

COR MINUTES

To: COR Members

From: Tom Jablonsky, Recording Secretary, and Melody Baker

Date: 9/9/09

Re: Marquette University Committee on Research
Approved Minutes/ September 9, **2009** Meeting

Present: Claire Badaracco, Richard Friman, Arthur Hefti, Tom Jablonsky, Doug Lobner, Steve Melching, Keith Osterhage, David Papke, William Pink, William Wiener, Marianne Weiss, Pinfen Yang

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker)

Excused: Abdur Chowdhury, Javier Foronda, Beth McDonough

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Hefti at 9:00 a.m. The agenda was approved with one change: to hold the elections for secretary and vice chair first.

Elections:

Dr. Hefti, past vice chair becomes the new chair for this year. Members were asked if they would be willing to serve in one of the open positions. Steve Melching was nominated and elected as vice chair. Tom Jablonsky volunteered and was elected by acclamation to be secretary.

Reports:

Report from the Graduate Dean

Darren Jackson has been named as the new chair for the MU Board of Trustees (BOT). A number of issues will be discussed at a BOT upcoming retreat, which may include the topic of research. Dr. Wiener presented a PowerPoint he is putting together for the Dean's Council, and asked members for their opinions. The PowerPoint will show organizational functions of MU research areas and introduce the research team which includes staff from ORSP, ORC, and Tech Transfer. Intellectual Property and Tech Transfer will be discussed in more detail, including website info and the process of a patent, from idea to product. Details involving patents were discussed along with a national perspective on patents generated by universities. Dr. Wiener also shared the Marquette approach to technology transfer and the list of MU patents that have been approved to date as well as the list that is pending. A summary of faculty accomplishments, grants and contracts was shared along with a breakdown of federal research sponsors.

The PowerPoint also addressed the topic of research thrusts. In the past, departments were asked to name what the research thrusts of their departments are. Centers, Institutes, and Projects were examined as well, to see what topics are being focused on. Some were discussed in detail, such as the Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI). Dr. Wiener also informed members that the America Competes Act will require training in Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) for any

students involved in federal research. A program is being developed to meet this requirement and Dr. Wiener will be looking for faculty members with expertise in specific areas to develop training modules.

Finally, the strategic plan for research that was established last year was discussed. The committee had listed five top priorities. The number one priority, to reduce teaching loads to enable more research production was not accepted by the provost due to variability within departments and resource issues. The remaining top four priorities were shared with members.

Dr. Wiener asked members if anything was left out of the PowerPoint or if anything should be changed. It was suggested to make a point of showing the many ways research benefits MU, such as: it enables hiring of top faculty, retention of faculty, revenue source, great effect on undergrad education, innovation coming from grad students. It was also pointed out that research is a requirement for some departments to even exist (such as Biomedical Sciences). It was also recommended that the presentation should make clear what is needed to take MU to the next level (leverage). It may be helpful to show 3 years of research history and project 3 years into the future. Another recommendation was made to make more representation for the humanities – (the top research thrusts for humanities are not being represented here). This would hinge heavily on the priority of reducing teaching loads for faculty. A concern was expressed that faculty in certain areas may be constrained by a focus on industry and science, with little attention focused on humanities and education. The discussion about research seems heavily focused on invention and not enough on discovery. How much funding goes just to discovery in humanities as well as science?

Report from the Chair – no report

Report from the Director of ORSP

Mr. Osterhage provided a summary cover sheet summarizing the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009 in terms of proposals submitted/awards received for the last FY, handouts on stimulus applications submitted to date, white paper and discussion of F & A distribution, info and PowerPoint on Conflicts of Interest, and a 2 part webinar on export controls. Mr. Osterhage discussed the handouts in more detail, and informed members that a new website has been created for ORSP which is still awaiting approval to go live.

Report from ORC – no report

Unfinished Business:

Evaluation of Centers and Institutes

Dr. Wiener asked Dr. Jablonsky to share what he has learned from a study of MU Centers and Institutes. Dr. Jablonsky reported that, because the range of mission and interest is very broad, it is not recommended to form a committee to oversee them. There would be no way to standardize evaluation of such varied centers and institutes. Rather, it is recommended to have a single person assigned to assess whether the individually stated mission of these centers and institutes is being fulfilled. There should be annual reports and Dr. Jablonsky recommends that the chair of the COR could be the person to read them and raise any questions of concern regarding the center or institute. A report every two years seems sufficient. Forming a committee would only create a

hardship on the well intentioned and hardworking people who make up the centers and institutes.

It was asked if the centers and institutes should be divided and assigned to overseers by topic? There was little support in favor of the proposed because it would be a small enough number to be designated to one specific person. However, it is possible the reporting process could be standardized to simplify it.

Other questions that were raised: what would the responsibility of the overseer be? After reports are read and any concerns raised, would that person report to someone? Should this be a function of the COR? After all the time spent reading the reports, would anything change, would any action be taken?

One suggestion was made that an accreditation committee could be formed to do internal reviews of the centers and institutes every 5 – 7 years. This idea was still resisted as being overkill and carries the possibility of causing more problems than it would solve, and becoming institutional. Some members who are involved in centers believe mechanisms are already in place to monitor the centers and make sure they are meeting their missions, and that most of them already report to a dean. It was pointed out that while Dr. Wiener was tasked with this issue, half the centers have nothing to do with graduate education or research. A suggestion was made to have a summary submitted to the COR on centers that do contribute to research which would be in line with the purview of the COR.

It was asked what provision was established for review when changes were made in 2006 to the requirements for centers and institutes. It would be more useful to see what the deans already have in place for the centers and what the university has in place to evaluate institutes under their jurisdiction, rather than put this under the purview of the COR. Centers typically fall under the purview of the colleges, whereas institutes fall under the university. It was agreed that the COR would not make a recommendation now, but reconsider the topic on next month's agenda.

New Business:

Development of COR Agenda for the year

Possible topics that were presented:

- F and A Policy Revision
- Physical Infrastructure Needs (Animal facility is a top priority)
- Plan for Summer Research Experiences
- RCR Training for Students and Post Docs
- Restructuring the IP Board
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Export Control Policy

Priorities for the year were discussed. It was asked if the COR's top priority from last year (to reduce faculty to a 2/2 teaching load) could be put back on the agenda and re-examined. The members believe this is critical to increasing research and that argument in favor of this could be strengthened. In regard to Summer Research Experiences, an increase in internal funds for faculty conducting research that is not extramurally funded needs to be considered. It is important to show the real cost, benefit, and value of meeting these goals. It was recommended to show research output (publications, presentations) statistics. Dr. Wiener described the research programs that have had proven success but have had funding cut nonetheless. This is due to a decrease in discretionary funding to the provost this year. Bridge funding has been eliminated, the PHD visitation program has been cut, and the research development program has had a substantial cut. It is estimated that this trend could

continue for the next two years. It was asked, how can a university develop a research program without a budget for research? It was also asked if someone from the provost office could come to a meeting to describe the budgeting process. This may help the committee come up with more reasonable ideas.

It was asked if a report could be made available to the COR that shows where funding has been cut that affects research. This would be helpful in discussing the viability of some of these topics proposed for the agenda. Dr. Wiener said he could provide this. It was agreed that the topic of course loads would be added to the already listed items.

Due to lack of time, these items will also be moved to the upcoming agenda:
Use of Students as Research Subjects
America Competes Act Requirements for RCR Training

A motion was made and seconded, a vote taken and passed unanimously, to select all listed topics as agenda items for the academic year.

Dr. Wiener asked the members if they would be willing to continue approving the minutes via email for expediency and to enable timely posting of the minutes. The members all agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58am.