

Present: Michael Harold, Jack Fletcher, Wynne Chin, Ezemenari Obasi, Pradeep Sharma, Gangbing Song, Maria Solino, Stuart Long, Karl Titz, Alessandro Carrera, Gregg Roman, T. Randall Lee, Stuart Dryer, Alan Burns, Allan Jacobson, Christie Peters, Andrew Davis, Venkat Selvamanickam, Steven Craig, Ramanan Krishnamoorti, Cris Milligan, Rathindra Bose, Mary Ann Ottinger, Kirstin Rochford, Maribel Salazar, Ashley Merwin, Rozlyn Reep, Brooke Gowl

Absent: Gregory Marinic, Haluk Ogmen, Robert Palmer, Michael Zvolensky, Richard Bond, Luis Torres, George Zouridakis, Abdelhak Bensaoula, Jacqueline Hawkins, Mark Clarke, Patrick Bordnick

Chair Dr. Harold called the retreat to order at 9:09 am.

Welcome by the Chair: Dr. Harold started the retreat by introductions. After introductions he welcomed everyone, especially guests.

Approval of April Minutes: Dr. Harold mentioned one change to the minutes provided by Stuart Long, which was the name of an award – the Udall Scholars award. The award is in recognition of attention to environmental concerns, and there are only 50 awarded in the nation.

Dr. Fletcher made the motion for approval of the minutes. Dr. Solino seconded. The minutes were approved.

Status Report by VP/VC Dr. Bose:

- Dr. Bose gave his greetings to the committee. He gave an update on what is happening in the nation.
 - The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) meets 3-4 times per year. COGR is collecting information and sent out a survey to see what issues faculty members encounter in terms of research. A report lists these issues; some are common nationwide such as: grant processes for report submissions, reporting formats not being uniform, finance and budgets, personnel management and hiring of employees, effort reporting, conflict of interest, responsible conduct of research, and data sharing. The major item articulated was IRB and administrative burden associated with expanded requirements and responsibilities. COGR has collected regulations that have been passed by the federal government since 1991. Dr. Bose will distribute the list to committee members so they can appreciate what DOR staff go through each day.
- Dr. Bose has been dealing with the ADVANCE grant and has spent time negotiating with NSF (President Khator is the PI on this grant).

- Dr. Bose's main concern is how DOR will implement A-81 (A-81 is the consolidation of 8 circulars into 1, hence the name A-81). It has to be implemented by December 26th; he will work hard with faculty, Finance and Administration, and IT. It is not a single point implementation.
- IDC Taskforce Update:
 - Because of unusual circumstances in which Board meetings were called, Dr. Carlucci has had to prepare budget information for those meetings. As a result, he has not been able to call the last taskforce meeting. However, Dr. Carlucci has collected all of the information that is needed. The real issue is how we treat IDC uniformly for the PI's. This issue will need to be discussed and Dr. Carlucci will hold the taskforce meeting soon.
- Animal Care Operations (ACO) Update:
 - When Dr. Bose first arrived at UH, the plan was to have part of the 4th floor in the Health and Biomedical Science Building for animal care operation facilities. During Hurricane Katrina, there were universities that lost animals due to basement animal housing. Since it is not ideal to have animal care operations in a basement, the decision was made to complete the Health and Biomedical Sciences Building. The estimate was originally \$8M, but ended up costing around \$10M. Dr. Bose called a meeting with the ACO users to explain the purpose for not rebuilding the facility in the SR2 basement, and requested input on their needs in their animal facilities so that those could be added to the new facility.
 - The plan was to create the Health and Biomedical Science facility and also keep SR2 as a satellite facility for those investigators who cannot move their animals due to study constraints.
 - Right now there are no deadlines or dates for any moves. The decision on SR2 has not been made, but there is a plan to keep it as a satellite facility.
 - They are also working on the Health and Science Building 2. The plan would be to move Biology to that building and over time dismantle SR2, and then move Pharmacy and other departments. Because Dr. Bose was told by the dean of NSM that some faculty do not want to leave, he would like to identify the groups in Biology and Chemistry that conduct animal studies and talk with these groups to identify what their needs are to see if some of them can be moved as the new building progresses.
 - Also, there are questions about per diem charges being high at our university. If we want to bring the cost down, Dr. Bose will work with

the deans and chairs. Dr. Bose has asked Dr. Brammer to give him an estimate on the shortfall based on current users.

- Dr. Dryer stated that he is in Biology and hopes that every animal care user is considered as potential logistical issues emerge.
- Dr. Bose stated that we will keep the satellite facilities for critical experiments. No decision has been made yet, and right now we want to determine what the nature of the satellite facility will be and then begin the planning process of moving most of the labs to the new facility.
- Dr. Roman expressed concern about some of the PI's not being involved, and asked if there is a way to see what users are being looked at.
- Dr. Bose stated that the Executive Director of ACO is working on this and will be holding a follow-up meeting regarding this issue.
- Dr. Fletcher stated that forming an advisory group would provide a systematic way for users to have input.
- Dr. Lee asked if Dr. Bose would welcome a user advisory group. Dr. Bose responded yes, and he has a list of users he can send to the RSC Chair. The Chair can pick users from the list to serve on the committee.
- Dr. Fletcher made a motion to have the RSC form an advisory committee for ACO to work with Dr. Brammer on animal user issues.
- Dr. Ottinger stated that she would like to be a part of the advisory group, and Dr. Bose agreed.
- Dr. Dryer seconded the motion and the motion was approved.
- Finances:
 - At the Board meeting yesterday there was a discussion on budget and finances, and the new polymer chemistry facility from the Welch grant to finish the STL extension building that was presented for \$4.6M.
 - Dr. Carlucci also presented plans to complete space for TIMES and Psychology on the 4th floor of the Biomedical building. The Board approved the items presented and they will move forward.

Manufacturing Initiative Presentation by Dr. Selvamanickam: Dr. Harold introduced Dr. Selvamanickam, MD Anderson Chair Professor of Mechanical Engineering, who was invited to give a presentation on initiatives for a university manufacturing center. Dr. Selvamanickam presented the following information:

- Need for a formal coordinated effort at UH to address manufacturing issues & opportunities.

- High potential for UH to be impactful in manufacturing industry.
- Obama Administration established IMI; has funding from \$70-100 million.
- Advanced manufacturing: multi-agency initiative
- Institutes to address gaps in manufacturing innovation.
- Four manufacturing institutes created; several more on the way. Forty-five manufacturing institutes planned in the next 10 years.
- UH Energy Research Park operation to accelerate technology transfer to manufacturing and commercialization. Rapid transfer of technology advances to manufacturing to accelerate commercialization of superconductor of energy and other applications.
- Facility established in UH Energy Research Park for R2R manufacturing of semiconductor devices for energy and electronics.
- Roll-to-Roll MOCVD system for advanced materials on inexpensive, flexible substrates.
- Strong expertise and unique facilities in R2R processing of advanced materials.
- Roll-to-Roll manufacturing of advanced materials targeted to several industries – thin film products & thin film semiconductors.
- Creating a consortium on Roll-to-Roll manufacturing of advanced materials.
- Current personnel: 11 faculty members, 1 business director, 1 safety manager, and 3 engineers to name a few; all contributing to the common area of Roll-to-Roll manufacturing of advanced materials.

Dr. Jacobson mentioned they have been working to bring the HTS community together beginning with a workshop last fall that generated a report and recommendations. One recommendation was to form a steering committee to put together a white paper to go to the Advanced Program Manufacturing Office in Washington D.C. Dr. Selvamanickam said they are in the process of writing that whitepaper.

Dr. Bose followed up by saying that Dr. Jacobson and Dr. Selvamanickam are working together with support from the DOD and NASA, and the whitepaper will complete a lot of groundwork. He also wanted to share this program with the RSC. Dr. Jacobson told the committee that they have support from the community college system (Houston) and are gradually building a base. Dr. Harold said the project is exciting and wishes Dr. Selvamanickam much success. He also mentioned that Dr. Selvamanickam just received an Excellence in Research & Scholarship award.

Election of RSC Vice Chair: Dr. Harold told the committee that the Vice Chair will serve with Dr. Fletcher the next coming year and asked for nominations. Dr. Fletcher nominated Dr. Zouridakis and said he's done an excellent job with the Centers & Institutes Subcommittee. Dr. Harold called for a vote. Dr. Zouridakis was unanimously and enthusiastically voted next Vice Chair.

Roundtable Discussion on Potential New Award: Dr. Harold introduced the panel members: Dr. Steve Craig, Economics; Dr. Andrew Davis, Moores School of Music; Dr. Maria Solino, President of Faculty Senate, Hispanic Studies. The panel discussion focused on the Research & Scholarship award and recognition of the arts.

Dr. Craig started the panel discussion by telling the committee he appreciates the invitation and feels that there is a terminology problem. The University had a research report that showed grant dollars are more critical to achieve scholarship in some disciplines, but not others. He provided a handout from US News that shows comparability of departments in CLASS to NSM. He went on to say that research awards don't necessarily reflect strengths of the university if they focus on the sciences. University awards should reflect the whole university, like Tier 1 reflects the whole university. Small grants, which are \$3000 each, are perfect for many faculty members in CLASS; whereas this may not be sufficient for faculty in other colleges. He suggests that the RSC consider approaches to ensure recognition for deserving faculty members.

The next panelist was Dr. Davis. He began by saying he appreciated the invitation to attend the meeting. He said he can address some issues, especially in the performing arts. He works with faculty with similar concerns as Dr. Craig, and had an opportunity to go over the accomplishments university-wide when he was involved in the PBK (Phi Beta Kappa) campus visit. With performing arts, they currently have ways to measure performance and quality with systematic equivalents. They have college recognition and it would be good to have recognition with university awards.

Dr. Dryer told the panel that as a musician and former chair of the Excellence committee, he appreciates their input. The committee that selects awards represents the university broadly and he is sympathetic to what they're saying. He is in support of a separate award; however, a separate award is going to have the same problem, even with attempting to come up with equivalence across criteria in different disciplines. The same people will complain, just towards a different committee.

Dr. Long told the panel he had been on the Excellence committee several times, and members in the liberal arts and fine arts agreed on the award selections each time. There's a difference in the disciplines, and the liberal arts/fine arts will never be able to compete when someone is looking at the comparisons.

The next panelist, Dr. Solino said her focus is on the individuals who are discouraged and don't want to apply; she believes that these individuals should be also considered. She had a discussion with Dr. Bose and Dr. Ottinger regarding DOR's annual breakfast recognizing researchers and would like to see it expanded to recognize faculty beyond just those who receive monetary grants. This will allow individuals to receive recognition as well as boost morale. There are people from every college that deserve at least a pat on the back. We need balance and have to

be one University. The current perception is that individuals outside the hard sciences don't have a chance. What can we do to work on that perception? She also mentioned that every time the idea of a separate award is raised, it's for the "creative arts" and this again would only serve those specifically in the creative arts.

Dr. Sharma said he was on the Excellence in Research Award subcommittee, and the reason it works the way it does is because some members may not understand the disciplines the panel mentioned.

Dr. Dryer said the only way to address perception is to have another award, but in the long run it's not going to solve the problem. Dr. Solino responded by saying she is not asking for a new award.

Dr. Fletcher reminded the committee that in 2009 there were 8 nominations, of which 6 came from NSM and Engineering. The RSC identified the lack of nominations as a problem, and tried to make it easier for people to nominate. He said some colleges and department chairs need strong nomination letters that articulate a compelling case for each candidate. Dr. Harold added that frequency of nominations is also an issue; as a department chair he writes about 30 letters per year.

Dr. Bose said the committee was having a great conversation and brought up good issues. He believes that the message is not to create a separate category for Excellence, but rather to figure out a way to measure excellence across the disciplines.

Dr. Roman said that in the sciences you can bring in grants, resulting in higher output, which may put faculty in CLASS at a disadvantage. If there was room for another award, perhaps it should be for "individual achievement", whether it's a book, performance, or other creative activities.

Dr. Chin told the committee he's glad they were having this discussion. "Individual achievement" is an interesting concept. With the Excellence award, there are a disproportionate number of applications. For instance, the Business College did not have candidates; they and other colleges should be encouraged to apply and help should be available to prepare the materials.

Dr. Solino said it's tough for faculty to be at the mercy of someone writing a good letter. Dr. Craig suggested having all the colleges have an award, and perhaps build up the letter writing ability. Dr. Solino mentioned having the deans of research at each college review the letters going out.

Dr. Solino raised the question of how many years until a woman receives an Excellence award. She doesn't think the committee discriminated, but knows there's a perception on campus. Parts of the university (colleges) that have the most female researchers do not have many awards.

Dr. Harold said the “individual award” may be the “seed” for addressing this issue in the upcoming year.

Dr. Bose told the committee that he doesn’t want to dilute the recognition of the Research and Scholarship award. He wants to keep the current award and look at the metrics for these awards. We need more criteria and evaluation, and should bring in people from outside to determine ways that can be done. Having a separate category would look like having two different types of awards.

Dr. Solino suggested a research breakfast to recognize accomplishments from across campus. Dr. Bose responded by saying we will celebrate scholarship broadly at the next breakfast event.

UH Energy Presentation: Dr. Harold introduced Dr. Ramanan Krishnamoorti who gave a presentation on UH Energy:

- Energy Initiative: a platform to integrate UH wide efforts and enable UH to become a strategic partner of the energy industry by providing trained workforce, strategic and technical leadership, research and development.
- Four Step Process: 1.) Get in the game; 2.) develop comprehensive communications strategy; 3.) prioritize areas where institution can be distinct; 4.) build out selected “no regret” capabilities.
- UH Energy Advisory Board – created 5 years ago. Can be dynamic group. Volunteer board meets 3 times a year. Supported by 4 sub-committees: education, upstream, midstream, alternatives. Advisory Board has 24 members.
- Energy Pillars: energy education, upstream, midstream, sustainability alternatives & grid power, energy technology development
- Energy Education: new programs – accelerated BS-MBA program; Online/hybrid energy courses & curricula; energy & sustainability minor; upstream energy certificate program.
- Energy Education: Energy Day @ UH – opportunities at the graduate school and beyond; collaboration between new graduate school & UH energy; was held on November 23, 2013; 80 graduate students attended all-day event; plan to develop program for fall 2014.
- Had Symposium Series in collaboration with NSM – critical issues in energy; 4 topics designed to be debates; Series for 2014-2015: sponsored by Chevron.
- UH & HISD Energy Programs: HISD – Energy Institute High School; HISD – Young Women’s College Preparatory Academy; UH partnership (UH grad students tutored math students at EIHS, summer camp for juniors of EIHS, dual credit programs? scholarships?, internships?)

- Upstream Strengths: unconventional resources, subsea engineering, intelligent oilfields.
- Developments: master research agreement in place with Aramco Services, Shell America, BP, SABIC, etc; Development of Subsea Systems Institute
- Midstream: CNG Station Development
- Alternate energy & sustainability
- Energy and Environment Center for advanced studies
- Electric power analytics consortium
- Questions for the future: how do we make UH relevant? What are we doing well? What should we focus on? What is missing?

Dr. Lee told Dr. Krishnamoorti that the RSC can work with him and help him when needed. Dr. Krishnamoorti responded by saying they need help with many things and welcome the opportunity to speak anytime. They are happy to engage with the committee in a more productive way.

Dr. Harold said it was gratifying to see everything happening with UH Energy, especially since the University asked why they weren't doing more with energy in the past.

Centers & Institutes: Dr. Fletcher went through the C&I report that Dr. Zouridakis provided for the committee to review. The report provided information on six items:

1. Review of Texas Institute for Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistics —TIMES
2. Review of Texas Center for Superconductivity at the University of Houston — TcSUH
3. Finalized review of Center For Nuclear Receptors and Cell Signaling—CNRCS
4. Finalized review of National Center for Airborne Laser Mapping University Center—NCALM
5. Review responses to previous questions and finalize review of Center for Advanced Computing and Data Systems—CACDS
6. Classification of additional Centers/Institutes

Dr. Fletcher asked for the committee's approval of the recommendations for CACDS. Dr. Lee made the motion for approval, and Dr. Roman seconded. The recommendations for CACDS passed.

Dr. Fletcher recommended approval for TcSUH. Dr. Lee made the motion, and Dr. Harold seconded. TcSUH was approved.

Dr. Fletcher recused himself for the committee's review of TIMES. Dr. Long mentioned that some of the numbers were confusing in the report and asked for clarity on the numbers for every center as well as a description for the expectations.

Dr. Burns stated that TIMES provides a lot of services, and perhaps they should list them on their website. Dr. Harold said he'll relay the information to TIMES. The committee voted on the recommendations for TIMES. The recommendations passed.

There were two outstanding items for Centers & Institutes: NCALM and CNRCS. Dr. Harold said these centers raise the issue of what their expectations should be as a committee to make independent recommendations to the VPR.

Dr. Fletcher said the problem with CNRCS is they generated 2 sets of proposals: one for the RSC and one for VP. They also should have had signatures. Dr. Harold said they needed complete budget information. The committee decided they would not act on NCALM or CNRCS at this time, and the two centers would continue according to their current status.

Feedback on DOR: Dr. Harold informed the committee that information has been collected with an expectation of a survey. Feedback should be scientific, and the RSC needs to work with DOR to come up with a survey so DOR can act accordingly. Dr. Fletcher said that he would encourage departments to meet with DOR to discuss any issues. He mentioned Psychology faculty meeting with DOR staff as an example.

Meeting Adjournment: Dr. Fletcher thanked Dr. Harold for his service as chair of the RSC. He said he has done a fantastic job. Everyone applauded in agreement

The meeting was adjourned at 12:14 pm.

The RSC will reconvene on Friday, September 19 from 1:30 - 3:00 pm in the Faculty Senate Conference Room.