

Prepared by Linda Hatcher  
Submitted Final Draft 5/28/09

**Response to Recommendations for Sponsored Programs Made by  
Reviewers (2009):**

---

The reviewers gave an overall history of the office which was accurate except for two comments. First the report statement that the program operated without institutional oversight was not correct. The office has always had institutional oversight with weekly meetings, originally with the Academic Affairs Vice President, later meetings with the Vice President for Academic Programs, and then by the Dean of Natural and Mathematical Sciences. Also, the logical reporting line at this time is to the Dean of Natural and Mathematical Sciences. The reviewers's comment in the recommendation contradicts the statement on p. 6 of the recommendations, because the reporting structure is clearly defined and supported in this part of the review.

The reviewers made specific recommendations that fell into 8 broad areas of which the director of sponsored programs will directly address all of the recommendations below and suggest how the college administration might address those recommendations directed to them.

**Reviewers Comments:**

**• From Specific Recommendations: Most recommendations will require action by the administration or the entire faculty; others could be implemented directly by the Office of Sponsored Programs. These recommendations represent ideas that were developed during the various meetings with members of the Meredith community, specific suggestions that are informed by the external reviewer's knowledge of sponsored programs practices at other small colleges, and strategies that all members of the review team believe will lead to a stronger Office of Sponsored Programs at Meredith College.**

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 1. We recommend that the director's position be funded at least 20 hours per week from operating funds, not from an allocation of recovered indirect costs because of the fluctuation in that source given low grant volume and the unpredictability of receiving grants that allow indirect cost recovery. We also recommend that the Director have scheduled access to administrative assistance and that there be a job description for that position.**

**Response to Recommendations for Sponsored Programs Made by  
Reviewers (2009):**

---

**Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The position for Director of Sponsored Programs has been submitted as a budgeted position each year for the past three years. We will continue to submit a request for the position (full-time) because the position brings in funding. However, not all grants funded provide indirect funding that directly supports the position. Many of the grants and fellowships that the director lends support to faculty and staff provide no indirect costs (facility and administrative costs or F&A). Therefore, these grants are not able to support the position for sponsored programs but the grants are still worthwhile and needed. The NSF S-STEM Paschal II grant is an example of this type of grant. It is bringing in nearly \$600,000 in scholarship aid but \$0 in F&A to support the position of sponsored programs. The director has access to an administrative assistant for 7 to 10 hours per week, but since the director does not have routine scheduled needs that can be turned over to the assistant in a separate office, there is not a need to have scheduled time with her at this time. Also, the presence of a good work study student helps out with many of the clerical tasks which are needed on a daily basis. A job description is already on file for all administrative assistants but was not included in the program review.

- 2. We recommend that the college provide additional support for the Director to network in person with sponsored programs colleagues working at predominantly undergraduate institutions and to continually update her knowledge about research and curriculum development programs (federal and private) that are appropriate for PUIs.**

**Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The director will request travel to attend the Council of Undergraduate Research (CUR) the next time it is offered in Washington, DC or nearby if funds are available or an equivalent webinar if CUR or another group should offer one. The director will also continue to look for inexpensive or free webinars or programs offered over the Internet or offered locally.

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 3. We recommend that OSP develop the data to document this need and begin a strategic planning process to incrementally increase the hours for the director.**

**Response to Recommendations for Sponsored Programs Made by  
Reviewers (2009):**

---

**Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The director will begin to keep a diary of time worked throughout the week and weekend and report it to the Dean of Natural and Mathematical Sciences when requested. The current position is a part-time position for 20 hours. However, to complete many of the tasks, it takes great effort to keep the position to 30 or 40 hours per week. When a deadline is nearing for a proposal to be turned in, the hours generally exceed 40 hours per week. We have created job descriptions for 20, 30, and 40 hours per week. I would recommend that initially, the position start out on 10 hours general budget + 20 hours indirect funds for a 30 hour position in 2009-10, then increase to 20 hours general budget + 20 hours indirect funds for a 40 hour position in 2010-11, next 30 hours general funds + 10 hours indirect funds 2011-12, and finally 40 hours 2012-13.

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 4. We recommend establishing an advisory group, composed of relevant faculty and staff, for help with setting these goals.**

**Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The Director of Sponsored Programs will explore use in an advisory group as well as the Dean of Natural and Mathematical Sciences in setting short and long-term goals for the program. The advisory committee may be made up of faculty who have an interest in writing proposals or who already have or have had a grant. This ad-hoc advisory committee would be used to review some RFPs and stimulate more fundable projects among the faculty.

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 5. We recommend that the administration take the lead in clarifying the distinction between grants that are facilitated and managed by OSP and those that are the domain of Corporate & Foundation Relations.**

Communication between Institutional Advancement and Sponsored Programs will keep both aware of current projects with corporate and foundations. Sponsored Programs will continue to collaborate with Institutional Advancement to identify any funding sources for faculty scholarship, teaching, and service.

**Response to Recommendations for Sponsored Programs Made by  
Reviewers (2009):**

---

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 6. We recommend establishing regular meetings between the Director of Faculty Development and Director of Sponsored Programs, transmitting information on the role of OSP to various stake holders, connecting with faculty members early in their careers (perhaps through faculty orientation activities), meeting with department heads in all schools, and continuing to refine and focus grant opportunity notices to specific faculty or departments. [W]e recommend that internal procedures be developed to clarify this responsibility.**

**Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The Director of Faculty Development and the Director of Sponsored Programs will meet to plan how best to establish regular meetings, either once a month or once a semester. These meetings may include one or more faculty interested in grants or fellowships. The Director of Sponsored Programs was included one year as part of new faculty orientation and will contact the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs who is now coordinating orientation and request to become a regular component of the orientation for the future. The director currently meets with NMS department heads and will also request to meet with department heads of other schools in the coming year. Grant notices will continue to be refined to specific faculty or departments for those faculty who have expressed an interest in writing a proposal.

More effort will be made to make the Sponsored Programs website more visible so that new faculty will become aware of the resources available to them for grant proposal development. Also, a greater effort will be made to use the term “faculty grants” on the website to make it easier to find.

A section in “In a Nutshell” will be devoted to Grants each month beginning with Summer 09. Grant deadlines and proposal writing tips will be featured.

**Reviewers Comments:**

- 7. We recommend that OSP, with input from a grant advisory group, identify the areas of highest priority and develop plans for addressing these issues. In addition, we recommend that the college establish a new faculty standing committee comprised of faculty members who are each committed to writing a grant proposal.**

## **Response to Recommendations for Sponsored Programs Made by Reviewers (2009):**

---

### **Response to Reviewers Comment:**

With the aid of an advisory group, areas of highest priority will be addressed and plans for addressing them will be discussed. Issues brought up (human subjects, animal research, intellectual merit, broader impact, research misconduct, ethics training, intellectual property, and property transfer) have been covered in a recent continuing education seminars attended by the director and also suggested by the external reviewer. These are subjects that have become issues for funders in the sciences. Faculty pursuing science grants may have an interest in small group discussions in these areas as they prepare a grant because these are issues they must address in their grant proposal. Faculty in other disciplines may see trends in other areas such as human subject trials and ethical research. Rather than offering faculty grant writing workshops, an advisory group could help select topics for workshops and seminars for faculty for those seriously interested in writing proposals. A longer term approach would be to survey faculty to see what topics they would be interested in for a workshop. Faculty who have written grants could also help to mentor new faculty who lack the experience in writing a proposal. Materials obtained from external workshops could be shared among the advisory group. This group would review the Sponsored Programs website and suggest changes and improvements. The ad hoc advisory committee would recommended and advise sponsored programs in setting short-term and long-term goals, setting priorities for proposal development, and discussing compliance issues regarding some grants, assisting with the evaluation and assessment component of proposals, serving as reviewers and evaluators of proposals if requested, while getting feedback from committee members on their own proposal. The Faculty Senate and College Administration would need to review the situation as to whether the ad hoc committee would be able to eventually be able to become a standing committee after several years of productive work.

### **Reviewers Comments:**

- 8. We recommend that all publicity for these programs make it clear that working on a grant proposal is an eligible activity.**

### **Response to Reviewers Comment:**

The Director of Sponsored Programs could submit a request to the Director of Faculty Development to request that a note be placed on the stipend Request for Course Release to indicate that this can be used for grant proposal development. The Director of Sponsored Programs will meet with the Director of Faculty Development to see what efforts Faculty Development can make to help promote external grant proposal preparation in addition to advertising that faculty can receive a course release for the preparation of a proposal.