not Approved by the President:

Proposed Revisions to the Grant Competition Guidelines Faculty Research Committee

Submitted by Karen McCurdy

1/30/2003

Motion:

That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed changes to the faculty research grant competition guidelines (see attached Word document)

Rationale:

The current faculty research grant competition guidelines contain ambiguities that impede the ability of the Research Committee to efficiently make distinctions between those proposals that should be funded through internal funding. Additionally, the grant and stipend cycle that was designed for the quarter system produces duplicative effort for faculty members, an imbalance in the workload for committee members, and unnecessary confusion about the availability of funds in the fiscal year

SEC Minutes 3/14/2003: Faculty Research Grant Funding Procedure Revisions • David Allen handed out Karen McCurdy's plan for revising the Faculty Research Grant funding procedures. Allen suggested that the proposed changes will almost certainly meet stiff opposition throughout the University. He suggested that opponents of the proposed changes (along with supporters of reform) be invited to post on the Senate web-site and to address the Senate. He further raised that the Committee had already begun to consolidate different competitions into one date. This needs to be looked into further to make certain that it is advisable and will not have serious

negative consequences upon faculty. Allen anticipates this debate reaching the Senate by early April and reach the floor by our April meeting.