Committee on Research Minutes
of the 1/23/13 meeting

Present: Syed Akhter, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Doug Lobner, Tim McMahon, David Papke, Jane Peterson, William Pink, Joe Schimmels, Erik Ugland

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

Excused: Raj Rathore, Robert Topp

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Lobner at 9:00 a.m. The agenda was approved.

Reports:
Report from the Vice Provost for Research –
Dr. Hossenlopp reported she will be traveling with Advancement to meet with alumni, including one who may be interested in funding a graduate fellowship. Also, she will be meeting with the University Advancement team to make a presentation about graduate education at Marquette.

Report from the Director of ORSP –
Ms. Durben shared a handout of ORSP spring events and discussed some of the highlights. She also reported award and application figures, and licensing revenues to date.

Report from ORC (Austin) –
Mr. Fritsch reported that a new ORC website will be launched in April or May, and is designed to be more user-friendly.

Business:
Review Haggerty Award nominations and select recipient –
The ranking outcome was projected and the qualifications of the top two ranked nominees were discussed. A recommendation to award the top ranked nominee was made and seconded; a vote was taken and it was unanimous.

Way Klingler Young Scholar applications and Way Klingler Fellowship applications –
Applications for both awards were distributed today and the evaluation and ranking process was briefly discussed.
Joint Faculty Forum February 19, 2013, 3 – 4:30pm, AMU 163 –

This event is intended to be an open forum with faculty throughout the university, focusing on research and graduate education. This is in addition to the President’s January 30th Strategic Planning Workshop, which will focus on all of the themes. MU Ombuds, Kerry Egdorf will facilitate the forum. The format will be round tables with a discussion topic at each one, such as “How to support Graduate Education”, or “How to Raise Money for Research”. It is hoped that a representative from COR and UBGS will be at each table to help facilitate discussion. After a few minutes of introduction, and 15 – 20 minutes of conversation, participants will have the opportunity to change tables. The outcomes of this event will be shared with the President. Dr. Lobner will have more information at the next meeting.

Review revised SFF/RRG Ranking Sheet –

Dr. Schimmels explained the modified Review Considerations that he volunteered to draft for the committee. A potential revised score sheet was demonstrated; this will be revisited after the ranking sheet revisions are completed.

On the Review Considerations a recommendation was made to use the word “applicant” instead of “PI”. The allocation of points was also discussed, in regard to Work Plan and Abstract specifically. Some members would like to see more points in one or both of these areas and less allocated to Relationship to Research Goals. Others expressed a desire to see the Work Plan more fleshed out.

The purpose of the Abstract was also discussed, and a member noted that, at present, applicants often copy and paste Abstracts into the Background portion of the proposals. Committee members agreed that instructions should re-emphasize that the Abstract is to be a distinct element of applications. One member pointed out that successful grant Abstracts provide reviewers with a clear statement of the research problem being investigated and an overview of what the research project will be, thus shaping the reviewer’s thinking about what to expect in the proposal. In order to emphasize the importance of Abstracts, therefore, the Committee discussed whether or not to take some points off Relationship to Research Goals and assign them on the Abstract. Furthermore, it was suggested that the university post publicly Abstracts of those proposals receiving awards. In keeping with the practice of other granting agencies, the Committee agreed that award recipients receive feedback prior to the posting of Abstracts if reviewers considered revision appropriate before posting. A vote was taken and the majority voted to move 10 points from Relationship to Research Goals, to the Abstract.

The Committee recommended two further actions regarding the Review Considerations form: moving the Relationship to Research Goals to above References, so that all the point-bearing sections are grouped successively; and retaining the present proposal length limit of 4 pages plus the Abstract.

The revised documents will be brought back at the next meeting. Members were asked to send any other ideas they have to Melody.

The meeting adjourned at 10:07am.