

Provost's Task Force on Student Research

Final Report

October 23, 2008

Brenda J. Kirby, Co-chair

David Craig, Co-chair

Velma Lee

Wen Ma

Eileen Micaroni

Delia Popescu

Holly Rine

Patrick Yurco

Summary

This report is the culmination of work by the Student Research Task Force (SRTF), constituted in Spring of 2008 by the Provost and Academic Vice President, Dr. Linda Le Mura, in accordance with Strategic Planning recommendations. The charge of the SRTF was to evaluate issues relevant to student scholarly activities including: current practice and faculty compensation; support for summer scholarship; institutionalization of evaluative systems; and the feasibility/desirability of developing an Office of Undergraduate Research. The report reflects our efforts to examine these issues using methods designed to maximize input from relevant constituencies working on campus related to student scholarly efforts, along with outreach to outside institutions. The methods included surveys of students, faculty, department chairs, and peer institutions; on campus focus groups; and administrative and other interviews. The survey instruments and summaries of responses are included (See Section III & Appendices A-F.) We also gathered information from the Student Research Committee records as evidence of current administrative and faculty support for student/faculty collaborative scholarly efforts (Section I.) Seventeen specific recommendations have been derived from these efforts of the SRTF which were shaped by fourteen 'convictions and principles' that emerged from the survey data and discussions (See Section IV.) These recommendations are presented herein along with our estimates of their budgetary implications. It is our hope that the efforts of the Task Force will help guide the development and enhancement of student scholarly achievement at Le Moyne College into the future.

I. Introduction

Since the release of the Boyer Commission report (1998), there has been an increased focus nationally on undergraduate research and creative activities, not just in large research universities, but across the academy. The goal to encourage a move toward “research-based learning” as “standard” included increasing the opportunities for undergraduate students to have experiences as student-scholars (p. 15). The report acknowledged the ability for undergraduate students to contribute original work when provided with mentors and opportunities. There have been many examples of success in institutionalizing student scholarly activity (*e.g.*, Wayment & Dickson, 2008; Schilt & Gilbert, 2008; and for a review of several papers, Crowe & Brakke, 2008), with positive outcomes resulting at times from such simple changes as providing research course numbers so that students can register and receive course credit for research experiences (Schilt & Gilbert, 2008). Positive outcomes for students have included gains in self-confidence, ability to work independently, understanding the process of science, and learning laboratory techniques (Guterman, 2007). While only small increases in students’ likelihood of *planning* to go to graduate school occur for students doing undergraduate research (Guterman, 2007), those who did some research already knowing that graduate work was their goal surely improved their chances to be accepted into quality programs. Therefore, we begin this study of practices at Le Moyne College with the conviction that the opportunity to engage in undergraduate student scholarship is appropriate and even necessary for our students.

For faculty mentors, the benefit for students is of paramount importance. However, one often noted issue is also the great cost to those faculty mentors. There is a need to make faculty dedication to mentoring undergraduate research a beneficial process for those faculty mentors as well (*e.g.*, Guterman, 2007 and Wayment & Dickson, 2008). Some costs to faculty mentors mentioned in the research have included the sacrifice of time needed to commit to student projects, which may interfere with faculty research goals and productivity, lack of other compensation for faculty committing such time, and even sacrifice of time that may have gone to family activities (*e.g.*, Guterman, 2007). Innovative solutions have been instituted, such as the availability of matching funds to departments whose students are winning undergraduate research awards (Schilt & Gilbert, 2008) and restructured teaching assignments which serve to compensate engaged faculty by counting their mentoring activities toward their regular course loads (Wayment & Dickson). Therefore, we begin this study of practices at Le Moyne College with the conviction that appropriate mechanisms for support of faculty mentors of undergraduate scholarly activities are appropriate and necessary.

For many years, a key goal in the Le Moyne College Academic Affairs strategic plan was the enhancement of student scholarly activity at the college. The Student Research Committee, described below, met in the fall of 2007 and agreed that we should request that the Provost and Academic Vice President convene a group to deal with those issues. The strategic planning document – updated by Dr. Craig in consultation with Dr. Kirby in late 2007; see Appendix H – specifically included the following:

a. Faculty support for mentoring undergraduate and graduate students will be assessed by a task force appointed by the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations for faculty compensation will be provided to the Provost/Academic Vice President.

Support for student research should be expanded in two dimensions: 1) additional funding should be made available for graduate student research, with a system of awarding funds similar to that in place for undergraduate research, and 2) means should be devised to compensate faculty mentors for supervision of student research projects. This supervision involves a great deal of time, particularly in some disciplines where students must be assisted in the use of equipment, etc. Currently, compensation for mentoring student research varies among departments and programs, from nothing at all to accumulating a course load reduction to stipends. Compensation for faculty needs to be closely examined and an equitable policy worked out by the aforementioned Task Force, in consultation with the faculty and the administration, to be recommended for implementation.

b. Summer stipends and housing for undergraduates doing more intensive research with faculty mentors should also become a part of support for student research; possibilities for such support should be discussed and recommendations forwarded to the Provost/AVP as part of the charge to the Task Force

c. The college was set to “explore ways that implement the infrastructure necessary to integrate faculty-student scholarship in a systematic way. To that end, (it was stated) we will consider a faculty-directed Office of Undergraduate Research in order to foster a multidisciplinary community of researchers, scholars, and artists linked by a common enthusiasm for learning”. Specific objectives for that office are listed in the plan.

In March of 2008, the Provost and Academic Vice President, Dr. Linda Le Mura, convened the Student Research Task Force (SRTF) with the charge to evaluate current practice and faculty compensation, support for summer scholarship, institutionalization of evaluative systems, and the feasibility/desirability of developing an Office of Undergraduate Research. These specific charges were derived from the Academic Affairs strategic planning documents as listed above.

STUDENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Student Research Committee (SRC), which evaluates applications for funding and awards grants to support student research, was given permanent status as a College committee in 2005-06 after operating on an ad hoc basis starting in spring of 1999. In its first full year of operation, 2000, we worked with a budget goal of \$6000, but students' proposals were so impressive that even in that early year, the Academic Vice President serving at that time supported overspending that early budget by more than \$1000. This committee solicits and evaluates proposals to support research by undergraduate students (mentored by a faculty member).

The SRC makes recommendations for funding to the Chief Academic Officer (currently the Provost/AVP) who then communicates approval of awards to the Chair. The funding is managed through the office of the Chief Academic Officer. This committee is staffed each year by a faculty Chair, one faculty representative each from natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, management division, and an at large faculty position. It also includes one student member nominated by the Student Senate President. This seven member committee retains continuity by replacing with new membership no more than four members (including the student) in a given year.

An internal Strategic Initiatives grant (\$6,620) funded the enhancement of the scope of activities and the visibility of the Student Scholars Day in the Spring of 2006. We expanded the event to include presentations of scholarly and creative activities from all disciplines. This led to significant growth, both in terms of quality and number of presenters and attendance at the event. There were over 30 student presenters from many disciplines in Spring of 2006, 33 in 2007, and 38 in 2008. The planning for the Spring 2009 event is underway.

With this funding for undergraduate student research made available by the Provost/Academic Vice President's Office, 22 students [16 faculty mentors, 7 departments] were funded in 2005-06, 15 were funded in 2006-2007 [13 faculty mentors, 5 departments], 17 funded in 2007-2008 [13 faculty mentors, 6 departments] and so far 2 have been funded in 2008-2009 [2 faculty mentors, 2 departments] with three proposal due dates pending. Departments represented by the student/faculty teams include: Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Physics, Psychology, History, English, Crime and Justice Studies, Education, Sociology, and Business Administration. We regularly deplete the current annual budget of \$12,000. (This budget does not include Scholars Day expenditures.)

The Student Research Committee developed a webpage, which is accessible at <http://www.lemoyne.edu/src> , and which has a sample program from Scholars Day 2008 along with sample student research funding proposals, one each from natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. The page is prominently available in the 'Campus Links' listing on the main college webpage (Echo).

Student Research Committee funding guidelines are given in Appendix G.

II. Definition of Student Scholarship

From the outset, it was important to the Task Force to have a clear working definition of student scholarship that was inclusive not only of “research” as traditionally understood within the academy, but also broadly of creative and other scholarly work that might be pursued in academic environments. The charge of the Task Force was to formulate recommendations aimed at best institutionalizing support for student scholarly activity, inclusive of all disciplines and respecting scholarly products as they differ across disciplines. The broad vision of student scholarship underlying the work of the Task Force needed to reflect this diversity.

The definition of student scholarship ultimately formulated by the Task Force became the conceptual frame for the remainder of our work:

“Scholarly activity” by students is intended to include the same kinds of productive scholarly work in which a faculty member in the same discipline might engage. Depending on the discipline, this might include laboratory work, theoretical or computational analysis, field work, archival research, pedagogical research, creative writing, playwriting, musical or theatrical production and performance, and similar activities.

The focus is on significant scholarly work by students that potentially implies some sort of departmental or institutional support outside of the requirements or demands of ordinary coursework. This work might include independent research; research assistantships; summer research programs; internships; or senior, honors, or other kinds of theses. The nature of the support might include, but is not necessarily limited to, financial resources, faculty time, administrative support, facilities usage, room and/or board, and grants and scholarships.

Research projects or assignments that are components of regular coursework or methods courses should not be considered unless they imply a significant student and/or faculty commitment outside of standard course requirements and require commitment of resources above and beyond those normally allotted to the course.

This definition was featured prominently on the surveys that were distributed to all constituencies.

III. Methodology

The crucial data informing the work of the Task Force were gathered through a series of surveys, focus groups, and interviews with the relevant constituencies – students, faculty, administrators, and institutional peers.

Copies of the surveys, summaries of the survey results, and other relevant information may be found in Appendices A-F.

A. Student Surveys

The Le Moyne College Office of Institutional Research assisted with the development and administration of an online survey of students. The survey was announced by email to 2,125 students, of whom 302 [14.21%] responded.

B. Faculty Surveys

Full-time faculty were sent a long survey through campus mail. The survey was also distributed several times by email. Faculty returned 27 completed surveys, a rather low response rate of 18%, assuming 150 full-time faculty (See Appendix B.)

C. Department Chairs

A separate survey was distributed to Department Chairs and Program Directors, of whom 12 chairs and 2 program directors responded (See Appendix C.)

D. Focus Groups

Two focus group sessions attended by 17 invited faculty members were held in April of 2008. All 29 faculty who had mentored a student applying for research funding *via* the Student Research Committee or a student presenter at the Scholars Day event in the past two years were invited (See Appendix D.)

E. Administrator Interviews

Individual interviews were conducted with people serving in several administrative positions, including the Integral Honors Director, the Vice President of Student Development, the grants officer/institutional advancement team member, directors of Faculty Development, Student Learning Assessment, Peace and Global Studies, and the project leader from the Contemporary Catholic Trends project. . (See Appendix E.)

F. Peer Institution Surveys

Surveys were distributed to 27 other Jesuit institutions, in addition to a select few other institutions. Six institutions responded, all but one of them Jesuit (See Appendix F.)

IV. Recommendations

Taken together, the student surveys, faculty surveys, focus groups, and administrator interviews paint a picture of an institution which generally says it believes in the importance and relevance of undergraduate student scholarship outside the classroom context, but is somewhat conflicted about the level of commitment and support it should receive, or indeed, does already receive. The Task Force discussed the implications of our investigative work at great length.

Our recommendations are shaped by the following convictions and principles that emerged from those discussions:

1. Student scholarship is an important component of the education of some, but not all, Le Moyne undergraduates, depending upon their individual goals, aspirations, and interests. Strong support for these students is integral to the College's Mission to educate the whole person and to adequately prepare them to fulfill those plans and dreams.
2. Some experience as a student scholar at the undergraduate level is becoming almost essential for admission to graduate programs in many fields including those in the natural and social sciences such as physics and psychology, as well as humanities disciplines such as history and religious studies.
3. Strong support for undergraduate scholarship is essential to increasing Le Moyne's national profile and competitiveness, both for quality students, and for attracting quality faculty committed to teaching and scholarship.
4. Existing support for student scholarship has been successful and rewarded with growth in both the numbers and quality of students engaging in scholarly activities.
5. Direct institutional support for faculty mentoring student scholarship is uneven across campus disciplines, and tends toward the non-existent in most. For the most part, such mentorship has been conducted essentially only through the commitment, generosity, and sacrifice of interested faculty.
6. Mentorship of student scholarship should be supported and encouraged, but not required of faculty.
7. Expectations of faculty concerning mentorship of student scholarship have not been clearly articulated.
8. Faculty who mentor student scholarship strongly desire both significantly stronger departmental and institutional support and greater clarity of expectation and reward structure.

9. The principles guiding institutional expectations and support of faculty mentorship of student scholarship should be *clarity of expectation, consistency of application, and equity of distribution*.

10. Mentorship of student scholarship can be as extraordinarily time consuming as it is valuable for the student. The appropriate compensation for this commitment is therefore also time.

11. The present level of student scholarship has or will soon outgrow the existing support mechanisms for faculty mentors and students.

12. Understanding that the College has limited resources, it is important to focus on commitments that offer the greatest value relative to the scale of the investment. Outside support for student scholarship may help offset the institutional commitment.

13. As the level of student scholarship grows, it will eventually become necessary to coordinate the many necessary services – external fund raising, development of internal and external opportunities for students, coordination of Summer research administration, administration of funds, planning for Student Scholars Day and other activities, and so forth – at an administrative level, possibly through the establishment of an Office of Undergraduate Student Scholarship. (This Office would likely begin with a Director and some secretarial support.) Establishment of various elements of institutional support for student scholarship at Le Moyne should be made with a clear eye toward the eventual development of such institutional-level administrative support.

14. It is recognized that the recommendations made herein represent by themselves a significant increase in responsibility for the Student Research Committee and thereby its Chair. Absent the implementation of the recommendations which support the SRC such as an administrative budget, secretarial support, and a mandate for appropriate College offices to participate directly and consistently in this effort, the success of many of these proposed endeavors is doubtful. The implementation of these recommendations should therefore be regarded as contingent upon the appropriate support for the SRC.

The Task Force therefore makes the following recommendations:

A. SRC AWARDS BUDGET INCREASE

Student Research Committee [SRC] funding for student awards should be increased from the current budget of \$12,000 to \$16,000 per annum.

The SRC has consistently disbursed the full amount of the awards budget, even as that budget has grown over the years since the inception of the committee. In years when the SRC has run short of funds to support worthy proposals, the Office of the Provost/AVP has generously stepped in to assist. The committee budget has been static for the past several years, and the recommendations herein (including specifically at

least recommendations D, G, H, and possibly J) will place additional strain on the existing budget. Keeping funding levels static at \$12,000 is largely incompatible with many of the following recommendations.

B. SRC ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

The SRC should be allocated a budget of \$3,500 for incidental expenses and support of Student Scholars Day expenses, including a stipend and other expenses for a speaker (totaling in the neighborhood of \$1,000.) Currently, Scholars Day expenses come out of the office of the Provost/AVP and administrative expenses are from the office of the Provost/AVP and the SRC Chair's departmental budget. For comparison, expenses for the most recent Scholars Day (without an external speaker or invitations to area high schools) were a little over \$2,000.

C. SRC ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Administrative/secretarial support should be assigned to the SRC to help coordinate funding application cycles, assist with administration of SRC awards, Scholars Day publicity and administrative arrangements, and so forth. The SRC-related responsibilities will vary considerably over the course of a year, but we estimate would total 50-100 hours over the course of a year. Currently, many of these tasks are performed either by the SRC Chair or Carolyn McTiernan, Assistant to the Provost.

D. SRC INCIDENTAL EXPENSES FUND

The College should establish a process for funding for incidental student research expenses, including

- Doubling the student print quota from 450 pp/term to 900 pp/term for honors, integral honors, and students registered in research courses.
- Poster printing for conferences, Student Scholars Day, and other events where student scholarship is presented. Although in some cases these expenses have been covered by IT, there should be some normalization of this allocation managed through the SRC that will make access more transparent and equitable.
- Duplication expenses.

and related expenditures that can be fast-tracked through the normal SRC application process.

For the time being, such funding should be administered by the SRC through a separate, simpler, more rapid application process than the periodic calls for more formal, generally larger research funding requests. (Costs of the increased print quota would not come from SRC funds.)

E. PROMOTION OF STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Opportunities to engage in research, and funding therefore, should be more broadly disseminated. Email announcements have proved to be of limited effectiveness.

Such publicity efforts should include the usual email and Echo announcements; posters; public announcements at talks such as the weekly Natural Science Seminar; advising materials and meetings; faculty advisors; career services; promotion through AVS 101; and other such measures.

Another possibility includes establishing an online research opportunity “clearing house” page where faculty could post needs for research students and/or their availability to work with students on projects. Interested students would have a central location from which to investigate the kinds of scholarship in which they might become involved, and potential faculty mentors.

For the time being, these publicity efforts should be coordinated by SRC and its administrative support. Funding for the promotional efforts would where necessary be drawn from the SRC budget of recommendation B above.

F. PROMOTION OF STUDENT SCHOLARLY ACCOMPLISHMENT

The accomplishments of student scholars at Le Moyne should be much more broadly publicized and disseminated.

Such promotional efforts should include the College web site (not just Echo); articles on Scholars Day and regular profiles of individual student researchers in The Le Moyne Magazine; in electronic alumni communications and on the web site; and coordination with the Office of Communications.

For the time being, these publicity efforts should be coordinated by the SRC with the Office of Communications and its administrative support. Funding for the promotional efforts would where necessary be drawn from the SRC administrative budget of recommendation B above and/or supplemented through other publicity efforts such as the publication of The Le Moyne Magazine, *etc.*

G. SUMMER SCHOLARSHIP

The College should standardize support for summer research programs at Le Moyne. In order of priority, the College should provide:

1. Course credit for Summer research.
2. Housing for Summer research students.
3. Support for faculty mentors, which may include stipends or teaching credit according to some agreed-upon formula such as that of recommendation N.
4. Board.
5. Student stipends.

The course credit could take the form of credit for enrolling in a designated research/independent scholarship course the term following the summer research, in order to avoid the necessity to be formally enrolled as a Summer student (and hence paying Summer tuition. In some such cases, where enrollment in courses with laboratories normally puts the students' course load above 15 credits during a regular semester, the research students should be permitted to register for more than 18 credits in that term.) This could be facilitated by adopting some standard course designation for student scholarship such those currently existing in many departments (*e.g.* CHM 495, PSY 471, PSY 499, and others) across all participating disciplines that do not already have such a course designation. Such courses could also help facilitate implementation of recommendation N, below.

According to Sean Ward, Vice President for Student Development, housing can be provided in College dormitories at minimal real cost to the College, and no expense to students, at the direction of the Provost/AVP. (The nominal fee is currently \$5/day, but as indicated Student Development is comfortable waiving this fee if requested by administration. As the number of students engaging in Summer research grows, this policy may require reconsideration.) Students would be required to obey all rules and standards of behavior of any other students living in College housing.

These components are critical to the success and growth of Summer research and could be accomplished with minimal cost to the College.

Board (at standard student summer rates – currently \$25/day/student) and possible student stipends for Summer research – if funds are available – could be awarded and administered through proposals to the SRC as with any other funding allocations for student scholarship.

H. SUMMER RESEARCH FUNDING

The Student Research Committee should reserve one funding call specifically for Summer research projects.

Since this call would come near the end of the fiscal year, at a time when SRC award funds have normally run out, the funding for the Summer awards call should be drawn from the *next* fiscal year's SRC budget. This may require a further increase in the SRC awards budget as more students express interest in summer programs.

I. EXTERNAL FUNDING SUPPORT

The College should more aggressively and consistently pursue opportunities for external funding, internships, and other external resources through Grants Development and Career Services. This support should come in the form of an explicit commitment of administrative time such as a commitment of 10-20% of Lisa Lessun's time to pursuit of external funding opportunities. These external funding opportunities should include, but not be limited to, pursuit of REU and other REU-like programs that would support faculty mentored student scholarly participation.

J. EXTERNAL ENDOWMENTS

With Grants Development, the College should aggressively pursue external opportunities to endow both the SRC award budget itself, as well as special individual named SRC awards. The pursuit of such external funding would necessarily follow the development of an increase in the formal publicity allocated to student scholarly activities mentioned in the promotion of student scholarly accomplishment, recommendation F above.

K. FACULTY TRAVEL

Faculty who attend a conference as a co-author with students or mentor of a student presenter should be supported for a second conference, if the faculty member would normally attend a conference in their field other than the meeting attended with the

student(s). Support for this travel could be in a separate travel budget line in the office of the appropriate Dean, or perhaps in the student activities budget. Alternately, faculty who attend a conference with students may be allowed to include support for their attendance in the student's application for SRC committee funds (obviously over and above the de facto \$1,000 per student SRC award cap.)

L. EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY

Expectations of faculty concerning mentorship of student scholarship should be clarified. It should be made clear that student scholarship is regarded as a valued and significant component of the College's educational mission. Based on the focus groups, faculty surveys, and administrator interviews, we recommend that it be made clear that in general, mentorship of student scholarship is not required, but is welcomed, supported, and encouraged at an appropriate level. Some departments may, however, expect some level of faculty mentorship of student theses and other scholarly projects.

In all cases, expectations regarding mentorship of student scholarship should be made clear in discussions with a faculty member's Dean and Department. However, any explicit statement regarding the importance of this activity must be accompanied by the institution of appropriate reward mechanisms as described below.

To that end, we recommend that more explicit language be proposed for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook according to the procedures outlined in the section "Procedures for Amending the Handbook".

We suggest Section I.A.1.a be amended to read (new/revised text in bold):

- a. Satisfactory fulfillment of teaching duties in assigned courses or their equivalent.

In general, mentorship of student scholarship outside of normal coursework is not required as a teaching duty, but is welcomed, supported, and encouraged. Some departments may, however, expect some level of faculty mentorship of student theses and other scholarly projects. In all cases expectations regarding mentorship of student scholarship will be explicitly discussed with faculty members.

M. TENURE AND PROMOTION STANDARDS

The role mentorship of student research will play in tenure and promotion at both associate and full professor levels should be clarified. It should be made clear that student scholarship is regarded as a valued and significant component of the College's educational mission. Based on the focus groups, faculty surveys, and administrator interviews, we recommend that this clarification be guided by the following principles:

1. Mentorship of student scholarship should in general be regarded as teaching.
2. Scholarship which results in collaborative publications and presentations with students should be counted as scholarly work at a level on par with publication or presentation in the same venue (journal/conference) without a student co-

author/presenter, and should not be arbitrarily discounted or credited. In other words, student co-authors/presenters should be regarded in the same manner (in a discipline-appropriate fashion) as other professional collaborators. Accordingly, similar discipline-appropriate standards for co-authorship should be applied by faculty working with students on joint publications and presentations.

We recommend that more explicit language expressing these standards be proposed for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook according to the procedures outlined in the section “Procedures for Amending the Handbook”.

We suggest the second paragraph of Section IV.A.1.a be amended to read (new/revised text in bold):

Le Moyne College encourages its faculty to develop teaching styles, consonant with current pedagogical methods and grounded in the scholarship of teaching; all such styles should respect diverse approaches to learning and facilitate each student’s intellectual, professional, and personal development. Through programs based on a core curriculum in the liberal arts and sciences and marked by academic excellence, faculty members engage students in value-oriented learning. **Facilitation of discipline-appropriate student scholarship conducted outside of ordinary course requirements is also highly valued as a contribution to a faculty member’s teaching. Depending on the discipline, such scholarship might encompass laboratory work, theoretical or computational analysis, field work, archival research, pedagogical research, creative writing, playwriting, musical or theatrical production and performance, and similar activities.**

We suggest the fourth paragraph of Section IV.A.1.b be amended to read (new/revised text in bold):

Along with original research, scholarship may be reflected in publications and presentations that interpret a scholarly field to a general audience. **Facilitation of original discipline-appropriate student scholarship may be partial evidence of scholarship where contributions to knowledge can be documented in ways appropriate to the field. Papers, presentations, performances, publications, and other appropriate documentation with student co-authors should be assessed on their merits according to the same standards applied to any collaborative work in the faculty member’s discipline, and be neither arbitrarily over-valued nor discounted in importance.** The development of textbooks, workbooks, computer software, and other teaching resources that demonstrate competence in one’s field will also be considered in the assessment of a candidate’s scholarship.

N. COMPENSATION OF FACULTY

The appropriate compensation for the time-consuming commitment to mentorship of student scholarship is time. In keeping with the principle that such mentorship is a particular form of teaching; a formula should be established for compensating faculty

for mentorship of student research for the time they have already committed to this teaching.

The baseline recommendation of the Task Force is that for every 21 registered credit hours of mentorship of student scholarship *outside of regular course/major requirements* faculty be credited for one course taught. (Courses such as required senior theses or research methods courses are thereby excluded and considered as part of faculty members' normal teaching load.) This is consistent with standards established for teaching of independent study students and with practices at some comparable institutions.

This standard implicitly requires that students being mentored be *registered in a course* that their department has established for research/scholarly activity outside of normal course requirements. (Examples of such courses include CHM 495 and PSY 471.) Mentorship of scholarship outside of this framework is of course permissible, but will not be compensated as time spent teaching. Students who participate in scholarly work while registered for course credit are paying for that credit, thereby providing a logical financial stream for the corresponding compensation of faculty.

In some instances at the College such policies already exist in principle, but are rarely implemented due to staffing and other constraints. *For such a policy to be at all meaningful, it is critical that it be consistently and uniformly applied and supported by administration with appropriate resources.*

O. OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

The Task Force does not recommend the establishment of an Office of Undergraduate Research at this time. This recommendation is due in part to significant reservations expressed on the part of most who were asked during the data collection process. Nonetheless, the Task Force believes that as student engagement grows, an Office of Undergraduate Research (or something like it) will eventually become essential. Refinement of current policy and procedure should proceed with this eventual transformation in full view.

Until such time as such an office – with an appropriate Director and administrative support – is established, the functions of such an office should become explicit mandates of the appropriate offices on campus, in coordination with the SRC.

Examples of such functions and corresponding offices include

1. External funding – Grants Development/Institutional Advancement.
2. Promotion of Scholars Day and student achievements – Communications, Web Committee, Admissions, and other offices (*e.g.* Provost/AVP and the Office of the President.)
3. Internships and other external opportunities – Career Services and Grants Development/Institutional Advancement.
4. Summer research support – Career Services, Grants Development/Institutional Advancement, and Student Development.

5. Promotion of opportunities to engage in student scholarship – Advising, Career Services, and other offices.

6. Promotion of opportunities to secure funding for student scholarship – Advising, Career Services, Institutional Advancement, and other offices.

It is appropriate to note that proposed added duties and responsibilities in combination with the current workload of the chair of the SRC constitute a significant time commitment that will be difficult to sustain absent implementation of recommendations B and C and the coordination and assistance described just above.

At such time as an Office of Undergraduate Research is established, a significant issue to be clarified will be the nature of the relationship between the Office and the Student Research Committee. It is the firm conviction of the Task Force that, in order that the awards process remain transparent and subject to the review of a multi-disciplinary group of faculty, the Student Research Committee should retain its jurisdiction over the funding awards process. The Office of Undergraduate Research would assume responsibility for most of the non-awards duties described herein, including promotion of undergraduate student scholarship, administration of Scholars Day, development of funding resources, administration of summer research programs, and so forth.

P. COUNCIL OF UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH

We should maintain our Council of Undergraduate Research (CUR) institutional membership and continue to encourage faculty participation. We should also support CUR initiatives (workshops for disciplines, grant-writing workshops, *etc.*) and continue to fund membership fees for interested faculty members.

Q. SUPPORT FOR GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

We should investigate more fully the need for support for independent scholarship by Le Moyne graduate students. The Task Force did not gather sufficient data from most programs granting graduate degrees to properly understand the needs of programs in this area. It was the feeling of the Task Force that the issues and demands of undergraduate student scholarship are sufficiently distinct from graduate student scholarship that graduate research is simply a separate problem. We recommend that independent scholarship by graduate students be explored in a dedicated fashion by a committee of faculty with direct experience with the affected programs.

COST ANALYSIS

Of the 17 recommendations A-Q, ten [D, E, F, H, J, L, M, O, P, and Q] are essentially policy or procedural recommendations, and therefore relatively cost free.

Recommendation B effectively shifts money already being spent by the Provost's office explicitly to a budget for the SRC, with a small additional amount for support of the SRC itself.

Real costs are associated with recommendations A, C, G, I, K, N and P.

Recommendation A suggests an increase in the SRC award budget from \$12,000 to \$16,000, and therefore represents an increased expense of \$4,000. (This value does reflect expenses heretofore paid for by the Office of the Provost/AVP such as occasional overruns of the SRC awards budget [but not including Scholars Day], and as such the real cost is probably less than \$4,000.)

Recommendation B suggests a small budget for SRC operating costs as well as an increase in the budget for Scholars Day to cover expenses related to the attraction of an external speaker. The overall increase over current spending is roughly \$1,500.

Recommendation C involves allocation of some administrative support to the SRC. If these duties are assigned to existing Le Moyne staff (without overburdening any individual) this may be cost-neutral. We do envision this recommendation as shifting some responsibilities off the shoulders of the Assistant to the Provost to staff dedicated to the SRC, in addition to providing support to the SRC beyond that historically offered by the Assistant.

Recommendation D suggests doubling the print quota for students engaged in student scholarship. This represents a real cost of roughly \$22.50 per student per semester, according to Bill Thieke in IT. (All printing costs are born by IT.) However, since according to Bill, honors and other courses already routinely request increased print allocations of this order, systematizing this increased allocation may not represent a significant burden until the number of student scholars grows well beyond current numbers. Recommendation D also suggests shifting some poster printing and related expenses from IT to the SRC awards budget, thus to some degree balancing the expense to IT of increased print quotas.

Recommendation G, increased support and organization for Summer Research, involves real costs if student board and faculty and/or student stipends are included. This assumes that housing costs would be nominal, as was indicated by the Vice President of Student Development. Some of this may be drawn from the increased SRC awards budget of recommendation A, and therefore not necessarily represent a large separate expense to the College.

Recommendation I, a request for dedicated assistance from Grants Development, does represent an increase (or re-allocation) of the workload of one individual.

Recommendation K, travel support, represents an increase in the support for faculty travel, unless it is implemented to the detriment of funding for the “first trip” for *other* faculty (which we strenuously argue against.) Alternately, if these funds are instead drawn from the student activities budget or the SRC awards budget then this recommendation does not represent an additional expense over recommendation A.

Of these recommendations, the total cost – approximately \$6,000 plus increased staff, summer support, and, potentially, travel expenses – is relatively negligible compared to the value their implementation would bring to the College.

Perhaps the most important recommendation, however, is recommendation N, teaching equivalence. This recommendation represents a significant cost to the College because it reduces the number of hours of regular courses faculty who mentor student scholarship will be able to teach over a period of years. It is difficult to gauge this cost precisely, but we may estimate that a faculty member who mentors 3 credit hours of scholarship every semester (one student per term or two students for one term) would be eligible for credit for a course taught once every 3-1/2 years. Assuming they take that credit in the fourth year without mentoring a student in that term, that represents one less regular course the faculty member is available to teach every four years. (Of course, some faculty members have in the past mentored more than one student per academic year, so there may be departments for which this is a consistently greater cost.) While this may place a burden on some departments, especially those in which many faculty engage actively in mentorship of student scholarship, we do not believe the burden to be excessive or inappropriate to the mission of the College. We firmly believe the overall value to students and to the College far exceeds this relatively manageable cost.

The cost of this recommendation should be evaluated in the context of the potential benefits for the student, the faculty, and the College as a whole, including, for example, greater access to quality graduate programs, engaged and invigorated faculty, and an increased profile for Le Moyne College as our students represent Le Moyne while presenting their work, in graduate programs, and in the community.

For this recommendation to be successfully implemented, however, Departments and the Administration must include scholarly mentorship teaching hours in calculations concerning staffing needs.

V. Summation

The scope of undergraduate student scholarship at Le Moyne College is relatively small, but healthy and growing with the active support of the Student Research Committee, the Chief Academic Officer, and, of course, the faculty. The manifold benefits to Le Moyne students, faculty, and to the College as a whole, are inarguable. As student scholarly activity grows, however, the current rather informal and ad hoc practices, policies and procedures will require a certain degree of normalization. Moreover, for growth to continue at a healthy pace and in a manner in keeping with the Mission of the College, support for both student scholars and their faculty mentors must be actively attended to. The Student Research Task Force has made every effort to provide the College with a detailed roadmap for the development of vigorous but prudent institutional support for undergraduate scholarship at Le Moyne.

The Task Force is keenly aware that these recommendations arrive at a moment of considerable uncertainty. Nonetheless, we believe that the costs associated with implementation of these recommendations, as outlined above, are truly negligible relative to the enormous benefits – both short and long term – of their timely implementation. The possible exception, recommendation N, compensation of faculty, is associated with a cost that even if implemented today would not be realized for a minimum of several years, at the very least deferring its immediate budgetary implications. The Task Force urges strong consideration be given to the immediate implementation of all of the recommendations herein. If it is ultimately determined that implementation must be deferred, we strongly recommend that a compact and specific timetable for implementation be established in order that support for a currently healthy component of Le Moyne's education of some of its very best students is not permitted to wither on the vine.

Acknowledgements

The Task Force would like to thank Aurea McNamee for her considerable help in collecting, compiling, and summarizing survey results into a coherent form. Her assistance was invaluable.

The Task Force also wishes to acknowledge Daniel Skidmore and the Le Moyne College Office of Institutional Research for helping formulate, execute, and analyze the student survey.

References

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, S.S. Kenny (chair), (1998), "Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities", State University of New York-Stony Brook.

M. Crowe and D. Brakke (2008), "Assessing the Impact of Undergraduate Research Experiences on Students: An Overview of Current Literature", *CUR Quarterly*, **28** (4) 43-50.

L. Guterman (2007), "What Good is Undergraduate Research, Anyway?", *Chronicle of Higher Education*, **53** (50) A12.

P. Schilt and L. A. Gilbert (2008), "Undergraduate Research in the Humanities: Transforming Expectations at a Research University", *CUR Quarterly*, **28** (4) 51-55.

H.A. Wayment and K.L. Dickson (2008), "Increasing Student Participation in Undergraduate Research Benefits Students, Faculty, and Department", *Teaching of Psychology* **35** 194-197.

Appendix A – Student Survey

Survey [Online]

Le Moyne College Survey of Le Moyne Students on Student Scholarly Activity

For the purposes of this survey, scholarly activity means scholarly work conducted outside the requirements of regular coursework (but possibly including theses, independent research, internships, and so forth.) This survey is intended to gather information from Le Moyne College students concerning interest, importance and level of participation in student scholarly activity. Our goal in conducting this survey is to formulate recommendations for the Le Moyne College administration concerning support for student scholarship across the curriculum. The information you provide will help to ensure that we have a clearer understanding of student interest and needs as we make our recommendations. Depending on the discipline, scholarly activity might include: laboratory work theoretical or computational analysis field work archival research pedagogical research creative writing playwriting musical or theatrical production and performance and similar activities Scholarly activity outside of ordinary coursework might include: independent research, research assistantships summer research programs internships senior, honors, or other kinds of theses Support for scholarly activity might include, but is not necessarily limited to: financial resources faculty time administrative support facilities usage room and/or board grants and scholarships. Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Le Moyne College Survey on Student Scholarly Activity

NOTE: For the purposes of this survey, scholarly activity means: Scholarly work conducted outside the requirements of regular course work (but possibly including theses, independent research, internships, and so forth.)

1. I have participated in scholarly activity at Le Moyne College outside of regular course requirements (as described above).

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

If yes, please describe your experience:

2. I am considering attending the following graduate or professional school after graduating from Le Moyne.

- (1) Law school
- (2) Medical school
- (3) Dental school
- (4) Physician Assistant program
- (5) Nursing school
- (6) Other health profession
- (7) Veterinary school

- (8) Master's Program
- (9) Ph.D. Program
- (10) Other, please specify below

If you selected 'Other,' what type of program do you hope to attend?

3. Student participation in scholarly activity outside of regular course requirements is an important part of Le Moyne's mission to educate the whole person.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree
- (5) No Opinion

4. Scholarly activity outside of course requirements (such as a senior thesis or an internship) is part of my major requirements for graduation.

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

5. I am aware of opportunities to participate in scholarly activity outside of my course requirements at Le Moyne.

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

6. The number of students I know at Le Moyne who are engaged in scholarly activity is:

- (1) 0
- (2) 1-3
- (3) 4 or more

7. I am aware of opportunities for financial support at Le Moyne to participate in scholarly activity.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree
- (5) No Opinion

8. I would like to engage in scholarly activity at Le Moyne before I graduate.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree
- (5) No Opinion

If you had the opportunity to participate in scholarly activity over the summer, you would require:

9a. Campus Housing

- (1) Strongly Agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly Disagree
 - (5) No Opinion
-

9b. A Stipend

- (1) Strongly Agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly Disagree
 - (5) No Opinion
-

9c. Course Credit

- (1) Strongly Agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly Disagree
 - (5) No Opinion
-

9d. Other (please specify below)

- (1) Strongly Agree
 - (2) Agree
 - (3) Disagree
 - (4) Strongly Disagree
 - (5) No Opinion
-

9. If other, please describe.

10. Please add any comments or suggestions you believe may be helpful regarding student scholarly activity at Le Moyne.

Summary Results – Student Surveys

Of the 302 students who replied to the survey some clear patterns emerged. Students from a variety of majors responded to the survey. The largest number of respondents came from psychology and biology with 15.5% and 15.2% of respondents respectively, but students from other social sciences, natural and physical sciences, humanities and business were represented as well. Although only 14.21% of students replied, 199, or 67.7%, of them indicated that they are interested in engaging in scholarly activity at Le Moyne, while only 12.3% indicated that they clearly did not wish to participate. 85.8% of this population also indicated that they view independent scholarly work outside course requirements to be an important part of Le Moyne's mission of education. Furthermore, of the 302 students who did reply, 279 indicated that they planned on attending graduate or professional school after graduating from Le Moyne. Lastly, the majority of the student respondents 224 or 74% had grade point averages above 3.1. Given the demographics and current status of the students who replied, we could therefore assume that the responses we did receive are from those students who are interested in the scholarly opportunities available at Le Moyne.

Current participation in scholarly activity

Students were given an opportunity to describe any scholarly activities they have participated in while enrolled at Le Moyne. There were 96 written responses from the 111 students who identified themselves as having participated in scholarly activity. Of those 96 responses 48, or 50%, indicated that their experiences came in the form of off-campus internships that included working at hospitals, the NYS Dept. of Tax and Finance, Fermi National Laboratory, Elmcrest Children's Center, the New York Supreme Court and Syracuse Children's Theatre, to name only a few. Many of these students indicated the importance of these experiences in preparing them for future work or graduate school. Of the remaining half of the respondents, 24, or 25% of the total, indicated that they participated in scholarly activity through opportunities such as Integral Honors, departmental honors, independent studies with Le Moyne faculty, or required class work for their major. The last 25% of the respondents gave answers that were more miscellaneous in nature such as "Lab", "online surveys," or "participation in philosophy symposium," which did not indicate actual participation in scholarly activity, although several in this category expressed that they would be participating in such activity later. The most significant finding in these responses appears to be the large number (50%) of students engaged in scholarly activity, do so in an off-campus setting through internship programs.

Incentive to participate in summer scholarly activity

As stated above, 199 of the 302 respondents are interested in engaging in scholarly activity while at Le Moyne. When asked about what students would require to participate in scholarly activity over the summer the largest percentage and number of students (146 of 292 respondents or 84.3%) indicated that they would require course credit. 116 students (116 of 290 respondents or 74.5% of respondents) indicated that they would require a stipend of some sort, while the fewest number (168 of 287) and smallest percentage (58.5% of respondents) indicated a need for summer housing. Although the numbers indicate that course credit, at minimum, is required for students

to participate in summer scholarly activity, the few written responses (13 total) emphasize the need for financial aid or a stipend being the primary requirement.

Awareness of scholarly activity opportunities

Students were asked how aware they were of opportunities to participate in scholarly activity outside of their course requirements. The numbers indicate that 71.4% of the student respondents indicate that they are aware of these opportunities, although only 42.5% indicated that they are aware of financial support available to them to do so. However, when given the opportunity to provide “any comments or suggestions you believe may be helpful regarding student scholarly activity at Le Moyne,” the majority of those open-ended responses indicate that a better job needed to be done in advertising these opportunities. Forty-three students offered additional comments and of those, twenty-six (60.5%) indicated that Le Moyne needed to do a better job in making students aware of these opportunities. Several transfer students indicated that they were not made aware of such opportunities or, if they were aware, it was often too late to take advantage of them. Several students wanted the opportunities to be made known to them earlier in their Le Moyne career in order to plan accordingly. A few students indicated that they found their internships on their own. Many other suggestions were major specific (i.e. wishing for more opportunity for foreign language majors or allowing science majors to replace certain requirements with scholarly activity). The most significant pattern in this open-ended section, remains students desire to have the numerous scholarly activity opportunities available at Le Moyne to be made known to them more clearly.

Appendix B – Faculty Survey

Survey

Survey of Le Moyne College Faculty on Student Scholarly Activity

For the purposes of this survey, “scholarly activity” means scholarly work conducted outside the requirements of regular coursework (but possibly including theses, independent research, internships, and so forth.)

This survey is intended to gather information from Le Moyne faculty concerning opinions, policies, practices, and manner and means of institutional support for scholarly activity by Le Moyne students. The ultimate aim is to formulate recommendations to the Provost concerning support for student scholarship at Le Moyne and normalization of compensation for faculty supervising such scholarship. The information you provide will help ensure these recommendations are as reflective of faculty views as possible.

This survey is being distributed both in hardcopy through campus mail, and as an email attachment. Feel free to fill out either version and return **by May 1** either by email to *[contact information here.]* Our goal is to have responses by May 1st, however, recognizing how busy this time of year can be, we will accept responses until May 31st in order to maximize the input that we receive.

Our primary focus is on undergraduate student scholarship, but we also have an interest in scholarship by graduate students in the areas of education, business and management, and health professions. If you mentor graduate student scholarship, you may include consideration of graduate students in your answers as appropriate, but please indicate so explicitly.

For the purposes of this survey, “scholarly activity” by students is intended to include the same kinds of productive scholarly work in which a faculty member in the same discipline might engage. Depending on the discipline, this might include laboratory work, theoretical or computational analysis, field work, archival research, pedagogical research, creative writing, playwriting, musical or theatrical production and performance, and similar activities.

Our focus is on significant scholarly work by students that potentially implies some sort of departmental or institutional support outside of the requirements or demands of ordinary coursework. This work might include independent research; research assistantships; summer research programs; internships; or senior, honors, or other kinds of theses. The nature of the support might include, but is not necessarily limited to, financial resources, faculty time, administrative support, facilities usage, room and/or board, and grants and scholarships.

Research projects or assignments that are components of regular coursework or methods courses should not be considered unless they imply a significant student

and/or faculty commitment outside of standard course requirements and require commitment of resources above and beyond those normally allotted to the course.

No identifying information will be made available to anyone outside the committee. Results will be reported in aggregate only.

The Student Research Task Force offers you in advance our sincerest thanks for your commitment of time and effort in completing this survey.

Kind Regards,
David Craig and Brenda Kirby (co-chairs)

Survey of Le Moyne College Faculty on Student Scholarly Activity
Please return by May 1 if possible

What is your department? _____

What is your academic rank? _____

Are you tenured or in a tenure-line position, or part time? _____

Do you mentor undergraduate student scholarship? _____

Do you mentor graduate student scholarship? _____

According to the definition of student scholarly activity above and regarding our undergraduate curriculum:

1. Please list the contexts in which you have mentored students in scholarly activity for at least one semester in the last three years. (Examples: departmental honors, independent study, research course designations, paid research assistantships, etc.) Indicate how many students and how many semesters for each student. (Count summer research as one semester.)
2. What is the final product of your students' scholarly activity? (Examples: thesis? poster? publication? conference presentation? departmental or integral honors?)
3. How many contact hours per week do you need to spend with each student in order to successfully mentor student scholarship?
4. What are the benefits that students derive from participation in scholarly activities? What are the costs to a student for engaging in scholarly activity?
5. What are the benefits to faculty for mentorship of student scholarly activities? What are the costs to faculty for such mentorship?
6. Do you expect or intend to mentor student scholarship within the next two years? (Why or why not?)
7. Do you believe all or most students should engage in scholarly activity, or only some? Explain.
8. How does your department encourage students to engage in scholarly activity?

9. Being as specific as possible, what sources of support **have** your *students* received for doing scholarly work? (Examples: student research committee grants, grant funded research assistantships, course credit, departmental budget funding, non-monetary support such as Summer housing, etc.) If available, please indicate the level of that support.
10. Being as specific as possible, what forms of support do you believe **should be available/provided by** the College to *students* for scholarly work?
11. Being as specific as possible, what sources of support **have you** received for mentoring student scholarly work? (Examples: reassign time from teaching, credit toward normal course load, stipends, etc.) If available, please indicate the level of that support.
12. Being as specific as possible, what kind or kinds of support do you believe **should be** provided to *faculty* for mentorship of student research?
13. Do you believe such mentorship should be expected of faculty without being counted toward their normal course load? If “yes”, at what level should this activity be expected (*e.g.* how many students per year/semester, how many generated credit hours)?
14. Should faculty fulfilling some standardized level of student scholarly mentorship have an accompanying reduction in regular course load expectations (*e.g.* generation of X number of credit hours counts as a course taught, registration of X number of students in a semester counts as a course taught)?
15. Have expectations regarding mentorship of student research ever been discussed explicitly with you or within your department? If so, was it by a colleague, department chair, or an administrator?
16. Is it your impression that mentorship of student scholarship **is** expected/discouraged of faculty in your department? At Le Moyne College?
17. Do you believe mentorship of student scholarship **should be** expected/discouraged of faculty in your department? At Le Moyne College? Why, or why not?
18. Is it your impression that mentorship of student scholarship **is** counted significantly toward tenure and promotion decisions? If “yes”, in which category or categories (teaching/research/service)? If “no”, do you believe scholarly mentorship counts *against* faculty in such decisions? Please explain your answer.
19. Do you believe that mentorship of student scholarship **should be** counted significantly toward or against tenure and promotion decisions? Why, or why not? If so, in which category or categories (teaching/research/service)?
20. Do you believe the establishment of an office of undergraduate research would be beneficial? If so, what services should such an office provide? If not, please be specific why.

Please add any comments or information that you think may aid in our assessment and development of support for student scholarly activity.

If you mentor graduate student scholarship, are there any issues specific to graduate students that are not mentioned above?

Summary Results – Faculty Surveys

Responses from the general faculty survey totaled 27, coming from 12 departments, including: Biology (3), Chemistry and physics (5), Math (2), ACS (1), Psychology (3), Education (3), History (1), English (2), Religious studies (1), Business (2), Sociology (2), Visual and Performing Arts (1). Of these respondents, 16 (59%) were tenured, 6 (22%) were tenure-track (not tenured), 1 (4%) was part-time, and 4 (15%) did not indicate their status. 30% (8) each were Full or Associate Professors, 27% (7) were Assistant Professors, with 1 each (4%) being visiting, adjunct, or not indicated. Most (85%) indicated that they did mentor student research, with 18% indicating that they mentor graduate research.

Context in which faculty mentored students

The respondents were evenly split between integral/departmental honors and independent research/independent study. A few of the respondents also indicated that mentoring was in the context of internship or course work.

Final product of student scholarly activity

The two most common responses were honors theses and poster/paper presentation at a regional or national conference. A few indicated that students coauthored publications.

The number of contact hours spent with each student per week

These numbers varied *considerably* depending on the student, the context in which the student was working (thesis, independent study, *etc.*), and the stage of the project (*e.g.* literature review, collecting data). All respondents indicated at least 1 contact hour per week and most were 3 or more contact hours per week per student. The majority indicated greater than 3 contact hours per week on a regular basis. Six respondents indicated that they spent more than 7 contact hours per week with their student(s).

The benefits and costs to students involved in scholarly activity

Most respondents indicated that the benefits to students were a deeper level of thinking and knowledge as well as improving critical thinking skills. All respondents stated that scholarly activity gave the students experience that could not be gained in a class room. The *only* cost respondents indicated for students was extra time required for scholarly activity. Four respondents indicated that there was no cost to students.

The benefits and costs to faculty involved in mentoring undergraduate student scholarly activity

All respondents indicated that the greatest benefit is the satisfaction of seeing intellectual growth of student(s) and self. *All respondents indicated that uncompensated time was the biggest cost for mentoring student scholarship.*

Do you expect or intend to mentor student scholarship in the next two years?

The majority of respondents indicated that they intend to mentor student scholarly activity in the next two years. Two indicated that they would not, although one said,

they would if they were asked. Six respondents indicated they would only if asked. These respondents indicated that due to the extensive time commitment and lack of compensation they were hesitant to actively seek out students to mentor.

Should all or just some students engage in scholarly activity?

About one third of the respondents feel that all students should engage in scholarly activity, citing that all students would benefit intellectually. The other two thirds feel that only some students should engage in scholarly activity. The majority of respondents indicating some feeling that scholarly activity should be limited to students interested in research or graduate school due to a limited amount of resources (money, equipment, time, *etc.*).

How do departments encourage students to engage in scholarly activity?

Approximately one third of respondents indicated that majors in their department were required to pursue scholarly activity. One third indicated that their departments actively communicated research opportunities to students via class, emails, seminars, etc. A few respondents indicated that their departments did nothing to promote scholarly activity.

What sources of support have your students received from doing scholarly work?

The majority that indicated their students received research support indicated that support was received through Student Research Committee grants. Some received minor support from their departments. About one third indicated that their students did not receive any support.

Forms of support that should be available/provided to students for scholarly work

While a few felt that the college's support through the undergraduate Student Research Committee is good, the majority of respondents felt that there should be more support for student research, including cost for research-related supplies and travel, summer housing and stipend, and course credit. One respondent said that "funding for software and meeting places would help".

Sources of support faculty received

The majority of the respondents felt that there is no financial or other compensation for mentoring student research.

Kind(s) of support that should be provided to faculty for mentoring student research

Most indicated that there should be course load credit because mentoring students requires significant time and effort. Some also felt that there should be some moderate stipend based on the accumulated credit hours.

Should such mentoring be expected of faculty without being counted toward their normal course load or not?

A clear majority of the respondents felt that mentoring students should not be expected of faculty without being counted toward their normal course load.

Should faculty fulfilling some standardized level of student scholarly mentorship have an accompanying reduction in regular course load expectations or not?

The majority of the respondents felt that faculty who fulfill some standardized level of student scholarly mentorship should have an accompanying reduction in regular course load expectations. A few said no. One suggested that there should be some sort of recognition of discipline and research method differences.

Have expectations regarding mentoring student research ever being discussed explicitly with you or within your department or not?

The responses are almost equally divided in their responses. About half said no, and another half said yes. When the expectations for mentoring student research were explicitly discussed, it was discussed both through chair, colleagues, and in one case during job interview.

Is your impression that mentoring student research is expected/discouraged in your department and at the college?

The majority of the respondents felt that it is encouraged or expected. A few felt that it is neither expected nor discouraged. One felt that it is virtually being discouraged if the Rank and Tenure Committee does not count it in the decision-making.

Should mentoring student research be expected/discouraged of faculty in your department and at the college?

The majority of the respondents felt that it should be expected of faculty. Three of them suggested that, while it should be encouraged, those not doing it should not be penalized.

Is it your impression that mentoring student research is counted significantly toward tenure and promotion decision or not?

About five respondents do not feel that it is counted, but the majority felt that it is counted—varying from being viewed as part of the applicant's portfolio to as part of teaching or as part of service.

Should mentoring student research be counted significantly toward or against tenure and promotion decision or not?

While the majority of the respondents felt that it should be counted, they varied considerably in their views. It is suggested that mentorship should probably be counted as one criterion in the portfolio, either as teaching or as service, or as scholarship if it results in conference presentation or publication. One respondent said "It is possible to have quality teaching while mentoring student research, but unreasonable to impose higher research expectations without any changes in the current structure."

Do you think the establishment of an office of undergraduate research would be beneficial or not?

The responses are widely different. Those saying yes felt that such an office might be useful in finding funding avenues, reducing administrative responsibilities for faculty mentors, or helping those students who could not fit in the existing programs. But the majority of the respondents said no. Their reasons ranged from adding another layer of administration, delegating the supervision to the department level, to further diverting limited resources from supporting existing research projects.

Appendix C – Department Chair Survey

Department Chair Respondents [*]

1. Accounting
2. Anthropology/Criminology/Sociology*
3. Business Administration*
 - Applied Management Analysis
 - Finance*
 - Information Systems
 - Management & Leadership
 - Marketing
4. Biological Sciences*
 - Biochemistry
 - Natural Systems Science
 - Multiple Science
5. Chemistry*
 - Physics*
6. Economics*
7. Education
8. English*
 - Communications
 - Creative Writing
 - Film
 - Irish Literature
9. Foreign Language
 - French
 - Spanish
10. History
11. Mathematics*
 - Computer Science
12. Nursing*
13. Philosophy*
14. Physician Assistant
15. Political Science
16. Psychology*
17. Religious Studies*
18. Visual and Performing Arts*
 - Visual Arts
 - Theatre Arts
 - Music
19. Interdisciplinary Programs
 - Urban Studies
 - Peace and Global Studies
 - Gender and Women's Studies
 - Work and Employment Relations

Survey

Survey of Le Moyne College Department Chairs on Student Scholarly Activity

For the purposes of this survey, “scholarly activity” means scholarly work conducted outside the requirements of regular coursework (but possibly including theses, independent research, internships, and so forth.)

This survey is intended to gather information from Department Chairs about department-specific information to help us evaluate the information that we collect regarding opinions, policies, practices, and manner and means of institutional support for scholarly activity by Le Moyne students. The ultimate aim is to formulate recommendations to the Provost concerning support for student scholarship at Le Moyne and normalization of compensation for faculty supervising such scholarship. The information you provide will help ensure these recommendations are as reflective of faculty views as possible.

Please answer the following questions and return the survey to [return information here]. Our goal is to have as much information as possible **by May 1**, however, recognizing how busy this time of year can be, we will accept responses until May 31st in order to maximize the input that we receive.

For the purposes of this survey, “**scholarly activity**” by students is intended to include the same kinds of productive scholarly work in which a faculty member in the same discipline might engage. Depending on the discipline, this might include laboratory work, theoretical or computational analysis, field work, archival research, pedagogical research, creative writing, playwriting, musical or theatrical production and performance, and similar activities.

Our focus is on significant scholarly work by students that potentially implies some sort of departmental or institutional support outside of the requirements or demands of ordinary coursework. This work might include independent research; research assistantships; summer research programs; internships; or senior, honors, or other kinds of theses. The nature of the support might include, but is not necessarily limited to, financial resources, faculty time, administrative support, facilities usage, room and/or board, and grants and scholarships.

Research projects or assignments that are components of regular coursework or methods courses should not be considered unless they imply a significant student and/or faculty commitment outside of standard course requirements and require commitment of resources above and beyond those normally allotted to the course.

No identifying information will be made available to anyone outside the committee. Results will be reported in aggregate only.

The Student Research Task Force offers you in advance our sincerest thanks for your commitment of time and effort in completing this survey.

Kind Regards,
David Craig and Brenda Kirby (co-chairs)

Survey of Le Moyne College Department Chairs on Student Scholarly Activity

- 1) What department do you chair? _____
- 2) How many full time tenure track faculty are in your department? _____
 - a) How many mentor student scholarly activity? _____
- 3) How many full time non-tenure track faculty are in your department? _____
 - a) How many mentor student scholarly activity? _____
- 4) How many part time faculty are in your department? _____
 - a) How many mentor student scholarly activity? _____
- 5) We are interested in the number of students served by your department. If you have multiple programs within your department (Ex. Anthropology and Criminology and Sociology), please describe the following for each program:
 - a) The number of majors in _____ is _____.
 - b) The number of minors in _____ is _____.
- 6) According to the definition of student scholarly activity above and regarding our undergraduate curriculum:
- 7) Does your department require student scholarly activity as part of graduation requirements?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 8) Do students in your department have the option of earning departmental honors by completing scholarly projects?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|

 If yes, how many students do so in the average academic year? _____
 Are there formal policies regarding departmental honors that would be accessible to the Student Research Task Force?

| | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
- 9) Do students completing scholarly work do so largely independently or does it require significant assistance from a faculty member? What is the nature of assistance if it is required?
- 10) Does your department have a course designation(s) for student scholarly activity? If so, please describe (Ex. PSY 499).
- 11) Does your department provide any support out of your departmental budget to students completing student scholarly activity? If yes, what form does the support take?
- 12) What policies exist in your department regarding compensation for faculty mentors of student scholarly activity?
- 13) Have expectations regarding mentorship of student research ever been discussed explicitly with you or within your department?
- 14) Please add any comments or information that you think may aid in our assessment and development of support for student scholarly activity.
- 15) If you chair a department with graduate students, please describe the number of students in each graduate program and please add information on any issues specific to the graduate program that is not adequately mentioned above.

Summary Results – Department Chair Surveys

The surveys distributed to Department Chairs and Program Directors were principally intended to gather information concerning existing policies and practice concerning student scholarly activity at Le Moyne. Twelve department chairs and two program directors responded: Anthropology, Criminology, and Sociology (ACS), Biological Sciences, Business Administration, Chemistry and Physics, Economics, English, Finance, Mathematics, Nursing, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Religion, and Visual and Performing Arts (VPA). This sample represents the majority of departments and programs at Le Moyne with the exception of some large and important humanities programs such as Education and History. It also leaves out Le Moyne's graduate programs entirely, with the notable exception of Nursing.

The results of the survey were instructive. *Every* department or program responding indicated some level of student scholarly activity took place in the program, with most indicating that essentially all program tenure-line faculty participated as mentors to some degree. However, only Finance, English, and VPA indicated that non-tenure-line faculty (full or part time) mentored student scholarship at any level.

Of the respondents, only Mathematics, Physics, and VPA *require* scholarly activity for graduation. Most of the remaining programs, however, have departmental honors involving some kind of scholarly activity. Most of the responding programs (but not all) indicated that there were existing course designation(s) for student scholarly activity. Programs were evenly split between those which provide any kind of support for student research projects from program budgets, and those which do not. (All those indicating that they did emphasized that this support was very limited in scope.)

Programs were evenly split between those indicating that mentorship of student scholarly activity was *expected* of program faculty, and those in which it is not. All respondents indicated that the level of faculty commitment required to mentor student scholarly activity varied considerably both with the student, and with the nature of the project. Finance, VPA, and the responding science programs were the most adamant that such faculty mentorship generally implied significant commitments of faculty time and energy to lead to successful outcomes.

Only one of the responding programs (Psychology) indicated that it had any policies concerning compensation for faculty mentors of student scholarship, with some expressing skepticism that fair compensation could be established without compromising their ability to staff their courses. (Indeed, while Psychology does have a compensation policy – 30 credit hours of mentored research projects equaling one course taught – that policy has historically not been possible to uniformly implement for just this reason.) Economics indicated that it considered faculty mentorship as part of regular teaching and service responsibilities.

The final section of the survey was an open-ended opportunity to add further comments or information the Department Chair or Program Director believed would be helpful. It is striking that *every program responding to this question save one* (Economics) used

the opportunity to emphasize the importance of some form of compensation for faculty mentoring student research. Many also emphasized the overall importance of such activity to student scholarly life.

Appendix D – Focus Groups

Summary Results – Focus Groups

We held two focus group meetings in April of 2008 attended by 17 invited faculty members. All 29 faculty who had mentored a student applying for research funding via the Student Research Committee or a student presenter at the Scholars Day event in the past two years were invited. Specific topics that we planned to explore included:

- ◆ Access to support for students
- ◆ Access to support for research mentorship – how should it ‘count’ in our regular work load – what mode of compensation should exist for the work
- ◆ How research mentorship should ‘count’ for tenure/promotion consideration
- ◆ Attitudes toward an Office of Undergraduate Research

However, most time was spent on issues of how the work should count, both for compensation and for tenure/promotion.

Access to support for students and mentors

The most commonly identified need for student support was for support of summer research needs, including the need for housing, along with faculty and equipment access. They also noted that when there was a need for other financial support for research expense that the schedule for distribution currently accessible via the Student Research Committee occurs within the parameters of the academic year, with budget closed at the end of the fiscal year – leaving a gap for summer need.

There was a clear perception that there was inadequate support for the faculty mentor side of the equation. Specifically, there may be a need for equipment that is not fundable through the Student Research Committee due to real limits in that funding. There may also be need for financial support to accompany students as they present their research and it was clear that faculty did not think it appropriate to count the travel required for that mentoring work as the travel to which they are entitled to present their own work. There was strong sentiment that doing this work equated to making a ‘time-donation’ at the expense of doing the faculty members’ own scholarly work, and that there should be a system of release time to compensate faculty who have students completing scholarly work that requires significant time contributions (and depending on that need for time commitment) from the faculty member. In some cases of high time commitment the assignment of course credit was discussed as appropriate. Some felt that compensation should be dependent on expected outcome for the project. As for providing mentorship during the summer, there could be stipends available. There was an assertion from people representing many departments that *the cost* of having no system for this compensation was that it 1) provides a cue for general discounting of the value of the work in the eyes of the institution, 2) that there are many faculty who will not participate, and 3) there are some who ‘burn out’ after initially participating.

How research mentorship should 'count' for tenure/promotion consideration

There was clear agreement that mentoring of student scholarship should count some way in the evaluations of the Rank and Tenure Committee when people were applying for tenure and/or promotion. One assertion was that since it seems 'easy to amass service' that this work should count as teaching and/or scholarship rather than as service. There was strong support for using this work as teaching evidence, and that it was indeed very intensive teaching, both in terms of time and effort. However, many mentioned that doing this mentoring work does not contribute to the faculty members' research (contrary to the beliefs of many), and that it, in fact, slows the progress of the research program being worked on by the faculty member. Therefore, the negative impact on the faculty scholarship productivity is a negative incentive to do this work in the absence of some compensatory system. There was clear support for the idea that collaboratively done conference presentations and co-authored scholarly publication should be counted as scholarship, *without any discounting* of that work due to the fact that a student was a co-author. Another key issue is to be sure that the 'multiple-author' nature of this work does not cause a discounting of its value, and this seemed to be a problem relevant to all multiply-authored scholarship. It was also noted that while the administrators at the institution seem to indicate that the work is important, the absence of a link in promotion and tenure consideration belied that indication.

Attitudes toward an Office of Undergraduate Research

While no one had a lot to say about the possibility of establishing an Office of Undergraduate Research, what was said was generally negative. There is a perception that it would only add another layer of bureaucracy or administration. There seemed to be a distrust of the idea of oversight rather than an expectation that this office could enhance the efforts of this already active group. There was also some question in the minds of attendees regarding what this office would or could actually do for faculty or student scholars.

Other Issues

Some of the above discussion was couched in terms of the level of encouragement and/or pressure to participate in faculty mentoring of student scholarship. The understanding of expectations for that activity varied greatly, from those who believed that they didn't need to worry about it at all, with an understanding of that as standard, to those believing that there was an explicit expectation, a requirement, that they be involved. Some of that difference seemed to be discipline-specific, some due to time-of-hire, with newer faculty having been told to expect to participate.

Appendix E – Administrator Interviews

Summary Results – Administrator Interviews

Several issues emerged as important during interviews with people holding several administrative positions, including: Integral Honors Director, Vice President of Student Development, grants officer/institutional advancement team member, directors of Faculty Development, Student Learning Assessment, Peace and Global Studies, and the project leader from the Contemporary Catholic Trends project.

Faculty Compensation

The manner in which student research mentors are compensated was addressed by many of the interviewees. Compensation refers to both practical compensation such as with time or money, but also to how the work will be credited in evaluations for promotion and tenure.

The directors of faculty development and student learning assessment each indicated that especially in the case where there was a national conference presentation or a publication the work should count as scholarship on the part of the faculty member. The observation was made that publications of that type should carry *more* weight than single-authored publications due to the intensive additional time and effort necessary on the part of the faculty member to get the work completed when a co-author is a student. Also acknowledged was that much of the intellectual investment of student/faculty collaborative scholarly activity comes from the faculty member. In cases where the end product was not a conference presentation or publication, the consensus was that it should count toward the teaching criterion for promotion and tenure.

Comments regarding other compensation for the faculty members focused on a need to identify what type of scholarly product particular disciplines expected as fulfilling normative expectations for scholarly contributions, and then to be sure that the faculty member would have the mentoring work valued in such a way as to make it worth the investment of their time and the expense of that time loss to other service and scholarly pursuits. This includes consideration of summer activities. In some cases, the interviewees clearly recommended that course reassign time was appropriate depending on the time investment required for the mentoring work and also that a financial incentive was appropriate. The point was made that if the institution truly values and expects these activities, there would be a reward system in place to demonstrate that value, and that faculty will note when it is absent and discontinue the investment.

Student Support

One consistent topic was that of availability of support for summer scholarly work. That which must occur on campus with faculty collaboration also requires access to housing, board, and research facilities (along with access to the faculty mentor). The Vice President of Student Development indicated that should requests for especially room, but also perhaps for board were made with enough notice, that there would be strong

support from that office to facilitate summer student research *if* there was some sort of standard institutionalization of the practice and process.

Availability of research expense support was also important. While the contributions of the Student Research Committee grants were acknowledged, in some cases it was seen as insufficient, and in some cases interviewees seemed to be *unaware that it existed* as a resource for these activities. Some of their suggestions for improvement included the addition of a special funding opportunity for Integral Honors students; access to summer support for students, to include stipends, housing and board; help to access outside granting opportunities, and an increase in recognition for completing scholarly activities.

With regard to granting opportunities, it was suggested that there should be assigned, dedicated search time by those working on granting opportunities to focus specifically on grants related to faculty/student collaborative work so that we could more effectively identify both resource eligibility and identify opportunities that would be viable for our institution.

An additional suggestion was to set up an endowed research support fund that would be separate from other financial aid consideration. The fund would provide a grant or grants that would be competitive (possible managed through the Student Research Committee) and available to students to cover expenses related to scholarly activities &/or to provide a stipend in their junior and/or senior years. This idea could contribute to the above-mentioned additional recognition as it could provide one or more students with a more prestigious public acknowledgement of their work and with an enhanced level of support that may not be accessible via the normal granting process as it currently exists in the Student Research Committee.

Publicity/Marketing

In some ways, the work that we already do in faculty mentored student scholarly activities is one of our best kept secrets. From an Institutional Advancement perspective, one clear way to institutionalize this work and gain support, both emotional and financial, is to better share the information about activities that are happening here. There was some assertion that individual alum donors are inclined to prefer to support scholarships for students. That desire to directly support students may be encouraged to be targeted in a slightly different direction, to support research grants for students pursuing scholarly engagement. Gaining that support must be preceded by publicity for the scholarly activities already occurring. A suggestion was made that there should be at a minimum a story highlighting Scholars Day in the Le Moyne Magazine every spring. Additionally, there could be a 'spotlight on the student (or student/faculty team) researcher' in the magazine at other times or as a regular feature in the online 'magazine'. An appeal for support for a fund student research could be timed for a post-Scholars Day story.

Appendix F – Peer Institution Survey

Survey

Le Moyne College Survey of Peer Institutions on Student Scholarly Activity

This survey is intended to gather information about policies, practices, and manner and means of institutional support for scholarly activity by students. Our primary focus is on undergraduate student scholarship, but we also have an interest in scholarship by graduate students in the areas of education, business and management, and health professions.

For the purposes of this survey, “scholarly activity” by students is intended to include the same kinds of productive scholarly work in which a faculty member in the same discipline might engage. Depending on the discipline, this might include laboratory work, theoretical or computational analysis, field work, archival research, pedagogical research, creative writing, playwriting, musical or theatrical production and performance, and similar activities.

Our focus is on significant scholarly work by students that potentially implies some sort of departmental or institutional support outside of the requirements or demands of ordinary coursework. This work might include independent research; research assistantships; summer research programs; internships; or senior, honors, or other kinds of theses. The nature of the support might include, but is not necessarily limited to, financial resources, faculty time, administrative support, facilities usage, room and/or board, and grants and scholarships.

Research projects or assignments that are components of regular coursework or methods courses should not be considered unless they imply a significant student and/or faculty commitment outside of standard course requirements and require commitment of resources above and beyond those normally allotted to the course.

A brief cumulative summary of responses will be shared with responding institutions. (Though this summary will avoid identifying institutional characteristics, you may opt out of inclusion in this summary if you wish.)

When complete, please return this survey to [return information here.]

The Le Moyne College Student Research Task Force offers you in advance our sincerest thanks for your commitment of time and effort in completing this survey.

Kind Regards,
David Craig and Brenda Kirby (co-chairs)

According to the definition of student scholarly activity above and regarding your undergraduate curriculum:

1. How does your institution view the role and relative importance of student participation in scholarly activity in relation to other student scholastic activities and your overall educational mission? What are the benefits that students derive from participation in scholarly activities?
2. In each of the following categories, what is the percentage of undergraduate students who engage in at least one full semester of scholarly activity by the time they graduate?
 - _____ a. Social Science
 - _____ b. Natural Science
 - _____ c. Humanities
 - _____ d. Business and Professional Programs
 - _____ e. Education
3. What are some of the reasons for differences listed in question 2 (if any)?
4. Being as specific as possible, what are sources of support for undergraduates doing scholarly work? (Examples: grant funded research assistantships, course credit, departmental budget funding, non-monetary support such as Summer housing, *etc.*) Please rank the top three sources, along with the level of that support if available.
5. What are the top three ways that your institution encourages students to become engaged in scholarly activity?
6. Please list the top three contexts in which students engage in scholarly activity in each of the following categories. (Examples: departmental honors, independent study, research course designations, paid research assistantships, *etc.*)
 - a. Social Science
 - b. Natural Science
 - c. Humanities
 - d. Business and Professional Programs
 - e. Education
7. What proportion of your full-time faculty mentor student scholarly activity? Is such mentorship explicitly expected of faculty in addition to their normal course load?
8. Being as specific as possible, what forms of direct support are available for faculty who mentor student scholarly work? (Examples: reassign time from teaching, credit toward normal course load, stipends, *etc.*) Please rank the top three sources, along with the level of that support if available.

9. Does faculty mentorship of student scholarly activity count toward tenure and promotion? If so, is there a distinction between promotion to associate as compared to full professor? Is scholarly mentorship formally included as counting for teaching, service, and/or scholarship?
10. Do you have an office of undergraduate research or other institutional mechanism(s) to support student scholarly activity? If available, at what level is that office supported?
11. If your institution awards masters degrees in business, education, and/or health sciences, please respond to questions 2, 4, and 10 for those programs.
12. Please add any comments or information that you think may aid in our assessment and development of support for student scholarly activity.

Summary Results – Peer Institution Surveys

The Task Force requested that the Le Moyne College Survey of Peer Institutions on Student Scholarly Activity be sent to 27 other Jesuit institutions in addition to a select few other institutions. Six institutions – Creighton University, Fordham University, SUNY Fredonia, Loyola Marymount University, Santa Clara University, and St. Louis University (all Jesuit save Fredonia) – returned their surveys.

Jesuit Institutions:

Boston College
Canisius College
College of the Holy Cross
Creighton University
Fairfield University
Fordham University
Georgetown University
Gonzaga University
John Carroll University
Le Moyne College
Loyola College Maryland
Loyola Marymount University
Loyola University Chicago
Loyola University New Orleans
Marquette University
Regis University
Rockhurst University
Saint Joseph's University
Saint Louis University
Saint Peter's College
Santa Clara University
Seattle University
Spring Hill College
University of Detroit Mercy
University of San Francisco
University of Scranton
Wheeling Jesuit University
Xavier University

Role and relative importance of student participation in scholarly activity

Overall, for all the six respondent schools, institutional commitment to supporting and promoting undergraduate research has grown in the past few years. All respondents pointed out that they encouraged student research, and were focused on expanding opportunities for students to engage in scholarly activity.

Regarding the role and relative importance of student participation in scholarly activity in relation to other student scholastic activities and overall educational mission, all respondents pointed out that student research is a cornerstone of liberal arts education. One institution even called student research “the very essence of higher education.” All institutions strongly agreed that student scholarly activity needs to be encouraged and supported.

As for the benefits that students derive from participation in scholarly activities, four out of the six respondents pointed out that student scholarly activity is an excellent way for students to gain a variety of skills (such as working collaboratively, analytical thinking, understanding the research process, *etc.*). Three respondents specifically argued that scholarly activity helps students learn how to think and work like a scientist. Two respondents pointed out that student scholarly activity is personally and intellectually rewarding, and all respondents agreed that student scholarly activity provides students with excellent preparation for graduate school.

Percentage of Undergraduates engaged in scholarly activity in different areas

Most (4 out of 6) respondents listed Science as the area in which most undergraduates engage in scholarly activity outside the traditional classroom context at their institutions. The percentage of science students engaging in research ranged from 12% to 60%. Social Sciences were a close second with percentages usually around 30%. The percentage in humanities was, in most cases, around 10%. One school pointed out that 100% of their performing arts majors are required to organize a performance outside their regular course load before they graduate.

Difference between areas

Respondent schools were given a chance to explain any differences they found between the number of students engaged in scholarly activity in the different areas reported in the above section. Almost all of the respondents cited as the main difference between areas the fact that sciences, and to a lesser degree social sciences, have a long tradition (and place a greater emphasis on) engaging students in scholarly activities guided by faculty. In addition, most respondents noted that sciences (and sometimes social sciences) receive external grants that allow them to hire research assistants. This makes it easier for students to be part of scholarly activity in the sciences, and, sometimes, in the social sciences. Most schools also noted that humanities have recently also started to develop a tradition of student scholarly activity, although these efforts are only incipient. Regarding the humanities, however, two of the respondents pointed out that humanities faculty are far more accustomed to working alone, and far less likely to receive external funding. One of the two respondents also pointed out that “regrettably,” some faculty are not convinced that students are prepared to engage in scholarly activity

“at the level that would merit presentation or publication.” The respondent also noted that at their institution, this belief is not the norm. Overall, the responses emphasized the differences between the sciences (and to a lesser degree social sciences) and other areas (mostly the humanities), and emphasized the need for support in the latter areas in order to encourage student scholarly activity.

Sources of Support for Undergraduates

All six respondents listed several substantial sources of support for students engaged in scholarly activity. Examples of support provided were: college research grants, summer research grants, conference travel funds specifically addressed to undergraduates, summer fellowships, Dean’s fellowships, Honor’s budget grants, course credit, and summer housing grants. Significantly, all institutions provided at least four substantial sources of funding for student scholarly activity. Many of the research grants included both a student and a faculty grant component that allowed faculty and students to work on the same project with independent budgets suited to their needs. It is also noteworthy that most of the respondent institutions provide student conference travel funds. Three out of the six respondents have specific offices (or institutes) charged with providing research funds for undergraduates engaged in scholarly activity.

Types of encouragement for students to engage in scholarly activity

All respondents mention faculty as one of the most important sources of encouragement and recruitment of students interested in engaging in scholarly activity. Most respondents also emphasize the need for better publicity regarding opportunities for student research in collaboration with faculty. Three respondents point out the important role of the offices charged with supporting student research. Notably, all respondents organize a research fair or a Scholars Day in order to encourage students to present their work. One school argues that student networks have proven to be the most powerful force of encouragement for other students to apply for grants funding independent research. The respondent cites student networks as the number one reason why the number of applications for its institutional summer grants program having doubled this year.

Full time faculty mentors

The surveyed institutions were asked to provide the proportion of their full-time faculty who mentor student scholarly activity. Two of the respondents listed faculty mentors at 50% of the full time faculty. Another respondent estimated that percentage at around 25%, while the fourth respondent placed it at 10%. A couple of the respondents noted that the proportion is much higher in sciences than in other disciplines. One respondent placed faculty mentoring in Sciences at 95% (Social Sciences – 75%).

Peer institutions were asked to provide information about the way they evaluate faculty mentorship of student research when it comes to promotion decisions. A couple of the respondents argued that faculty research in collaboration with students is currently placed, according to the result, in either the research category (if the resulting work is published) or under the teaching category (if the work results in an unpublished work). Surprisingly, three of the respondents place faculty-student research collaboration under the rubric of Service to the institution. One of the three respondents noted that

research with students is a “great indicator of the faculty’s member’s engagement with the college.” Most respondents noted that faculty-student research is rarely funded and it generally does not receive any direct support, nor does it count toward regular course load.

Peer institutions were also asked to talk about whether such mentorship is *explicitly* expected of faculty in addition to their normal course load. Most of the respondents pointed out that mentorship was not *explicitly* expected of faculty. This response seems to reinforce the conclusion that although mentorship was not explicitly expected, it was still informally considered part of a faculty member’s responsibilities. In fact, *two of the responding institutions show that they have recently identified mentorship of student research by a faculty member as an “invisible teaching load.” Both institutions are currently working on a standardized way to include faculty mentorship in the formal teaching load.*

Recognition of mentorship effort towards tenure and promotion

Institutions were asked if mentorship of student research is counted toward tenure and promotion. Two of the six respondent institutions expressed an explicit link between such mentorship and tenure, especially in the Science disciplines; other departments having varied expectations. Another institution linked such mentorship with annual performance appraisal but was unclear about the relationship with tenure decisions. Most indicated that mentorship of students is unofficially taken into account in some way during the process of evaluation for promotion.

Presence of an undergraduate research office

Differing institutional responses are captured in the following list:

1. Unfunded coordinator, with expectation for funding in the future
2. Designated committee with faculty from a variety of disciplines serve the UG research efforts (like our SRC)
3. Office of Student Creative Activity and Research. The director receives a stipend and a one-course release. The office has a budget for supporting student travel.
4. Office of Research Initiatives—Provost’s level.
5. Support comes from \$10,000 allocated from the Arts and Sciences travel budget to defray costs for student travel to academic conferences and the Honors Program, which offers travel stipends to students presenting their research at regional and national conferences.
6. Plans to establish an UG research office with FT Director and regular administrative support (minimum ½ time assignment) by AY 09-10, and has already formed an Advisory Board for UG Research with the goals to
 - Create a database of faculty research specialization and projects
 - Create a database of venue to present or publish research
 - Enhance support for (1) faculty and student conducting research, (2) conference travel for students and mentors (as relevant), (3) summer Research Awards, especially in fields other than Natural Sciences
 - Publish regular newsletter to recognize and publicize student research; distribute to Admissions, Development, etc.

- Explore possibility of exchange programs to bring students to our campus over summer

Additional Comments

Two institutions emphasized the advantage of being a member of The Council of Undergraduate Research (CUR) as a good resource.

Appendix G – Student Research Committee Funding Guidelines

1. Limitation of award amount: The maximum initial award will be \$1000 per fiscal year (Jun 01-May 31) with the possibility of additional funding after last deadline, if money is available, for those projects which were partially supported.
2. Research materials, and travel to research sites will have equal priority with presentation at meetings.
3. Late applications (and those which are not complete or require revision, such as those missing supporting documentation) will be considered with applications at the next deadline.

Approvals may be made pending Institutional Review Board approval, acceptance of paper by conference organizer, *etc.* provided the student has submitted the appropriate documents to the proper authority.

4. Funds will be allocated by priority, according to quality of proposal and completeness of proposal. The committee is interested in funding all students working on research, and will suggest improvements for inadequate proposals. The committee will seek (but not guarantee) additional funds if necessary.
5. Reimbursement for previously purchased materials is not guaranteed, and will have no priority over pending projects.
6. Once per semester students may request reimbursement for miscellaneous expenses less than \$100, subject to the approval of the supervising faculty and Student Research Funding Committee chairperson.
7. Student award history will be considered, in order to support as many different individuals as possible. Students who have not yet received funding will have priority. Accordingly, the student proposals should list prior funding by the Student Research Fund committee.
8. Applicants must submit an electronic copy of their proposal in addition to the paper copies.
9. Reference texts and books are not generally appropriate for funding.
10. Awardees will present their work at the Annual Le Moyne Student Scholar Day as a condition of acceptance of funding.

Approved Spring 2006 by Provost and Academic Vice President John Smarrelli, Jr.

Appendix H – Strategic Planning Concerning Student Research

2006-2010 Strategic Plan and Student Research – Summer 2007 Recommendations

Linda–

Brenda Kirby and I met to discuss the status of the strategic plan as it relates to student research. Of the three principal recommendations from last year, only something like 1/2 of one (the third) has yet been implemented since at least the 9-1-05 revision of the plan (the last one of which I have a copy). Examining previous revisions, the dates in the initial recommendations have been pushed back several times, indicating implementation of this component of the strategic plan has been significantly delayed. After discussion with Brenda, we agreed that the existing recommendations remain appropriate for the present moment, with minor revisions. Thus, this document hews closely to the last.

We appreciate the opportunity to contribute positively to Le Moyne's future, especially in a crucial area such as this.

Regards,
David Craig

[Proposed changes are in italics]

1) Initiative **Section I B 3** has not yet been implemented. We recommend the following revised language:

Section I B 3

During the 2007-2008 academic year, as incentives for student research continue to be enhanced (see Initiative V), support for the faculty mentoring undergraduate and graduate students will be assessed by a task force appointed by the Provost/Academic Vice President. Recommendations for appropriate compensation for faculty research mentors will be provided to the Provost/Academic Vice President by May 2008. The task force will consider support for faculty mentors and students doing research in the summer, and support for graduate student research. The task force will also assess the costs and benefits of establishment of an Office of Undergraduate Research, as specified in Section III A 9, and the scope of responsibilities for such an office should it eventually be established.

2) Initiative **Section III A 9**, assessment of the *potential* for an Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR), has not yet been implemented. We should **change the year to 2007-2008** and *implement* this assessment during the coming year through the task force specified in Section I B 3 (as above). Many of the specific charges of the OUR would require the help of other offices/divisions, so college-wide consensus on the importance of student research will be crucial.

In order to emphasize that the proposed OUR would play primarily a support role, the following paragraph should be added to III A 9 following the first paragraph (ending "... linked by a common enthusiasm for learning"):

The Student Research Committee would retain responsibility for assessing applications for funding and granting awards. The role of the Office of Undergraduate Research would be to promote undergraduate research in other ways, including support for the Student Research Committee, faculty mentors, and undergraduate researchers.

These bullets should be added to section II A 9, the charges of this potential OUR:

- *To provide logistical support for undergraduate research programs.*
- *To develop additional sources of funding for student research, including exploration of possibilities for internal and external scholarships and grants.*

In addition, the "communicate" bullet should be amended to read, "To communicate and celebrate...."

Finally, a logical location for an office of this kind would be in the new Science Center. However, no such space has been allocated and no obvious spaces present themselves in current designs. Another potential location would be in a renovated Coyne. A discussion of this question should be part of the task force's deliberations.

3) **Section V E** is the section on enhancing support for undergraduate research. With updates in the data and the status of the Student Research Committee, the section should be replaced as it appears below:

A. Enhanced Support for Student Research

Continued support and enhancement of student research opportunities, including expanded support for student work with faculty mentors, should be a top priority. To that end, the Student Research Committee, which evaluates applications for funding and awards grants to support student research, was given permanent status as a College committee in 2005-06. With funding for undergraduate student research made available by the Provost/Academic Vice President's Office to date, the numbers of students awarded funds has grown such that 12 students were funded in 2002-03, 14 were funded in 2003-04, 18

were funded in 2004-05, 22 were funded in 2005-06, and 22 were funded in 2006-2007. 2006-2007 awardees came from Biological Sciences, Chemistry, History, Physics, Psychology, and Theater Arts, reflecting the diverse nature of student research. For the 2006 -2007 academic year, the committee budget was \$12,000 and the 22 awardees were allocated a total of \$13,208.50, with an additional \$936 recommended allocation that could not be funded. We recommend that the budget for student projects be increased to \$16,000/year.

Support for student research should be expanded in at least three specific dimensions: (1) additional funding should be made available for graduate student research, with a system for awarding funds similar to that in place for undergraduate research; (2) opportunities for Summer stipends and housing for undergraduates doing Summer research with faculty mentors should become a component of support for student research; and (3) equitable means should be devised to compensate faculty mentors for supervision of student research projects.

Supervision of student research generally involves a significant commitment of energy and time. Currently, compensation for mentoring research varies among departments and programs, from nothing at all to accumulating course load reductions to stipends, emphasizing the need for more equitable policies and procedures. Stipends or other support for faculty mentoring Summer research should be considered. An appropriate emphasis should also be placed on supervision of student research in consideration of promotion and tenure.

These issues should be closely examined by the Task Force recommended for appointment in Section I B 3 and recommendations forwarded to the Provost/AVP for implementation by the 2008-09 academic year.