Faculty Senate Research Committee
Wednesday, October 9, 2013
Meeting Time: 12 PM – 1.15 PM
Location: Centennial Room, Union

Meeting Minutes:

In attendance: Mike Williams, Larry Hoyle, Derek Reed, Dan Spencer, Celka Straughn, Jeffrey Krise, Catherine Preston, Rodolfo Torres (ex officio)

Excused: Barbara Phipps, Belinda Sturm, Mahbub Rashid

I. Introductions

II. Discussion of Charges and plans for this fall

A. Standing Charge 4 and Specific Charge 1 re. Restricted Research:
RGS is working on issues regarding the increase in activity in areas relating to restricted research, working with industry, DOD and international collaborations. Other issues not named are rare instances, but RGS is prepared if anything arises. RGS is planning to create training materials to share, especially with new faculty as well as other faculty, and possibly graduate students. RGS will keep FSRC informed.

Specifically re. Specific Charge 1: Specific Charges:
There is need for face-to-face as materials are all already submitted electronically and it seems to run smoothly. Decisions usually are made very quickly so that PIs have as much time to prepare.

B. Standing Charge 5 and Specific Charge 3 re. ACEC: Larry Hoyle will serve again as FSRC representative and share information between the two groups.

C. Specific Charge 2 re. PRO and AA:
Rodolfo Torres reports that PRO is still not fully implemented and it is likely take another full year. The FSRC will invite Linda Mannering to an upcoming meeting.
PRO is generated locally and is largely an expanded version of cv. PRO data can generate different formats for cvs. All information for PRO is provided by the faculty. PRO doesn't have metrics.
One goal for PRO is to replace forms for P&T and sabbatical; it will also replace all unit annual reports. It has features so that it can produce reports. Currently PRO is used in Business for merit evaluations. PRO has a feature that allows for searches of faculty research backgrounds and expertise. PRO will include information on GRF grants.

Rodolfo Torres also reported on AA, which is a system that aggregates faculty information, gather it from a variety of other sources. While it does not draw from a full, complete range of sources, AA information tends to be accurate; e.g. publications, citations, conferences, grants, awards). There is some delay in information by a couple of years and the information is generally quantitative. It has a feature for faculty scholarly productivity index, a metric with weights similar to those of NRC (this feature is more controversial) that compares to national mean. Weights differ according to disciplines. It can explore various comparisons, e.g. with funding sources (only federal agencies). KU's current subscription does not allow for individual faculty records.

AA is used primarily for chairs, deans, directors to access. It is currently used by RGS for funding questions and research investment, some deans for decision making, and all chairs have option to use and some do. The question was raised about comparison among KU units (e.g. Journalism and Business – is this used and/or useful). AA is useful to compare to peer units at other institutions and has a new tool to select peers for comparison (useful for benchmarking and to try and understand what peers are doing to achieve success). AA analyzes departments and PhD programs (not MA level). It is possible to have AA run certain studies as part of basic fee Another question was raised about whether units use AA info for accreditation. AA data cannot be used for publishable comparisons.

RGS going to try to provide a consulting service for departments to learn AA better. There seems to be a lack of clarity of information of how AA used among faculty at large. FSRC will contact deans and other units as to how AA being used, also RGS, Provost office – how used, how valuable, challenges, etc.
1. provost how using it comparing units across campus, rel. to budgeting
2. deans using to compare to peers and across campus
3. PTR – how be used as part of review processes, in particular PTR
4. funding opportunity aspects
5. how useful for research centers – inter or crossdisciplinary work – ways to do types of comparisons
FSRC member Jeffrey Krise will draft a letter we can send to deans, chairs, provost, RGS, etc.
[Letter drafted, needs to be reviewed by committee. Put on hold for FY15]

Specific Charge 3. Larry Hoyle and Dan Spencer will co-lead subcommittee with Derek Reed and work with ACEC and Libraries and RGS. Rodolfo Torres will inquire about already existing committee.
Key issues include: storage of data, support of collecting metadata as generated to curating data once study completed; caring for data well (e.g. so can be used to replicate, extend studies). Important to involve IT, Libraries, ACEC, among others. There is growing pressure with funding agencies that are changing their policies for data management plans, e.g. open access, and may soon require and check that make data available.
Question of who at KU helps develop data management plans. Britain has some models in place and it seems KU can be a US leader in this area.

Specific Charge 4: Reconsidering GRF allocations and structures based on FSRC FY13 Reort. Celka Straughn, Mike Williams, Cathy Preston and Jeffrey Krise will pursue possibilities for how to assess further and explore recommendations.