Committee on Research Minutes
of the 3/4/15 meeting

Present: SuJean Choi, Abdur Chowdhury, Sarah Feldner, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Sarah Knox, Donnalee McCarthy, Tim McMahon, Kristy Nielson

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Kathy Durben (ORSP), Austin Fritsch (ORC), Ben Kennedy (ORC), Tom Pionek (OMC)

Excused: Kim Factor, Chris Okunseri, Chad Oldfather, Joe Schimmels

The meeting was called to order by Dr. McMahon at 9:07 a.m. The agenda was approved.

Reports:

Report from the Vice President for Research and Innovation –

Dr. Hossenlopp reported that the 275 Innovation Funds pre-proposals have all been reviewed and clustered into categories and type. Feedback will go out to proposers this week. The ULC has access to the summaries and budgets of the pre-proposals and will provide help with how to facilitate some of the requests. Also, a budget development workshop will be held on March 24th, before the due date for the full proposals on March 27th.

Last week, Ms. Durben was given the opportunity to report to a smaller group of the BOT members. Members are now anxious to hear how research funding will be doubled. Dr. Hossenlopp will be discussing areas to grow research with the Dean’s Council tomorrow, and will be reporting back to the BOT in April with preliminary ideas on how to do this.

Report from the Chair –

Dr. McMahon reported that at a meeting with UBGS officers and Dr. Gibson, it was decided that joint agenda planning meetings will no longer be held, and the joint faculty forum, previously scheduled for March 24th, will not be held this year. He has worked with Ms. Durben on prepping for SFF/RRG guideline updates which will be discussed at today’s meeting.

Report from the Director of ORSP –

Ms. Durben shared a handout report of ORSP updates and described in more detail the NIH ASSIST system. Award and application numbers are on track for February.

Report from ORC –

Mr. Fritsch reported that animal bio safety research has grown, and faculty in biomedical sciences have recently received some grants, causing significant strain on space that meets bio-safety regulations for staff and animals.
Business:

*SFF/RRG Guidelines* – based on the December discussion:

Continuing from the December meeting, members discussed an update to the language that SFF’s will only go to applicants that have not already secured summer funding. Members discussed if teaching or partial research support should be taken into consideration as support. It was recommended to add to the guidelines that you can’t supplant funding from other sources. The intent is to bring new funding to fill a gap. There was other opinion however, that it would be a hardship to have to choose either/or, and the preference was to instead just make it clear that COR will take into consideration if someone has other funding.

Another idea was to combine SFF/RRG funds into one fund that can be used for either salary or research needs as a way to stretch the dollars further. The applicant can then justify the budget whether it is for salary, equipment, travels, etc.

Members would like the applicant to describe the impact an award would have on their research program. Members recommended the following changes to the SFF/RRG Cover Sheet:

**Have you searched for external funding?**  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  **Eliminate.**

Instead ask,
Where will you search for additional funds?

If yes, explain how you searched for external funding (even if your efforts were not successful)  **Eliminate.**

Instead ask,
How do you plan to submit external applications? Or…
Where do you anticipate you will search for external funding for this project? Or…
What role will this award play in future grant applications? Or…

Explain how this fits into future funding? (More details)

**What other support are you currently receiving?**  **Eliminate.**

Instead ask,
List your current awards (external, internal, and pending) and relationship to this application. (Provide examples: startup funds, etc.)

Other recommendations included:

List current funding, what projects it is for, what the current application is for.
Provide an explanation of the impact the award would have on the research.
Ask for percent effort? (Not everyone agrees.)
State in the guidelines – if you don’t have 6 weeks to commit, don’t apply.
Update title to Vice President to Research and Innovation.
Consider offering a workshop for SFF/RRG’s.

Dr. McMahon and Ms. Durben will draft the updates and present to COR in April.

*Academic Senate description of committee* –
Members unanimously agreed to update the Vice Provost/Dean title to Vice President for Research and Innovation, and also to update the title Director (ORSP) to Executive Director where it appears in the document.

**Strategic Planning for the Office of Research and Innovation** -
The book *Engines of Innovation* was given to members today. Dr. Hossenlopp described a story within it of how faculty led grass roots initiatives.

Dr. Hossenlopp asked the members to think about solutions to research growth issues. Recently, associate research deans discussed barriers for increasing research and how to address those barriers (how to figure out how much money is left in a grant after accounting, MFS, possibility of funding grad students, hiring accounting students to help).

Some questions for the committee to think about are:
- Is the faculty right sized to grow research?
- Where do we have clusters?
- Where can we partner with UWM?
- What else is needed in infrastructure?

Other barriers members listed:
- Sharing a salary line for a bio-statistician with another department, but who isn’t fluent in grant writing, manuscript writing. Need to figure out ways around this.
- Figure out how to share someone to track budgets.
- Inability to offer a spousal hire has prevented the hiring of a qualified person.
- Need a place for potential hires to confidentially raise issues outside of the people making the decisions.
- Grants and funding quality of the College Business is far behind other areas of campus.
- ORSP tries to focus on first and second year faculty, but departments are not always as supportive as they could be – it’s not always part of institutional culture to expect faculty to apply for grants. What is the next step?

Some ideas:
- Incentivize people to apply for grants: set targets with incentives, figure out how to create peer pressure.
- Offers such as, if you apply for grant, you are eligible for an internal award that can be used to hire a student.
- Hire staff who can help understand the grant budget management process.
- May require a willingness to change direction/culture on the part of faculty. It was recommend to be careful how these ideas are worded.
- Think about hiring PhDs that just want to teach, that will free up researchers.
- Offer the incentive to get tenure for teaching. Recognize that there are researchers in the university for whom grants are not necessary or required.
- People still need time, travel, students...

Discussion on this topic will continue at a future meeting.
The meeting adjourned at 10:55 am.