Committee on Research Minutes
of the 10/12/16 meeting

Present: Sarah Feldner, Paul Gasser, Ryan Hanley, Andrew Hanson, Sarah Knox, Phillip Naylor, Daniel Rowe

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

Associate Deans: Victoria Fitzgerald, Scott Mandernack, Rosemary Stuart, James South, David Clark, Donna McCarthy, Marya Leatherwood, Carrianne Hayslet

Excused: Ron Coutu, Kristina Dreifuerst, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Michael McChrystal, Chris Okunseri

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

Reports:
Report from the Vice Chair – no report

Report from the Director of ORSP –
Ms. Durben shared a handout and reported on the status of awards, applications, and ORSP events. She also reported on the progress of the Kuali electronic grant management system.

Report from ORC – no report

Business:
Summer Faculty Fellowships/Regular Research Grants -
The COR SharePoint site and SFF/RRG ranking sheet were demonstrated. Dr. Naylor discussed the procedure for reading and ranking the proposals.

Associate Deans for Research –
Prior to the arrival of the associate deans, Dr. Naylor asked members what kind of questions should be asked. Suggestions for topics were:
  How associate deans can help encourage more applications for SFF/RRG awards
  Communication – how does information from the COR get transmitted to the associate deans for research? How does information trickle down to faculty?
  How can COR help collaborate?
  Mid-career faculty support
  How to create infrastructure
  Time for Research / Teaching loads / Research expectations
The associate deans joined the meeting and introductions were made. The associate deans were asked if they had any topics they would like to discuss. There is concern about the continuing diminishment of funding for the humanities.

It was also suggested that providing seed money for faculty, particularly those who have lost funding, would be very helpful. Although helpful, more money than that provided by SFF/RRG grants is needed to assist getting research projects up and going again. It would be great to have a fund dedicated to this matter.

Ms. Durben updated the associate deans on the Kuali system also and how it will be helpful to faculty. She went on to comment that research infrastructure is a major concern and that we need to think about how it needs to change and grow.

It was pointed out that faculty often express concern about research time. Members wondered if associate deans have discussed this matter. Dr. McCarthy shared that the College of Nursing has discussed a process which includes supporting faculty so they have the time to apply or reapply, for grants, while carefully examining teaching assignments in relation to faculty research projects.

Dr. South shared that the College of Arts and Sciences addresses with chairs scheduling around sabbaticals, fine tuning work load documents, working towards transparency, and maximizing faculty research time. He added that keeping up with all the university initiatives (plus core revision) is taxing. Dr. Feldner added that the final report on core revisions should be complete by January.

It was also asked if colleges measure how much time is spent engaged on research, or how much financial outcome results from projects? It was noted that this is more difficult in a discipline that does not traditionally receive grants. The College of Communication is trying to be strategic about how the college’s internal money is awarded by doing a better job of promoting research among themselves, and keeping a conversation going. The college additionally hosts a “scholarship week” to encourage students in to share in research projects, and is studying how to promote non-traditional scholarship.

Dr. Clark shared that the College of Business has a fourth year intensive research process in which faculty get one semester with service responsibilities, but no teaching if they are making progress towards promotion and tenure. The college also has a differential teaching load policy. After tenure, research active faculty can have a 2/2 teaching load. Adjunct or instructor lines carry a 4/4 load. Additionally, there is funding in the college to promote research fellows, and an endowment allows for summer support for junior faculty.

Dr. Feldner asked how faculty can get back to being research productive when they have a higher teaching load. Dr. South commented that his college has a pool of money that people with higher teaching loads can apply for (buyout) to get a reduced teaching load, enabling them to get work done towards publication, etc.

Mr. Mandernack (Raynor Memorial Library) described how the library has limited resources to buy new electronic subscriptions – it can’t take on new subscriptions without dropping some.
Dr. Hayslett said that the Graduate School is very much involved in what happens at the department level.

Dr. Stover shared that at the Dental School clinical faculty do research on their own time, while the labs are being used to work with students and research by tenure track faculty.

Dr. Fitzgerald shared that in the College of Education, there is collaboration between Counselor Education and Educational Policy and Leadership in the form of writing groups, especially to help those who have not yet reached associate rank with tenure. Also, engaging students more in research is resulting in more writing and presenting with students. Funds have been found to hire an external person to assist with grant writing and to generate new grants. With sabbatical leaves coming up, they are discussing how to keep classes covered with the constant ebb and flow of faculty.

Members asked how the associate deans relate to COR? What is the relationship?

Dr. Stuart said that because COR sees a broad spectrum of issues it could help develop policies and procedures regarding infrastructure (user fees).

Dr. McCarthy commented that COR does a good job of cross-communication and she appreciated the meeting.

Dr. Clark said COR has been a good advocate for scholarship despite its small resources. He would like to see the committee advocate for more resources and increasing the amount of awards. Once a year meeting with the ADRs is a good idea.

Dr. South asked if the minutes of the meetings are made available. He was informed that the approved minutes are posted on a webpage. That link will be shared. It was also requested to include the link to where minutes are posted on the minutes of this meeting.

Dr. Feldner asked the ADRs to think about issues from an administrative role and how the COR can advocate for research, what it takes to get it done, and how to recognize achievements.

Dr. Rowe added that MU has a lot of brilliant faculty that want to spend time solving problems if only they could have the time and money.

Dr. South suggested that the COR could survey the ADRs about agenda items.

Dr. McCarthy stated she is aware of the limited resources of the COR and vast pool of applicants and research and appreciates how the committee respects research from all disciplines.

Dr. Hayslett shared that new funds for graduate student research have become available.

Dr. South recommended that it would be good to talk about the various forms of research with deans and department chairs. Communications is essential.

Dr. Clark asked if the COR is looking at a university evaluation of predatory publishing and should make certain faculty understand this is something to avoid. The College of Business is looking more closely at that and believes it needs to be brought to faculty attention.
Ms. Durben explained what is meant by “doubling research expenditures” and gave examples. The ADRs were informed that the COR spent an entire year discussing research aspects of the strategic plan.

Everyone agreed it would be good for the COR and ADRs to meet together once a year.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55am.

Link to where minutes are posted:
http://www.marquette.edu/academicsenate/minutes.shtml