COR MINUTES

To: COR Members
From: Jeanne Hossenlopp
Date: 4/6/11
Re: Marquette University Committee on Research
Approved Minutes/ April 6, 2011 Meeting

Present: David Clark, Javier Foronda, Richard Friman, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Tom Jablonsky, Doug Lobner, Beth McDonough, Steve Melching, Keith Osterhage, David Papke, William Pink, Joyce Wolburg,
Excused: Marianne Weiss, Pinfen Yang
Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker)

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

Reports:
Report from the Vice Provost for Research –
Dr. Hossenlopp has presented, to the Dean’s Council, the committee’s recommendation to lower the amount of Way Klingler Young Scholar Awards going to departments to $15k so that more awards can be funded. Everyone was agreeable, though the amount may be $20k in order to provide more of a cushion.
On April 7, 2011, she will meet with finance people to discuss the proposal to return more of indirect costs.
Dr. Hossenlopp reported that she attended the talk by Dr. Clifford M. Lynch, Director of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI), at the library on March 23rd.
Campus research forums have been going well and workshops supporting scholarship for faculty in the area of community engagement have been recommended.

Report from the Director of ORSP –
Mr. Osterhage reported that Marquette is still ahead of last year on grants received. Application totals are comparable to last year. Licensing revenue is comparable to last year.

Report from ORC (Javier) –
Mr. Foronda reported the assurance was recently approved by OLAW (Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare). He also reported that the Office of Biosafety review went well.
Lastly, occupational health and safety forms will be electronic soon and training materials are going to be placed on D2L.

Unfinished Business:
**Reporting and Ranking**

Dr. Hossenlopp explained that MU reports to a number of places, but often data are not complete. As an example, in reports to the National Science Foundation (NSF), we are asked how many graduate students are supported via assistantships and fellowships. OIRA provides a lot of data but grant funded students have been missed in the past. MU also often under reports the amount spent on research. Part of the problem has to do with how research funds are indentified. Dr. Hossenlopp asked members if they know of places in their areas where data may be missed at department levels. It is important to have accurate figures because of the impact it has on rankings.

Members suggested numbers could be missed in the following areas: service contracts, the research portion of salary may not always be included, sabbatical leaves, fourth year intensive research semesters (college support), the Law School has extensive summer research, and the College of Communication has initiated some new methods for supporting research. Members were asked to email any other possibilities they could think of to Mr. Osterhage.

It was pointed out that Carnegie takes their data for rankings from the NSF, but US News and World Report asks for different information. Some members wondered how peer institutions are reporting.

**Research Statement**

The statement, intended for the new president, Fr. Pilarz, was sent to the members ahead of time for committee input at today’s meeting.

Dr. Hossenlopp asked if there should be a section listing needs, recommending this should not be a laundry list, but instead a starting point for conversation, prioritizing 3-5 of the most urgent needs needed to go to the next level.

In continued discussion it was asked if it would be possible to provide a perspective of the time squeeze that faculty experience. Can historical data on teaching loads be provided? Point out the challenges on time, and that enrollment trends are increasing.

Members would also like to mention how priorities fit with the mission of the university. Highlight rankings and the impact they have on the national reputation. Include a description of interdisciplinary activities that faculty are involved in.

There was also opinion that the statement seems slanted towards the natural and physical sciences and should include more information on the social sciences and humanities. It was recommended to get feedback from department chairs.

Members agreed the university is at a critical juncture now and supporting research is an important directive at this juncture. How can MU retain productive faculty that enhance the student experience.

Lastly there was a suggestion again for SWOT analysis and Dr. Hossenlopp said this may be an agenda item for next year.

**Fr. Fitzgibbons Sessions**

Members who have participated in these sessions shared some of the issues that were raised. Dr. Melching said he would be attending the Friday sessions and asked members for issues that should be brought up in the sessions. One thing that came out
in a previous session is that MU is getting close to a breaking point with the time issue – Dr. Melching should reinforce this, bring it up again, the issue is holding MU back.

**New Business:**

*Intellectual Property Review Board (IPRB)*

Dr. Hossenlopp shared that she needs to reconstitute the IPRB. How involved does the COR want to be? Should a representative from COR be on this board? Dr. Papke said the law school has an intellectual property law center and their own publication. He recommended faculty who specialize in this area. Dr. Hefti said one of the most important functions is to screen ideas – should this be added to the description? A committee charge would need to go through appropriate channels, including Academic Senate. This could be a subject for discussion once the IPRB is reconstituted. Mr. Osterhage said a process is in place to do this that involves Tim Keane and others, meeting in a more timely fashion than the IPRB.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00am.