

RESEARCH COORDINATING COUNCIL
Memorandum #168

March 23, 2006

Members Present:

Brian Attebery	Jim Bigelow	Phil Blick
Steve Byers	Chris Daniels	Kay Flowers
Larry Ford	Christina Rosen Galvin	Dianne Horrocks
Lori Johnson	Scot Kelchner	Catherine Kriloff
Fred Risinger	Beverly Ray	Susan Swetnam
Keith Weber		

Alternates: Cyndy Kelchner for Beth Hudnall Stamm

Absent: John Bennion, Trent Clegg, Linda Deck, Deb Easterly, Frank Harmon, Richard Inouye, Skip Lohse, Mike McCurry, Subbaram Naidu, Al Strickland, Paul Zelus

Dr. Ford declared that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order.

I. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Ford asked for any changes or corrections to the minutes. Dr. Ford requested a motion to approve the minutes. James Bigelow moved to accept the minutes, Dianne Horrocks seconded the motion. Motion passed (Memorandum #167).

II. Reports

- A. Faculty Research Committee (FRC) – Susan Swetnam reported 10 nominees were considered for Distinguished Researcher with five finalists being selected. The finalist will be honored at a banquet March 29th. They are David Adler, Tom Gesell, Nancy Huntly, Herbert Maschner and Jonathan Westphal. The Distinguished Researcher is to be named by Friday, March 31, 2006. Spring proposals are due on April 7, 2006.
- B. Graduate Student Research and Scholarship Committee (GSRSC) – Carole Gull reported that proposals were due on Wednesday, March 22nd. Approximately fifteen proposals were received – 3 dissemination and 12 research proposals. ASISU scholarship recommendations were made to the scholarship office a few weeks ago. The number of ASISU Scholarship applications was up significantly from past semesters.
- C. Undergraduate Student Research Committee (UgRC) – Fred Risinger reported that spring proposals are due tomorrow, Friday, March 24th. Symposium abstracts are due on April 4th. The symposium will be held April 13th and 14th. On April 13th starting at 4:00 pm Dr. Chris Daniels will be speaking with a poster session to follow

thereafter. The venue will take place in the College of Education Auditorium and outer foyer. Dr. Ford suggested that UgRC consider the Stephens Performing Arts Center for the venue next year.

- D. Humanities/Social Science Research Committee (HSSRC) – Dr. Ford reported that Greg Green led the committee in reviewing proposals. The committee disqualified one proposal for not following the guidelines. Four proposals were fully funded and one proposal was partially funded. Three proposals were not awarded due to the lack of funds, but were good proposals. Dr. Ford felt that the committee’s assessment and awarding of the proposals was good. Dr. Ford reported that the HSSRC travel funds for the year have been exhausted. There were many good travel requests submitted with several of them being invitations. The HSSRC committee voted unanimously that Dr. Ford request that the budget for next year be restored to previous levels before budget cuts were made several years ago.
- E. Federal Initiatives – Dr. Ford reported he and Dr. Wharton went to DC to meet with delegation staffers. It will be a tough year once again, especially with the demands from Hurricane Katrina, the war, and the pressure of doing something about lobbyist and earmarks, but the delegation still recognizes worthy projects.

III. Council Business

- A. Responsible Conduct of Research – brown bag lunches – Dr. Ford reported that the Office of Research will be sponsoring two noon discussions. A discussion on Plagiarism will be held at noon on Tuesday, April 4, 2006 in the Portneuf Room of the SUB and a discussion on Data Management will be held at noon on Thursday, April 13, 2006 in Room 162 of the Pharmacy Building.
- B. Hiring Research Associates Policy – Dr. Ford reported that earlier today he met with the Faculty and Professional Policies Council about concerns the Faculty Senate has with the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Research Faculty that this council passed a year or so ago. Cyndy Kelchner brought to Dr. Ford’s attention the time and rank provision for promotion from associate to full professor of 5 years. In the Faculty Staff Handbook the criteria is 7 years total experience (e.g., 5 years from Assistant to Associate, plus 2 years from Associate to Full). Dr. Ford contacted the secretary of the Dean of Arts and Sciences and both Dr. Ford and the secretary found that 7 years has never been the case, it has always been five years in rank for consideration. The College of Engineering is also 5 years. The College of Business and the College of Pharmacy operate under the Faculty Staff Handbook of 7 years.

The Faculty and Professional Policies Council is going to recommend to the Faculty Senate that the various colleges establish their own procedures for promotion and/or tenure of research faculty that are similar to what is used for regular faculty, realizing that the distribution of effort for research faculty is different, but that it involves a procedure involving peer evaluations, etc.

How this impinges on the Hiring Research Associates Policy is that one of the people present at the Professional Policies Council was Dean Hatzenbuehler and in her opinion, the Chief Research Officer should not have a say in either general evaluations or evaluation for promotion and/or tenure. Dean Hatzenbuehler feels that if the faculty member is hired with funds not coming through Office of Research, then it should be a college issue. Her parallel case was that the Graduate Dean does not have a say in promotion, evaluation, etc. of graduate faculty.

The Hiring Research Associates Policy has been used in the past to make sure that people are treated fairly. That is no longer a factor because there is a minimum salary for non-classified positions -- University policy is a minimum of \$32,000/year but federal law is \$24,000/year.

Should we recommend a change of the Hiring Research Associates Policy or rescind the policy?

Dr. Ford asked if any voting member of the committee was willing to make a motion to declare the Hiring Research Associates Policy no longer effective. Jim Bigelow made the motion and Christina Rosen Galvin seconded the motion. The committee voted 8 Y – 0 N and 1 abstention.

Dr. Ford reported that currently he is required to sign off on all Graduate Research Assistant offer letters and PR forms, even if they are not funded through Office of Research funds. Is this appropriate? The Office of Research does checks and balances of the PR forms. It would mean that each department would be responsible for entering the PR form information in the HP1 Administrative System. The committee agreed to leave this alone for a while.

- C. Administration of Internal Grants Program – Dr. Ford reported that he is not entirely sure what this is about since Deb Easterly was scheduled to speak on this matter and she was unable to attend. Dr. Ford reported that he thinks this discussion stems from some problems we have had recently with internal grants where the PI applied for internal funds on the basis of receiving matching funds. When the matching funds were not awarded the PI decided to go ahead and spend the money on something else without our knowledge. We are attempting to have this reversed and the money returned to the appropriate internal grant committee. Essentially, if you are not using the funds for what you stated the money would be used for, the funds should be returned to the committee to reallocate. Is this acceptable? The RCC agreed that if there are no funds matched then the money should be returned.
- D. RTSEF proposals are due Monday, April 3, 2006 – Dr. Ford reported that RTSEF in previous years was administered by the Office of Academic Affairs. Dr. Wharton has turned this over to the Office of Research. Last year we had five requests and were able to fund all five. If we can fully fund all the proposals we receive we will review them to see if all are worthy of being awarded. If the committee has more requests than funds, we will rate the proposals. The budget for FY2007 is a little over \$30,000.

- E. URC proposals are due Friday, March 31, 2006 – Dr. Ford reported that the URC has a little over \$86,000 to award this year.

Another Issue Not on the Agenda

Administration has asked for budget proposals for next year. Dr. Ford reported that he has not met with his people yet, but his initial thoughts are that he will ask for one of two possibilities for the Office of Research:

Ask for Office of Research accounts to be restored to the original levels before the budget cuts occurred several years ago.

The other possibility concerns the issue of indirect costs distribution. Currently indirect costs are distributed as follows:

45% Central Administration
2% Library
53% to the generating units

As an alternative, the Office of Research would ask that indirect costs be distributed as follows:

30% Central Administration
15% Office of Research
5% Library
50% to the generating units

Meeting adjourned ~3: 50 p.m.

Approved by RCC: April 20, 2006; Approved by FS: May 1, 2006