

**Research & Professional Development
Final Report to the Faculty Senate AY 2020-2021
May 14, 2021**

The **Committee on Research and Professional Development** has responsibility for the development and administration of policies for awarding internal grant monies and sabbaticals for faculty research and development. Members: One member elected by and from the Faculty of the Library, two members elected by and from the Faculty of each of the other Schools, the Provost or a designee (ex-officio), and a bargaining unit representative appointed by the President of the Union (ex-officio).

Members

Faculty Members

Christy Goodnight	Chair (2020–2022)
Justin Ostrofsky	Vice Chair (2020–2021)
Chris DiSanto	ARHU (2019–2021)
Kristen Jacobson	ARHU (2020–2022)
Carla Cabarle	BUSN (2019–2021)
Joy Jones	BUSN (2020–2022)
Darrell Cleveland	EDUC (2019–2021)
Douglas Harvey	EDUC (2020–2022)
Raz Segal	GENS (2019–2021)
Emari DiGiorgio	GENS (2020–2022)
Kerri Sowers	HLTH (2019–2021) and Union representative
Bryce Muth	HLTH (2020–2022)
Heather Perez	Library (2020–2022)
Steve Kalman	NAMS (2019–2021)
Craig Lind	NAMS (2020–2022)
Justin Ostrofsky	SOBL (2019–2021)
Keith Williams	SOBL (2020–2022)

Ex Officio Member

Pantelia (Lia) Bairaktaris Programs (Provost designee)	Acting Director for the Office of Research and Sponsored
Ronnie Carlini Maiorino Sponsored Programs	Internal Awards Program Manager of the Office of Research and

Funded awards for FY21

Name	School	Award Type	Title of Award	Funded Amount	Comments
Feige, Jacob	ARHU	Sabbatical	Iconostasis: Investigating Byzantine Painting through Contemporary Materials and Imagery	Spring 21	
Holton, Adalaine	ARHU	Sabbatical	The Libdan		

In response to the

Results Relevant to the First Set of Analyses

With respect to the race-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, Caucasians submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications whereas Asians submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications. Additionally, relative to the pool of applications submitted, we observed that Caucasians had a significantly lower rate of being denied awards than Asians, African Americans and Hispanics. Thus, **we observed a race-based bias for Caucasian applicants to be more likely to be recommended for award than Asian, African American and Hispanic applicants.**

With respect to our sex-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, females submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications and males submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications. However, we did not observe a significant difference in the rate of applications being recommended versus denied for award between male and female applicants. Thus, **we did not observe any sex-based bias with respect to the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.**

With respect to our academic school-based analyses, we first observed that, relative to the University-wide population of faculty members, faculty members in SOBL and ARHU submitted a disproportionately higher number of applications whereas faculty members in BUSN and HLSC submitted a disproportionately lower number of applications. Additionally, we observed that faculty members in SOBL, NAMS and GEN had a significantly lower rate of being denied awards than faculty members in ARHU, BUSN, HLSC and EDUC. Thus, **we observed an academic school-based bias for faculty members in SOBL, NAMS and GEN to be more likely to be granted awards than faculty members in ARHU, BUSN, HLSC and EDUC.**

Results Relevant to the Second Set of Analyses

The results of the second set of analyses indicated that some of the biases described above were either absent or found to be weaker when the alternative sampling methodology was used to assess race-, sex- and academic school-based disparities.

With respect to our race-based analyses, we did not observe any race group to be over- or under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the racial composition of the University population of faculty members. Further, **although there was a trend for Caucasians to be recommended for award at a higher rate than the other racial groups, there was a marginally non-significant difference between the race groups with respect to the rate of being recommended for award by the R&PD committee.**

With respect to our sex-based analyses, we observed the same pattern of results as was observed in the first set of analyses. Namely, females were over-represented and males were under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the sex-based composition of the University population of faculty members. However, **we did not observe any sex-based bias with respect to the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.**

With respect to our academic school-based analyses, we did not observe any school to be over- or under-represented in the pool of applicants relative to the academic school-based composition of the University population of faculty members. Further, **although there was a trend for faculty members in NAMS to be recommended for award at a higher rate than faculty members in other schools, we did not observe a statistically significant difference between the academic schools with respect to the rate of being recommended for award.**

In sum, both sets of analyses are consistent in demonstrating that there are no sex-based biases in the rate of recommendation for award by the R&PD committee. In contrast, the judgment of whether there are any race- and/or academic school-based biases in the rate of being recommended for award depends on which set of analyses one believes to be the best method of assessment of bias in the rate of being recommended versus denied for award.

The full report is [viewable here](#).

**Summary of the Proposal for Research & Professional Development (R&PD) Applicant Advocates:
Report of the Applicant Advocates Working Group Subcommittee of R&PD**

Historical Data Working Group: Kerri Sowers, Emari DiGiorgio, Raz Segal, Kirstin Jacobson, and Carla Cabarle

R&PD applicant advocates participate in the R&PD grant application review process from application submission to the end of the grant award process. Their role is to advocate for a fair and inclusive grant award process and to assist R&PD members in efforts to avoid unconscious, unintentional biases toward particular disciplines or individual applicants/projects. The full report outlines the responsibilities of R&PD applicant advocates along with the applicant advocates pMf