



Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

251 Foust Hall
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859

Phone: (989) 774-ORSP
Fax: (989) 774-3439

Notes from Faculty Advisory Committee Meeting October 28, 2013

Attendees: John McGrath, Kevin Cunningham, Mary Montoye, Ed Simpson, Sivaram Narayan, Steve Roberts, Mary Senter, Adam Epstein, Elina Erzikova, Jamie Johansen, Crina Tarasi, Rachel Caspari, Ksenia Ustinova, Megan Goodwin

Absent: Janet Sturm, Mark Reilly Ed McKee

1. McGrath indicated that the minutes from the September 30, 2013 Faculty Advisory Committee meeting had been distributed. Upon a motion duly made and seconded, the minutes were approved.
2. McGrath reminded everyone that these meetings are scheduled every two weeks and will be cancelled if there are no agenda items. If anyone has agenda items, please forward those to McGrath.
3. McGrath indicated that future discussion items will include the following:
 - review evaluation of ORSP internal programs--what is the best use of future funding? McGrath can share the report and discuss at a future meeting.
 - review royalty distribution for intellectual property--McGrath looked at 8 peer institutions. We can offer a more generous royalty distribution to our faculty. McGrath can share the data for discussion.
 - Faculty/ORSP dialog feedback review from 4 of 7 college's faculty. CHSBS, CST and CBA did not participate.
 - Faculty Advisory Committee recommendation--if any suggestions, let John know
4. The President appointed a strategic planning team led by Claudia Douglass and Barrie Wilkes. They have produced draft metrics. McGrath shared Priority 2 for Research and Creative Activity. These metrics were developed by strategic planning team. McGrath met with co-chairs of the team to discuss the metrics. McGrath had information from 10 peer institutions. Median for external funding for those peers is \$22 million. Deans provided information that suggested \$30 - \$40 million in external funding in five years

but then realized those goals were based on a misunderstanding of the data being requested. Those goals were subsequently changed to \$18 million in external funding over five years. McGrath produced a strategic planning template that provides more detail. Six of the seven deans agreed to use the template. McGrath would like this to be a five year planning process.

Faculty representative indicated that the metrics need to provide clarity on the percent of faculty engaged in research or creative endeavors. Since this is part of the FA, it should be 100%. Questions raised included the following? Why not look at Google impact factor as criteria instead of journal impact factors? Why not offer more incentives to mid-term faculty to continue to be active in research, similar to the programs we have for new faculty? Why not an incentive program based on the submission of grants? Motivating faculty comes back to an evaluation of the internal programs and how should the money be spent? Suggestion was to have a centralized program instead of a department/college program. McGrath thinks cost sharing is important as money goes farther and it shows that the department and colleges have buy in.

5. McGrath discussed issues surrounding the statistical consulting center which was previously housed in CST via the utilization of a ½ time FTE. CST Dean indicated a willingness to transfer the 0.5 FTE support from CST to combine with cost sharing contributions from other interested deans (i.e. CMED, CHP and CEHS) to provide support at the 1.0 FTE level. Due to other initiatives, ORSP was not in a position to take over the management of the center during the 2013 – 14 academic year. Thus, ORSP was not directly involved in the detailed discussions aimed at implementing such support. FAC members offered the following input:

- CBA and CHSBS faculty would benefit from statistical support and wanted their colleges involved in the discussions
- CMU faculty have significant statistical expertise and consideration should be given to using them to provide statistical support
- Should consider a model providing a statistical mentor in each college
- Faculty would welcome research design expertise/consultation support as well
- Consider using statistical software as part of the solution. “R” free software was mentioned
- Roger Rehm should be involved in the discussions

6. McGrath gave an update on the status of the ORSP website re-design. ORSP wants to improve the quality of the website, partially to highlight exciting things that faculty are doing. In addition, ORSP would like to make it a better tool for faculty to obtain information. ORSP wants to know what our current website does well and where people are having problems. Two of the ORSP program officers have been working with UCOMM. They suggested that we have a utilization study targeted at what's working and what's not working. We will send the idea to the FA for information purposes only. There are several areas that we would like faculty input. They want to get together a group including new faculty or staff, experienced faculty, grant active faculty and staff, novice grant seeking faculty, support staff, administrative staff, and undergraduate students. We want one or two people in each of these categories. If you have any suggestions, please send them via e-mail to McGrath. They plan, during the week of December 2, to have the group meet for 2 hours to have them conduct the assessment. This information will then be used in the development of the new website. There was a suggestion to include graduate students as they might have IRB issues, etc.

7. McGrath gave an update on the status of the IRB. HRP is working to customize the CMU SOP's. This should be done end of January 2014. HRP and General Counsel have talked about procedural changes in the SOP's that can be made to speed up the review of IRB protocols. McGrath is working with HRP to try to get a calming message out to the faculty. Most of the non-compliance is defined as technical non-compliance issues like lack of quorum for IRB meetings, etc. that will be reported institutionally to the feds. McGrath would like a message to go out to tell faculty that if they haven't been contacted yet, it's unlikely they will be contacted on a deficiency.
8. The next meeting will be in two weeks.