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**Present:** David Clark, Richard Friman, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Tom Jablonsky, Doug Lobner, 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 9:00 a.m. and the agenda was approved.

**Reports:**

*Report from the Vice Provost for Research* – Dr. Hossenlopp reported that the discussion of the COR F&A proposal is on-going, as well as other related options. She indicated to the Provost that revising the F&A return policy is a priority for this year. This will probably require a multi-step process.

Dr. Hossenlopp also reported that the NRC assessment has now been made public, and 11 MU programs were evaluated. There are some issues in the way that data was collected for some programs as well as the reporting, which makes the data already out of date. Ranges of rankings were issued other than specific rankings; thus, the individual data fields are likely to be more useful than the overall rankings. Dr. Hossenlopp offered to discuss the assessment with the COR members if they wished.

Dr. Hossenlopp also discussed available funds for the award applications the COR will be reviewing this year.

*Report from the Chair* – no report

*Report from the Director of ORSP* – Mr. Osterhage reported on a couple of policy changes that happened over the summer. He is still waiting for the final word on the Export Controls Policy. The Conflict of Interest Committee also proposed some changes to that policy and some issues are still pending.

A website is being created for sub awards, which will be available for all awards received from the feds after October 1 and will require reporting to that website. The ORSP template will be adjusted to collect the data to satisfy this requirement.

Mr. Osterhage also shared a summary of awards received at MU and stated we are still on track to have $60-70 million in proposals this year.

Dr. Hossenlopp shared that on November 1 the ORSP brown bag lunch will include representatives from Public Affairs and University Advancement as well as ORSP.

**New Business:**

*SFF/RRG’s (Packets to be distributed at next week’s meeting)* – As of this morning there are 15 applications and the deadline is tomorrow. A member raised a concern over some assumptions in various departments that there is an automatic guarantee for applicants seeking an award. A question was also raised concerning whether junior faculty members are given priority relative to
senior faculty. While some COR members have opinions on this, there is no policy. It is generally agreed that it is the quality of the proposal that is most important. It was noted that it is important to make proposals accessible to readers outside of the candidate’s area, which has been a factor for some of the past applications. There was also a concern over some feelings of entitlement among some senior faculty. Members also shared the fact that last year some decisions were made to cut the funding of some proposals, not because the applicants weren’t deserving, but in order to fund other worthy proposals.

Dr. Hossenlopp would like to see the humanities faculty take more opportunities to apply for external awards. One member commented that it is important to keep track of numbers of people who are applying, not just who is getting awards.

Succession Planning for Committee Officers – the method of appointing officers for the committee was discussed. The current three-year succession plan assumes that the officers will progress from secretary to vice chair to chair over time. However, members noted that the succession plan is not always possible due to term expirations or sabbaticals. Other alternatives were discussed, and there was a suggestion that a succession plan is not necessary and the committee could just elect new officers every spring. It was also asked if it is necessary to have a secretary position, and if not, whether it would be easier to manage with only two officer positions. The general consensus was that while the secretarial duties could be assumed by the vice chair, there is value in having a third officer because they – with Dr. Hossenlopp – set the agenda for meetings. Another suggestion was to change the membership term to 5 years, but there was little support for that. When asked how to proceed this year, it was decided that this topic will be put on the agenda early in the spring in order to plan for next year.

Way Klingler Call for Proposals – The guidelines were distributed to the members ahead of time, to be discussed today. There has been an issue with the quality and number of the proposals received for these awards, and a review to the wording of the guidelines may be needed. Dr. Hossenlopp pointed out that not all can classify their proposals as Science or Humanities, and concern was expressed that those in social science, education, or communication may not know how competitive they would be in the Science or Humanities category. A general concern was expressed that the current wording may discourage some applicants.

While there is an assumption that Social Sciences are included in Humanities, Dr. Hossenlopp suggested that changing the wording to make this explicit might garner more applications. It was agreed among the members that the language should be broadened to include the category Social Sciences and re-evaluated over a three-year period to see what the effect would be on the scope of applications submitted.

Other – Dr. Hossenlopp asked if there is anything that members would like to discuss at future meetings. Dr. Melching said he would like this committee to put together some topics to share with the new president.

Dr. Hossenlopp would also like to discuss how to better communicate research activities. One example is use of e-publications, and she encouraged COR members to take advantage of this. Librarian Ann Hanlon makes it simple to do so. Dr. Hossenlopp also offered to invite any guests to speak at COR meetings if members so wished.

Discussion of concerns about the University’s support of research continued. Dr. Hossenlopp said she is using Syracuse as a benchmark institution for comparison due to similarities with MU, and she is looking at a variety of research support issues. The need to include research as a topic for the new president’s orientation was discussed. Another member advised that none of the funding issues should be looked at in isolation, but rather as part of the larger picture. Making these positive changes will require the cooperation of all deans. For their part, ORSP is advocating the use of some of MU’s success stories to be used by advancement in attracting donors.

The meeting adjourned at 10:57.