

**Research Council Meeting
October 9, 2013
Blount Hall
Room A004**

FINAL

Attendees

Christine, Shepardson, Chair	Thomas Handler
Benjamin Auerbach	Sadie Hutson
Matthew Cooper	Ramki Kalyanaraman
Ian Down	Kim Newkirk
Bill Dunne	Stephen Paddison
Taylor Eighmy	Ken Phillips
Martin Griffin	Greg Reed
Joanne Hall	Kenton Yeager

Guest

Carol Malkemus, and Kelly Steele

Remarks by the Chair - Shepardson

Christine Shepardson welcomed everyone and asked them to introduce themselves. Shepardson thanked Lee Han for all the work he did as Chair of the Research Council the past two years to enrich the campus. She mentioned that the Research Council members are from various units on campus including UTSI. Three students from the Graduate Student Council should be identified soon.

The April 10, 2013 minutes were unanimously approved.

The September 11, 2013 minutes were unanimously approved.

Shepardson explained that the Research Council is a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. The Research Council currently consists of 13 senators (may add more), representatives from colleges, Associate Deans, and still missing three graduate students who will be appointed by the Graduate Student Council.

Business

Committee assignments

SARIF Equipment Committee Report by Bill Dunne

The SARIF Equipment Committee

Committee members: Chris Boake, Tina Shepardson, Agricola Odoi, & Ian Down plus Bill Dunne

The Committee divided the requests into those that are more than \$5000 and those that are \$5000 or less (total requests in this category were about 7% of all requests and less than six of the individual large requests).

For the proposals that were more than \$5000, the Committee recommended that 8 of 12 proposals be fully funded, that two be partially funded and two be unfunded for a total of \$263,935 of the requested \$317,545. With respect to the partially funded requests:

- a) The case for the equipment not sufficiently strong and had a modest impact in faculty members.
- b) In the other case, the committee believed that given the number of interested parties, a greater cost share should come from the user base.

With respect to the two proposals that are not recommended for funding, both had very narrow impacts in terms of number of faculty members based on a careful read of the proposals, and the one should have been resolved during negotiations for the startup package (it also did not make a sufficient intellectual case).

For the proposals that are \$5000 or less, we recommended that 7 of 8 be fully funded, and 1 be partially funded for a total of \$20,038 of the requested \$22,438. With respect to the one partially funded proposal, the Committee believed that it is appropriate for some of the Co-PI's and their organizations to cover the difference in funds.

Centers Review Committee Memorandum – Martin Griffin

Martin Griffin is working with Lee Han and Greg Reed preparing a report on recommended procedures for the Centers Review Committee to consider when reviewing center reports. The purpose of the report is to cut down on the committee's work and make it easier. The guidelines will explain what to look for and how to divide up work among the committee. Griffin's report will be a memorandum of understanding between the Research Council and the Office of Research and Engagement on how reports should look.

Reports of other RC committees, as needed

Shepardson plans work with the Bylaws Committee soon.

New Business

Seeking input on: speaker suggestions, faculty research concerns, better communication

Shepardson asked for suggestions on speakers, faculty research concerns that Research Council members are aware of, and suggestions on better communication.

Eighmy will speak at the December or January meeting presenting the Top 25 Strategic Action Plan from Listening Sessions with a list of things that need to be fixed. He would like the Research Council's feedback and collectively try to get things resolved.

Bill Dunne suggested that the Office of Research and Engagement give a presentation at the March meeting regarding the flexibility between the Faculty Development Team (FDT) and the Proposal Development Team (PDT).

E-mail Shepardson with suggestions of speakers.

Shepardson announced that Lee Han will be chairing the November meeting since she will be out of the country.

The Research Council members decided that another day and possibly time should be chosen for the December meeting due to so many conflicts.

Discussion of the UTK/ORNL relationship & Discussion about a possible RC resolution – Tom Handler

Handler discussed the relationship he has observed between UTK and ORNL. Handler suggests that UTK discontinue this relationship. Handler discussed an ORU proposal for “Project X” that was not funded and read a letter from Greg Reed as Associate Vice Chancellor for the Office of Research & Engagement that was addressed to Yuri Kamyshkov and Lawrence Townsend. The letter explained why this particular proposal was not funded which Handler says had nothing to do with the merits of the proposal. Handler claims that the decision to not fund such proposals strikes at academic freedom.

Handler presented a resolution to the Research Council asking them to approve it. The resolution stated “Be it resolved that all University of Tennessee faculty research proposals to the Office of Research or equivalent unit for internal University funds shall be judged strictly on the merits of the proposals. As academic freedom is the utmost importance, be it further resolved that such research proposal evaluations not be done in conjunction with or consideration of any external entities.”

Following was a lengthy decision of this resolution and the ORU guidelines.

Part of the ORU guidelines are: “Proposed new ORUs should present a campus-level funding proposal including how requested funds would be used. Other sources of support should be identified. A review of how these investments can be expected to provide substantial returns over the next two to three years should be provided, including any variables that may influence chances of success.” Handler stressed that UTK is independent and is not a part of ORNL.

Eighmy explained that when the ORU decision was made for Project X, there were other decisions that were made to support advancing Project X (e.g., signing the MOU with FERMILab, providing seed support, providing Research Development Team support to a Project X proposal to NSF). He explained that some of the language in the letter from Reed to Kamyshkov and Townsend was based on background discussions that he had had with ORNL relative to an anticipated request from the applicants to ORNL to receive “Laboratory Directed R&D” funds for Project X. The applicants would then be asking for UTK “Jointly Directed R&D” funds to complement the LDRD funding. He apologized to Handler that this language had been

inadvertently included in the letter from Reed to Kamyshkov and Townsend. He assured Handler that the ORU funding decision was based solely on the internal ORU review process based on recommendations provided by the Research Council-driven peer review. This fact was confirmed by Research Council members in attendance at the meeting who were actually involved in the peer review process. The ORU Review Panel had mixed reviews on this particular proposal. Eighmy then stated that the ORNL relationship is very important to UTK, but that his office was fully supportive of efforts and faculty involving other national labs.

Reed explained that the letter to Kamyshkov and Townsend was not well worded and contained unnecessary background information relative to the ORU funding decision, and he has already apologized to Kamyshkov and Townsend for that. Reed discussed how he had met several months ago with Kamyshkov and Townsend about the "Project X" proposal and worked out another means to financially support this project.

Research Council members decided that they did not want to present the requested resolution from Handler to the Faculty Senate. Handler may present the resolution to the Faculty Senate as a Research Council member or draft a new resolution for the Research Council to consider at the November meeting. The review process of the ORU proposals is one that the Research Council participates as reviewers.

Update from Taylor Eighmy

Ending FY13 with \$110M in new federal awards – down 2 ½% from last year. This percentage is lower than other universities because we do not totally rely on a particular agency.

1st Quarter this year proposals are up 46% and awards are up 3%. We do not expect 2nd quarter numbers to look as good due to the shutdown.

Bad news – since the government budget shut down, a stop has been put on work orders and some had graduate students on them. Graduate students have been put on other projects so they will continue to receive funding.

Eighmy discussed that ORE will float money during this period and doesn't mind you spending money that has already been awarded. New awards are held up.

Eighmy announced that a letter will be coming out soon announcing the JDRD process.

Meeting was adjourned.

Minutes taken by Jane Taylor