

Research Council Minutes—9/26/05

Present: Sams, Little, Wodarski, Handler, Gentry, Brown, Ganguly, Stephenson, Richter, Blass

Ex officio: Mashburn, Collier, Harris, Malkemus, Hamilton, Blass

A copy of the agenda is attached.

Comments from the Chair:

Dr. Handler welcomed all to the 2005-2006 Research Council. He outlined his activities over the summer during which he visited with faculty and administrators alike to get input on issues the RC should consider and feedback on how the RC was functioning to fulfill its mission.

Dr. Handler's remarks touched on several areas. Many with whom he spoke raised the distribution of F&A as an issue to be addressed. It is handled different in practically every college; does this raise the matter of equitable treatment? [The suggestion was offered that any new study would be well advised to begin with the report by Ray Hamilton about 2 years ago.]

Perhaps the item uppermost on people's mind's is the absence of any real strategic thinking about the research directions of the University. A strategic plan recognizes the strengths of the different parts of the University but should also outline major directions that emerge across colleges and departments (e.g., materials science and engineering and the humanities initiative, to mention two such themes).

Intellectual property was another "hot button" issue with faculty with several dimensions. First, there is a great deal of education that needs to be done about intellectual property. Second, RC needs to better understand how IP decisions are made and be assured that the University and faculty's interests are represented.

Dr. Handler spoke to the report by Vice Chancellor Mayhew's committee on post-doctoral appointments. He wants the RC to look at this report and advise on unresolved issues about these important research appointments. (At least 2 *ex officio* members of the RC were on that committee chaired by Dr. Robert Moore, Vet Med, also *ex officio* to the RC.)

Formation of Committees

In addition to the committees associated with routine business of the RC, Dr. Handler proposed additional committees to address topics raised during his summer discussions. He invited members to volunteer for the committee(s) of their choice.

Committees to be formed are (Names were added after the RC meeting):

EPPE--Wes Hines, Bill Blass, Joanne Hall, Tom Handler

F&A--Carl Sams, Bill Dunne, Ken Stephenson, Tom Handler

Strategic Plan—Bill Dunne, Bill Blass, Joanne Hall, Julie Little, Randy Gentry

Intellectual Property—

SARIF Awards (Equipment)-- Stefan Richter, Ranjan Ganguly, Janet Brown

Chancellor's Awards--Carl Sams, Bill Blass, Bill Dunne, John Wodarski, Stefan Richter, Tom Ladd

Post-doc Handbook-- Bill Dunne, Ranjan Ganguly

Center/Institute Reviews-- Ken Stephenson, Ranjan Ganguly, Randy Gentry, Vena Long

In Vice Chancellor Woods' absence, Dr. Harris mentioned the following items of general interest.

- UTK is closing on its best year ever in terms of new awards for grants and sponsored projects, approximately \$123 million, up from \$109 million in FY 2004
- Funds were requested to support re-instatement of a UTK research magazine, highlighting the research and scholarly achievement of the UTK faculty and students
- Negotiations are complete on a revised F&A Rate for UTK (rates for other campuses are still being negotiated)

Mrs. Mashburn (Office of Federal Relations) reported that the Federal government would be operating on a continuing resolution at least through November and most to Christmas, even beyond. This means no new program starts and a general reticence on the part of agencies to make financial commitments. She also reported that the authorization of the Higher Education Act had been postponed.

Under Old Business, Dr. Handler brought up the long-suffering policy documents on research data and tangible property. RC had ostensibly reviewed and commented on these over the past few years. Dr. Handler wanted to present them at the next Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. [They were so presented and were dismissed as not being responsive to earlier concerns; a new subcommittee will review and outline next steps.] – {This committee will consist of Thomas Handler, Frank Harris, Wayne Davis, Ken Stephenson, and Lou Gross. This committee note was added by Handler on 10/29/05}

Also under old business, Dr. Handler expressed concerns about EPPE that had been relayed to him over the summer. Dr. Harris outlined the way that the OR intended to handle EPPE requests, including some experiments to bring the larger area of requests (art) into the decision process. This 'experiment' will be reviewed during the year.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5 PM.

Research Council Agenda
Sept. 26, 2005

I) Comments from the Chair, Tom Handler

II) Comments from the Research Office

Vice Chancellor Clif Woods
Associate Vice Chancellor Frank Harris
Federal Office - Lillian Mashburn

III) Formation of committees

- A. EPPE
- B. F&A
- C. Strategic Plan
- D. Intellectual Property
- E. SARIF Awards
- F. Chancellor's Awards
- G. Post-Doc Handbook
- H. Center/Institute Reviews

IV) Old Business

A. Research Data Policy and Tangible Research Property Policy –
E-Mail Attachments. Please read them before the meeting so that we can discuss and then vote on them. These have been in the works for 3 years. I would like to present them to the Faculty Senate Executive Council for action so they may be then presented to the full Faculty Senate and have this wrapped up after the next Faculty Senate meeting.

B. EPPE

The Research Council needs to make sure that the EPPE awards guidelines are clear as to the guidelines and requirements. From various discussions, I have had over the summer, it is felt that it would make the process smoother if it was largely handled by the Office of Research. The EPPE committee would get monthly reports as to who has been receiving these funds and for what amounts. The EPPE committee would receive those applications for funds which are problematic (to be defined explicitly) for committee's comments and/or approval/disapproval.

V) New Business

VI) Adjournment

Topics for Research Council - Handout

I. Centers and Institutes

- a. Process needs strengthening
- b. Is a 5 year cycle for review appropriate
 - i. Terminate
 - ii. Probation
 - iii. Continuation
- c. Should there be a yearly report as to
 - i. Income and Monies spent
 - ii. Papers published and/or Talks given
 - iii. Graduate Student Involvement
 - iv. Undergraduate Student Involvement
 - v. Is the Center/Institute still functioning
- d. Is there a methodology for determining if there are common interests across faculty who could benefit from being under the umbrella of a center/institute
- e. Can any of the centers/institutes be combined – especially if they are cross disciplinary
- f. Joint Institutes with ORNL
 - i. Are they set up to benefit UT?
 - ii. Should they over time become strictly UT institutes?
 - iii. Are they properly located so that UT, students and faculty, get the most benefit?
 - iv. Should the Research Council be involved with setting the guidelines for the Joint Institutes?
 - v. How are other universities who are involved in Joint Institutes positioned with regards to these Institutes?

II. Strategic Plan (Research Aspect) – VISION

University Strategic Plan
Colleges
Departments

- a. No clear cut strategic plan with regards to research and graduate students

III. Intellectual Property

- a. Royalty Agreements with companies should not be worded so as to give all the rights to the ideas away but should be worded so as to leave rights with the University so that the rights for mutations of the ideas stay with the University.
- b. Are we set up properly to leverage the Intellectual Property Rights?
- c. What is the exact role of the Research Foundation and are they set up properly with regards to operating budgets and personnel?
- d. 100% of Intellectual Property rights should not be given away by the Principal Investigator.
- e. Equipment that is purchased with UT funds should remain on campus. Otherwise questions concerning the location of Intellectual Property rights might arise – SARIF Equipment purchases

IV. F&A

- a. Colleges function differently. Some return 100% while others much less.
- b. F&A should not be used for operating funds by departments
- c. OMB compliance with regards to F&A
- d. Departments/Pis hurt by grants which severely limit the amount of F&A that can be charged → leading to insufficient funds for infrastructure
- e. F&A returned at various levels should be clearly accounted for. College of Business requires a budget proposal from PIs for the spending of the returned F&A

- V. Cross Disciplinary Research & Degree Programs.
 - a. Research Database with Key Words that is accessible and that can be searched
 - b. Research Office overview – a department within that can spot the development or existence of thematic areas
- VI. Post Doctoral Handbook
 - a. Why is this under the purview of the Graduate Council?
- VII. UT – ORNL Ties
 - a. Joint Institutes Specifically
 - i. Are they structured for UT's Benefit?
 - ii. Location of Institutes
 - iii. Accessibility by UT Students and faculty
 - b. Adjunct Faculty from ORNL
 - i. Is this a way for them to obtain funding from agencies that they would otherwise be ineligible for?