

**Present:** Jack Fletcher, Alessandro Carrera, Wynne Chin, Stuart Dryer, Randy Lee, Stuart Long, Jay Neal, Clayton Neighbors, Ezemenari Obasi, Christie Peters, Gregg Roman, Gangbing Song, Luis Torres, Patrick Bordnick, Jonathan Snow, Manos Papadakis, Rathindra Bose, Mark Clarke, Mary Ann Ottinger, Cris Milligan, Brooke Gowl, Courtney Donica, Ashley Merwin, Rozlyn Reep

**Absent:** George Zouridakis, Richard Bond, Alan Burns, Allan Jacobson, Gregory Marinic, Robert Palmer, Shin-Shem Steven Pei, Pradeep Sharma, Michael Zvolensky

Welcome by the Chair: Chair Dr. Fletcher welcomed everyone to the meeting and called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. He informed the committee they have four more meetings this year including the Retreat.

Approval of December Minutes: Dr. Fletcher asked the committee if they had any edits or changes to the minutes. They were distributed electronically a week prior to the meeting so members had time to review. Dr. Long made a motion to approve. Dr. Roman seconded. The minutes were approved.

Status Update by VC/VP Dr. Bose: Dr. Bose gave the following update:

- Dr. Bose welcomed everyone back from the holiday break and stated that he is looking forward to working with everyone this year.
- The implementation of A-81 by the December 26<sup>th</sup> deadline went well. The only item needed is to define the institutional base salary, which is in the purview of the Office of the Provost. DOR has reviewed some best practices for a definition and has provided the information to the Provost's Office.
- Two information items Dr. Fletcher requested from Dr. Bose: IDC information and core facilities updated funding. For 2014, DOR committed \$3.5M for core facilities, distributed across the University. This includes \$700K for DOR facilities (i.e., NMR, etc.). The entire list is available if anyone is interested. He provided examples of the nanofabrication lab and the NMR in chemistry.
- Dr. Fletcher clarified that these are items under \$400K. Dr. Bose stated that there was one exception over \$500K in the nanofabrication area.
- Dr. Fletcher stated that an email had been sent out about Dr. Clarke taking a new position and asked Dr. Bose to comment.
- Dr. Bose stated that the job Dr. Clarke is taking is a rewarding job, and it would be unfair to ask him to continue his current operations in DOR. He is very pleased for Dr. Clarke. Dr. Clarke has faculty and research connections, so this is a win-win for everyone. Dr. Clarke is the PI on an iCorps center proposal, so it would be up to him whether he would like to designate it to

someone else. When Dr. Bose spoke with Dr. Short about exploring the possibility of hiring Dr. Clarke, he mentioned to her that he worked hard to put Dr. Clarke on the CICEP committee (this is an APLU standing committee) and would like for Dr. Clarke to continue membership on that committee and the Provost agreed. She also indicated that anytime DOR needs Dr. Clarke's help, he will be available. For DOR, Dr. Bose is talking with people to make an interim appointment for 1 year. He also negotiated with someone in the College of Business to be half time at DOR to market IP. This individual also has the skill for raising funds. If this individual comes on board, they will be able to help with some contractual items.

- Dr. Clarke thanked Dr. Bose for his kind comments. He also thanked him for his guidance – Dr. Bose spent a lot of time mentoring him. He said Dr. Bose is very innovative and has a positive reputation for commercialization. Dr. Clarke was thankful for the opportunity to work in DOR.

#### Subcommittee Reports:

**Small Grants/New Faculty:** Dr. Obasi told the committee he received a recent request from someone who had received a Small Grant award. The question related to having to change the research project because the proposed project would not be possible.

Dr. Dryer stated that usually when you write a grant the funding is specifically for the proposed project. As such, Dr. Fletcher asked if there was any reason not to fund the next person on the list. The committee agreed.

**Excellence in Research:** Nominations are due Friday, February 6<sup>th</sup>.

**GEAR:** Dr. Fletcher told the committee they may recall a discussion 3 years ago about whether or not GEAR should be discontinued. The question is whether GEAR funding has achieved its goal of enhancing external funding. The subcommittee will consider this question using data provided by DOR.

Dr. Lee said one issue that's problematic for his college is that they're given two weeks to review pre-proposals and they would like to have more time. Dr. Roman suggested 3 weeks and Dr. Lee said it was a good suggestion for next year's competition.

**Centers & Institutes:** There was no report from the subcommittee; however, Dr. Lee brought up an issue. He's chairing the committee on Academic Centers and Institutes. Centers and Institutes that are not under DOR are under this committee. They're asking every center on their list to reapply so they have more information.

Dr. Fletcher said the RSC Centers and Institutes Subcommittee revised the annual review form, which is now used by the DOR University-wide Centers. Dr. Lee said that one thing that was missing was organizational structure. Dr. Ottinger said it was part of last year's review. Dr. Lee requested that both committees use the same timeline for submissions and reviews. Dr. Ottinger said her office was getting ready to send out letters to College/Department Centers "reminding" them to forward their annual reports. According to Dr. Lee, reports were due January 15<sup>th</sup>. It was decided that Dr. Ottinger will coordinate with Dr. Lee on this effort.

Dr. Bordnick told the committee a letter was sent out from the Dean of his college saying the annual report was due (it was an academic center). Dr. Lee said that the Provost's office was asked to monitor centers. When Dr. Fletcher was chairing the C&I committee, they identified centers and institutes with research. With academic centers, they are in the process of change and organization and trying to make things more efficient.

**Resources & Core Facilities:** Proposals for Major Core Facilities were due January 15<sup>th</sup>.

**ACO User Advisory Group:** No update. The committee plans to meet in March.

**Research Misconduct Policy:** The policy is currently in the General Counsel's office. A subcommittee will work with Ms. Kirstin Rochford on the policy.

**Publication Costs:** A publication cost subcommittee was formed at the last RSC meeting. Dr. Roman informed the committee that they convened their first meeting at the library and developed a survey. They are going to gather more information with the goal of having a report as well as recommendations by the end of the semester.

**IP:** Dr. Fletcher received a memo from the Faculty Senate Governance Committee. The issue was whether there should be a RSC representative at the IP committee meetings. The committee discussed the advantages & disadvantages of membership and was concerned about the proportionment of the committee. The memo recommended that Dr. Fletcher meet with Dr. Bitner. Dr. Bitner previously informed him that they do not want an ex-officio on the committee and that there's historically no precedent. Dr. Fletcher recalled a time when Dr. Lee was Chair of the RSC and Dr. Dryer – a new member of the Research Counsel - was appointed to be part of IP. Dr. Dryer said that he attended the IP meetings. Dr. Fletcher asked Dr. Dryer directly if he attended the IP meetings as a representative of the RSC. Dr. Dryer responded affirmatively and thought there would be good reason to have a representative at the meetings. Dr. Fletcher said there's no available institutional history that predates Dr. Dryer.

Dr. Clarke told the committee that IP looked at its mission statement and saw that they needed to rewrite it - what was in the statement was different from what they were doing.

Dr. Lee said he thinks it's important. Dr. Bose said he would like for the RSC to select a representative who understands issues like Dr. Dryer. Dr. Fletcher informed Dr. Bose that he appointed Dr. Palmer for the task. The representative will sign a confidentiality statement, but won't vote. Dr. Fletcher will ask again for representation on the IP committee.

Dr. Dryer stated that representation is important because Dr. Bose is providing some of the money. Also, the RSC is closest with Dr. Bose, so it makes sense to have representation. Dr. Chin stated that the point will be clarified at the next Executive meeting.

Dr. Snow stated that his understanding from the RSC is that the primary purpose of the representative is to report back to the committee - which violates the confidentiality agreement. He said the representative would actually work as a conduit of information. He went on to say that the bylaws seem to be the smallest obstacle because they can be changed. Dr. Bose stated that policies and general reporting should be considered.

#### Old Business

**Audit:** A list of audit items was distributed to members electronically. Dr. Fletcher said anything faculty can do to insure colleges don't trigger violations would be helpful as well as being responsive to the issues. Dr. Lee asked if the list was a summary. Dr. Fletcher responded affirmatively.

**Travel:** Dr. Fletcher got a response about travel exceptions. If faculty members are in a situation where their hotel costs exceed the cap, there is a travel exception policy form that can be submitted. It allows you to exceed the cap. Dr. Fletcher will distribute the information.

**Tuition Policy:** Dr. Fletcher invited Dr. Litvinov to discuss the tuition policy memo that was released by the Provost Office. The memo invoked a motion that the RSC passed in 2012 about helping the graduate scholarship pool. The memo indicated a different procedure from what passed the RSC.

Dr. Litvinov stated that the Provost in 2010 was called to look at the GTF. They wanted to keep money in the system. The memo that was released shows the spirit of what was expressed by the RSC. When the RSC motion was passed, the only way to implement it was to include master's level students because they can't be treated differently. It would go against A81. They did not want to create a big bureaucracy because it would be an additional expense. The GTF has grown from \$2 million to \$7 million PhD's for fall & spring of next year. It will cost \$13 million and doesn't cover the summer. That would be another \$2.7 million. They can simply list how

much the PI pays for students and fees - it will be readily available. Everything that's a surplus will go back to the PI's.

Dr. Bose wanted to clarify old A21 issues by saying it never talks about funds going back to the PI. The tuition being charged is tuition & fees, and they have to have a uniform policy that will treat all grant funded students in a consistent manner. However, recovered tuition funds can be reinvested in the PI's lab or in the generating unit. Dr. Fletcher said if you pay a student's tuition off grants, a portion will be returned to the PI as discretionary to support a student. Dr. Lee asked how much. Dr. Litvinov stated whatever is in the surplus. Dr. Lee said he would like an estimate. Dr. Litvinov said to divide the number by 1.5. He thinks 66% will cover a person completely. How much money can be returned depends on how much is available.

Dr. Obasi said it seems more cost effective to hire post docs and asked Dr. Litvinov if it concerned him that post docs would be hired instead of grad students. Dr. Litvinov said they had this conversation and believes it's faculty's job to support grad students. Dr. Dryer replied that wasn't true – it's the faculty's job to teach. The moment it becomes not economically feasible to do research with grad students, he will go with post docs and feel fine teaching. Dr. Bordnick said there are some grants with stipends, which is good. But he wrestles with the policy Dr. Litvinov described. He said it's expensive to support students and agrees that it's less expensive to go with post docs. Dr. Obasi said logic assumes grants aren't helping as they're currently structured and it's not like the university isn't getting money. Dr. Litvinov stated that if you do the math, it's an expensive enterprise regardless. If compared to the rest of the US, the University will lose some of its competitive advantage. Dr. Obasi stated that the policy doesn't offer flexibility with different types of grants. Dr. Litvinov said that if you keep increasing the pool, you'll eventually get most of what you put in.

Dr. Bordnick said he doesn't mind writing a grant and including students. But it requires more time and more money.

Dr. Neighbors asked if there was any reason why the policy couldn't be restricted to R01's and larger grants. Dr. Dryer said R01's are larger, but you can't assume that a bunch of money will be thrown around. He doesn't think that what Litvinov is doing is unreasonable. But the University has to understand that they will start running into conflict over different goals that will affect Tier 1, such as the number of doctoral graduates.

Dr. Fletcher said there is a perception that the University is leaving money on the table. Dr. Dryer said you do not want to exceed your modular budget. Dr. Lee said many who have been on this committee know how hard he and others worked on this policy. In the spirit of cooperation they agreed to develop a plan they could live with. Their cooperation led to a recent change of policy where the Provost agreed to provide fees to PhD students. There is some benefit to sharing governance, even if it

hurts sometimes. He thinks Dr. Litvinov has developed a plan that won't put the university at risk of an audit. Perhaps the RSC should review the policy and consider a resolution that says if the rebate ends (can't be maintained), the provost and graduate school back off on the policy that commends their efforts and makes clear that the University needs to keep the GTF rate at a high enough level to where they can survive. They also need to invest more. Dr. Litvinov said they want to keep the rebate going. Dr. Fletcher would like to have it brought up at the next meeting. Dr. Dryer said he feels comfortable that Litvinov is handling this issue. Dr. Bordnick told Dr. Litvinov that he is not hearing dissention, just "How do we make this work?"

Dr. Fletcher thanked Dr. Litvinov for attending the meeting.

Dr. Papadakis, Chair of the Budget & Facilities committee, told Dr. Fletcher he will be dealing with the Tuition Policy issue and would like to attend future RSC meetings and be part of the discussion. Dr. Fletcher said he's welcome to attend the next meeting.

Dr. Lee made a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.