**FY2016 RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Meeting Date, Time, & Place:** 30 Oct 2015, 8:00 – 9:15 Am, Regionalist Room, Kansas Union

**Participants:** Hui, Rongqing; Pasik-Duncan, Bozenna; Staples, William G.; Lach, Pamella Robin; Moise, Alexander R; Jackson, Yo; Stefanov, Atanas Gueorguier; Chen, Yvonnes; Spencer, Daniel G.; Sturm, Belinda; Tracy, James W; Rashid, Mahbub

The Chair welcomed Vice-Chancellor Tracy and student member Brent Lee to the meeting. The committee discussed its charges and made the following decisions:

**Standing Charges:**

1. Monitor the administration of the General Research Fund (GRF) and make recommendations, as needed, to ensure its effectiveness and appropriate utilization. Report to FacEx concerning actions taken with respect to this charge by 03/05/16.

* The committee was informed that the Chair of FSRC was contacted by University Governance concerning GRF funding reallocation for the FY2016 – one of the two FSRC recommendations for change to the GRF procedures approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. It was noted in the meeting that no reallocation of GRF funding will be made until the review of the entity-level GRF processes is completed this fiscal year.
* Vice Chancellor Tracy was asked to present his view on GRF in the meeting. He noted that he has not yet observed a complete GRF cycle at KU since he joined seven month ago; therefore, his knowledge on GRF remains incomplete. However, he observed the following facts:
  + GRF has remained unchanged for a while, possibly affecting faculty research and productivity.
  + GRF may decrease in the coming years due to tuition deficits and potential state budget cuts.
  + At KU, GRF is allocated to entities, which then decide how to distribute the fund among the faculty. Could there be another model to ensure more equitable allocation of GRF? It was mentioned that at UMW, a somewhat similar fund is allocated to four large divisions. Each faculty member chooses his/her division for funding. The funding is then competitively allocated to individual faculty members by the division.

1. Monitor the execution of the University’s Restricted Research Policy (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX) in handling requests for exceptions.

* The Chair updated the committee on the activities of the Faculty Senate Restricted Research Committee. He noted that so far the Restricted Research Committee has received two proposals where the restriction imposed by the funders were minimal, and at least one of these proposals was already approved by the Restricted Research Committee.

1. Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.

* The FRSC committee did not receive any faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research. There was no further discussion on the charge.

1. Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited.  Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx.

* There was no discussion on the charge in this meeting.

1. Continue working with the ACEC (Academic Computing and Electronic Communications) Committee to process needs for and issues with computing and telecommunications for research, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures and monitoring ongoing and new developments in IT. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx as needed.

* Yvonnes Chen was unable to attend the first ACEC meeting because she received a very late notice of the meeting. Brent Lee, who attended the meeting, noted that the committee discussed the aging telecommunication infrastructure of the university in its first meeting. In the second meeting, the committee is expected to discuss various budget issues affecting research infrastructure of the university. Yvonnes Chen and Brent Lee have kindly agreed to keep the committee posted on issues with computing and telecommunications for research.

**Specific charges:**

1. Conduct three-year review of the GRF in Spring 2016.

* Concerning GRF review, the Chair provided the committee with the following documents (See attachment):
  + An outline of the review that was conducted by the FSRC in 2013, which also included a list of recommendations made by the previous committee on how to improve the review process
  + A set of additional questions and recommendations that were raised during the FY2010-13 review process
  + The FSRC evaluation rubric for the FY 2010-13 GRF review
* The committee asked the Chair to develop a simple review template for GRF entities to use, and to develop a set of metrics to be used in evaluating the performance of an entity before the next meeting.

.

1. Continue to consider issues related to the use of current systems for external evaluations of the University and internal research evaluations for departments, programs, and faculty.  Explore how these metrics are impacting faculty research, research opportunities, and the understanding of faculty research profiles.

* Bill Staples is working on a set of questions for a survey on PRO for departmental chairs. After reviewing and revising these questions, the committee will send them out to departmental chairs for their responses.

1. Review how the university’s development of faculty entrepreneurship programs relates to faculty productivity.  Consider how faculty entrepreneurship activities are evaluated.  Report to FacEx by January 1, 2016.

* The committee members had a lively discussion on the relationship between faculty entrepreneurship and research productivity in the presence of Vice Chancellor Tracy. After the discussion, the committee took the following consensus view on faculty entrepreneurship activities:
  + At this time, no university policy is required for the university’s development of faculty entrepreneurship programs in relation to faculty productivity.
  + Given the trends in higher education, the importance of faculty entrepreneurship cannot be ignored as a criterion for faculty evaluation. However, how entrepreneurship activities are evaluated for faculty performance should be left to the discretion of individual academic units.
  + Each academic unit should make its position on faculty entrepreneurship activities clear in appropriate policies and guidelines on faculty evaluation.

The committee decided to meet on **Friday, November 13, at 8:30 am for the next meeting.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Mahbub Rashid

(Chair, FRSC)