Committee on Research Minutes
of the 1/22/14 meeting

Present: SuJean Choi, Steven Goldzwig, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Tim McMahon, Kristy Nielson, Chris Okunseri, Chad Oldfather, Raj Rathore, Joe Schimmels, Robert Topp, Olga Yakusheva

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Kathy Durben (ORSP), Kevin Gibson (Grad School), Ben Kennedy (ORC)

Excused: William Pink

The meeting was called to order by Dr. McMahon at 9:03 a.m. The agenda was approved.

Reports:
Report from the Vice Provost for Research –
Dr. Hossenlopp reported that the budget plans are being reviewed. She noted that in her budget submissions she is trying to protect the SFF/RRG monies. COR members were encouraged to take leadership in research related concerns as they relate to the budget.

The Carnegie classification application is moving forward. Promotion and tenure in relation to community engagement is a topic. Dr. Hossenlopp elaborated on this at the request of a member, and gave examples of some of the community engagement already taking place at MU.

Report from the Chair –
Dr. McMahon reported that in follow up with Dave Murphy (OMC), it was confirmed that efforts are being made to promote research. A link will be shared that shows research in the news. Dr. McMahon will be meeting with Dave again to discuss ideas, and hopes this will be the beginning of an ongoing conversation. If members have anything they would like shared they should let Dr. McMahon know. Some ideas were briefly discussed this morning.

COR officers have met with UBGS officers, along with Jeanne to discuss some plans for the faculty forum. Further discussions will be held in preparation for the faculty forum.

Report from the Director of ORSP –
Ms. Durben shared a report of award application totals. She also announced that Mindy Williams has recently joined the ORSP staff as assistant director of project planning.

Report from ORC (Ben/Austin) –
Mr. Kennedy gave an update on a revised policy to improve reporting requirements. A consent form template is also being developed to assist IRB’s. Lastly, some improvements have also been made to liquid waste disposal.

Although Austin was unable to attend today, he did send a report that Marquette University has successfully completed the annual report to the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare and to our accrediting agency AAALAC.

Business:

Review Haggerty Nominations –

The results of the member rankings were unanimous and the top ranked nominee will receive the award.

Distribute Way-Klinger Young Scholar & Fellowship Nominations –

The award requirements and ranking procedures were briefly discussed after packets for both awards were distributed.

The issue of low application rates, and how that can be improved, was discussed:

- Feedback would help encourage people who are not awarded to apply again.
- Forward deserving Haggerty nominations to the next year (with updates).
- There is some perception that the Haggerty award is more science oriented and somewhat of a “boys club”.
- If someone is denied 3 times what kind of message does that send?
- *Considering what form feedback can be given will be placed on a future agenda.*
- Identifying people who are in the top five that did not get awarded, may be a way of encouraging them to apply again.
- Provide a percentile ranking without.
- The criteria is too vague, but then it has to apply across disciplines.

Ms. Durben noted that there are low application rates in other competitions also and this may be symptomatic of a larger issue.

Topics for Joint Forum –

A date is yet to be determined for this event. Dr. McMahon explained that topics are needed for table discussions that focus on clusters. Information contained in the Refworks file of faculty citations were discussed. This file does not capture books however, and pulls some grad student work. It was also noted that it was lacking in Law, Communication, and Psychology. Comments offered today were:

- Determine what is included in a cluster. It should not be departmental, but rather interdisciplinary.
- Search based on the contents of RO1’s.
- Go to the strategic plan and use goals as a search. i.e. – community engagement.
- Search Compendium also.
• Once clusters are identified, how can they be strengthened? How can a case be made for funding?
• Each member should propose a cluster, and identify what is missing.
• Look at what is currently being funded by the government. NIH is funding translational research. It was pointed out that a lot of research is being done at MU, but not all research is funded.
• Pick a topic and make, “this is the year of...” and highlight, tour, collaborate around that topic for a year to generate public awareness. This would also provide an opportunity to rotate the focus around campus.
• Consider what is the message to convey to the new President?
• What can be done in the culture to encourage collaboration? How can people come together on a specific topic that helps faculty share mutually beneficial knowledge?
• It is priority to raise research funding, but this can most effectively be done in an interdisciplinary team. Furthermore, interdisciplinary collaborations are part of the strategic plan.
• Research dollars are only one consideration in Carnegie rankings, things such as numbers of PhD’s produced are also considered.
• Though it was pointed out that a critical mass is needed for a successful cluster, it is felt that there are such clusters.

Dr. Hossenlopp encouraged members that topics of importance must come from the faculty. Methods for strategic hiring were briefly discussed. It was suggested to make chairs aware of the larger campus picture. It was also recommended to alter some of the awards to require collaborative efforts. (Allocate a percentage of SFF/RRG awards to be interdisciplinary awards). Ways and reasons to force collaborations were discussed.

Dr. Gibson has asked everyone to send ideas for clusters, as well as any perceived gaps to him. He will send a reminder email.

The meeting adjourned at 10:58 am.