Welcome by the Chair – Ramki Kalyanaraman
Ramki Kalyanaraman thanked everyone for coming to today’s meeting. A quorum of faculty senators was established.

Vote on approval of minutes for September
Ramki Kalyanaraman presented the 9 September 2015 minutes for approval. No amendments were presented. Senators Steadman and Hutson first and seconded the motion to approve the minutes, and the vote was unanimous to approve the minutes.

Presentation on biological safety at UT – Brian Ranger, Biological Safety Program
Brian Ranger, biological safety officer for the University of Tennessee Biological Safety Program, gave a presentation entitled, “UT biosafety program. Policy Development: purpose, scope, and applicability.” He provided an overview of the history of the development of the biological safety program at UT. A biological safety committee was formed in 1970s at the university to comply with NIH guidelines developed at that time concerning recombinant DNA. The UT Biosafety Office was established in 2004, and now follows and enforces OSHA, USDA, FDA, EPS, and NIH regulations. The structure of the current office was explained, and the role of the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) was presented. The IBC oversees plant & animal pathogens, agents that have a bioactive potential, toxic plants, venomous animals, and select agents (though no lab at UT uses these yet). The last IBC charter revision was made in 2010 to meet NIH guidelines. New guidelines are under review for the IBC, which changes the charter into bylaws that govern the roles and responsibilities of the Biological Safety Office. These include setting up a revised framework for interacting with teaching labs (monitoring of teaching labs was discontinued in 2005), and a new task force to assess the status and needs of lab-based classrooms. Brian encouraged all PIs and lab personnel to contact and work with the Biological Safety Office to ensure that best practices are followed. Discussion following the talk was concerned with: the identity of biosafety coordinators for the classroom labs; the communication to students & faculty/staff their rights
to request medical interventions to mitigate biological hazards; and funding for safety equipment. Brian requested RC members submit feedback on the new committee guidelines no later than 30 October.

Presentation on community engagement and outreach – Elizabeth Burman (ORE)
Elizabeth Burman, Director of the Office of Community Engagement and Outreach (OCEO), presented an update on research and outreach in a talk entitled, “Community Engagement and Research Partnerships.” She noted that the OCEO is looking for research partnerships with PIs across UT to promote further engagement and outreach, and reminded the audience that the activities of her office were part of the application that made UT a Carnegie Engaged University. This designation provides a number of benefits: it increases research grants & awards to the institution; it helps retain high quality faculty and students; in better connects UT to the local and state communities; it aids in data collection for assessment; and it leverages service learning courses. Outreach and engagement were explained to be essential in obviating feelings in the community about the university being elitist and irrelevant to the community, and establishes reciprocity with the community. Partnerships were emphasized over a one-way flow of information. She discussed strategies for overcoming obstacles to engaging in community involvement, including building collaborative networks, looking for mutual benefits to projects, developing inter-institutional relationships, and revising institutional policies at UT to make the development of partnerships easier. The OCEO exists to facilitate these connections. Discussion focused on concerns about the use of outreach and engagement in faculty performance assessment. Outcomes of faculty outreach must include successful scholarship and cannot be pure philanthropy. In the case of tenure and promotion, the setting of standards to measure outreach and engagement is a serious concern for the university, though currently it will need to be determined at the departmental level and defined in departmental bylaws.

Business
SARIF Committee – Bill Dunne
Bill thanked the committee (George Siopsis, Chris Boake, Qiang He) and Jane Taylor. The large equipment SARIF proposals were reviewed.
- 21 proposals were submitted, and the total amount of money requested was $460,000
- $300,000 in total funds were available
- Requests ranged between $1,000 and $68,000 in their budgets
- Matching funds are encouraged
- Scores were assigned to each proposal based on attributes of the projects
- 14 proposals were recommended for funding, and have been sent as advice to Janet Nelson for final approvals

Centers Review Committee – Matthew Cooper & Rebecca Klenk
- Five center reviews are due in the fall of 2015
- The committee held an initial meeting on 7 October to designate members to head each review and to set a schedule for reviews
- Discussion was held briefly to discuss the importance of continuing to perform center reviews. Several RC members suggested that ORE staff and the Center Review committee discuss strategies for streamlining and clarifying the review process.

RC Chair Update – Ramki Kalyanaraman
- The new research misconduct policy feedback has been submitted to be reviewed in the final formulation of the policy
Robert Nobles will be reviewing new plagiarism software on a committee; Dr. Islam (not an RC member) will be serving as faculty representative
- RC members were reminded to submit the names of new meeting speakers

New Business
No new business was presented for discussion.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes were taken by Benjamin Auerbach and Matthew Cooper