

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

May 13, 2009
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: L. Coble, D. Cook, N. Clemency, S. K. De Datta, B. Huckle, T. Inzana, R. Kapania, S. Martin, T. Schroeder (for D. Dean), R. Veilleux, B. Vogelaar, P. Young

Members Absent: R. Benson, C. Dawkins, T. Fox, R. Grange, R. Hall, T. Herdman, D. Jones, K. Miller, R. Siegle, P. Zellner

Invited Guests: C. Montgomery, S. Muse

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** A motion to approve the agenda was offered by T. Inzana and seconded by L. Coble and carried.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meeting March 11, 2009:** A motion to approve the minutes was offered by R. Veilleux and seconded by D. Cook and carried.

3. Review of policies 13005 Interdisciplinary Research Centers and 3020 Centers Financial Procedures:

B. Huckle reported to the CoR that he had spoken with Jane Wemhoener, a member of the Commission on Outreach and International Affairs (COIA), regarding the subcommittee that the CoR established to review these policies. B. Huckle requested that COIA identify a member who would be interested in and make a valuable contribution to the issues to be addressed by the subcommittee. The subcommittee would address issues such as the outreach component of a university center and how this is reflected during the review process, and clarification on what is expected in regard to research at university center or university institute. It was later reported that Jeri Childers and Max Stephenson from COIA volunteered to work on the subcommittee.

B. Huckle also reported that the COIA are currently drafting a document that defines scholarship in outreach, including the planning, performance and evaluation of outreach. T. Inzana added that the outreach component is one aspect of what the subcommittee needs to review.

T. Inzana stated that this would more than likely come up during the review of centers and therefore he would like to have it addressed. B. Huckle suggested that it would be best if the subcommittee could make some progress towards reviewing these policies over the summer.

4. Letter from CoR in support of allocation of resources to University Libraries:

B. Huckle reported to the CoR that there was an announcement made in March that the libraries budget had been increased next year rather than decreased. As discussed in prior meetings, B. Huckle circulated a drafted a letter on behalf of the CoR regarding this issue. He requested that all changes or comments be sent to him via

email and that he would incorporate them and circulate the final draft for a vote before sending.

P. Young proposed that an informational white paper be developed on the serials crisis. He explained that the increasing annual rates of serials subscriptions are 7-10% higher than the inflation rate. P. Young also explained that Open access movement has made an impact and has resulted in various universities passing resolutions with recommendations and some times even mandates that their faculty submit their publications to Open access repositories on-line.

P. Young explained that the idea behind the white paper would be to summarize our current research, the situation with serials, and the Open access movements going on at various universities. P. Young explained that he would be working on this with help from the Library Faculty Association. B. Huckle stated that he felt that this would be very beneficial to CoR members. S. Martin agreed that this would also be very well received by the Faculty Senate. P. Young stated that he plans to develop the white paper over the summer and distribute it to the CoR when they meet in the Fall.

5. Yale/Duke Settlement:

T. Inzana gave an update to the CoR on the Yale and Duke Lawsuits from NSF on issues related to misappropriation of funds. He explained that the two primary issues were that: 1. Investigators charging their time 100% on a grant and not spending 100% of their time on it- particularly during the summer; and 2. Funds being spent in areas not related to the grant, particularly near the ending of the grant to use up the funds before the grant expires.

T. Inzana explained that the first issue in regards to salary is more problematic because it involves changing how all research universities operate. He explained that a committee has been formed to address this and that Pat Hyer has been contributing her efforts towards this as well. The committee is trying to address ways in which no faculty member has 100% of their time on a grant at any given time, such as the average 9-month faculty member whom funds their summer salaries through grant(s). Instead of applying all of grant funds for salary to the summer, the funds would be distributed by the department over the entire year, and the department would provide a portion of the funds over the summer. S. Muse added that another option that they are looking in to is continuing the every two week pay cycle for summer salaries rather than breaking it down in to two lump sum payments.

T. Inzana explained that Policy 6200 addresses this concern for about 80 faculty. T. Inzana also pointed out that an important component of this is faculty education. T. Inzana stated that changes would not go in to effect practically until 2010.

T. Inzana also reported to the CoR on the status of the Research Incentive Plan. There was concern that a salary supplement for researchers would not get through governance because of the concern by some that it would generate a greater diversity of income between those able to put salaries on grants and those who cannot. T. Inzana explained that the policy is going through further revisions and that possibly a

pool of funds would be generated may come from the additional fringe benefit funds that would be generated due to the growth of faculty salaries recovered on projects. Such funds would be distributed to Departments to distribute as they wish. However as T. Inzana explained, this option needs to be looked into further simply because some of the colleges would generate most of the funds, and would basically be giving some of those funds to other colleges that wouldn't be generating as much.

R. Kapania stated that he felt that the Research Incentive Plan will drive the Indirects up thus driving the costs up for the sponsors. He also feels that the plan is taking too much from the departments when the university keeps the fringe savings and thus hurts the value of this plan. T. Inzana explained that it will vary from department to department and college to college, and that the plan was adjusted so that there was no cut in what goes in to the department. T. Inzana explained that the funds are generated from excess fringe benefits generated from additional salary savings on grants, not indirect savings.

T. Inzana stated that the plan is currently going under drastic revisions and he did not have a timeline on when it would be finalized.

6. Selection of CoR Chair 2009-2010:

L. Coble nominated B. Huckle as the chair for the Commission on Research for 09-10 and it was seconded by T. Inzana. Since there were no other nominations, B. Huckle was elected as chair.

7. Meeting adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:49pm.