The Advisory Committee to the Vice President for Research (AC/VPR)  

Summary of the  

General AC/VPR  

Meeting  

November 21, 2011 from 3-5 pm  

University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus

Members Present: Michael Ashby, Eve Bannet, Heather Basara, Fred Carr, David Craig, Chitru Fernando, Pat Hardre, James Patterson, George Richter-Addo, Ed Sankowski, David Stensrud

VPR Office Present: Kelvin Droegemeier, Andrea Deaton, Melany Dickens, Morris Foster, James Grimsley, Alicia Knoedler, Cathi Parker

Distributed Documents:
1. Thematic Mapping (Computer Science, Anthropology, History) (hardcopy)
2. CARD Decision Matrix for Engagement (hardcopy)
3. Policy on Internal Consulting-CARD (hardcopy)
5. Recommendations for a Research Incentives and Rewards Program on the Norman Campus (hardcopy)

VPR Update: Dr. Droegemeier welcomed everyone to the meeting and began with a brief overview of topics impacting the VPR Office.

- State and Federal Budgets
  - Dr. Droegemeier mentioned recent new grants including the $10.7 million I-ARPA and $27 million K20 Center grants.
  - 2011 expenditures are close to last year and projections are ahead of last year at this time. The VPR Office will again hold back $500,000 in SRI to continue pay down of VPR debt.
  - Has SRI stayed the same and with the expectation of “holding back”, are there any major changes expected in SRI in the next few years? Dr. Droegemeier stated that SRI was $200,000 greater than last year and that major changes are not expected in the next 2-3 years. It was stated that departments are fortunate to maintain funding during a very tough time.
  - Dr. Droegemeier commented that state budgets are looking up and referenced President Boren’s recent memo. Federal budgets are looking better than expected but FY13 is expected to be tough financially.

- A-21 Task Force Update
  - Dr. Droegemeier gave a brief explanation of the A-21 Task Force. Time and effort reporting is likely to be eliminated in favor of a simpler system. Efforts are underway to take the burden off of universities in regards to cost-sharing.

- Research Council update
  - Updates are now posted on the VPR website with changes effective January 1, 2012. Dr. Droegemeier thanked the many people that contributed to the discussion of the new policies.
• Leadership Academy
  o Dr. Droegemeier plans to produce a one-page write-up regarding a Leadership Academy. The goal is to help faculty develop leadership skills. What is the meaning of “leadership”? Knowing how to chart a course when none exists.
  o Discussion ensued. What mechanism is used to identify priorities?
    Botany/Microbiology has been successful with this. The VPR Office has folks in a position to see the “big picture” and determine priorities and it is expected that the AC/VPR Committee will play a big role in this process. It was suggested that we involve the Graduate College and strive to get students to “think Research”. This was mentioned by the ASPIRE 2020 action teams along with the need to engage undergraduate students more. How often do departments talk to other departments?

• Research Incentives
  o Dr. Foster presented handouts and gave a brief overview of the recommendations for a Research Incentives and Rewards Program. The next step is to discuss implementation in conjunction with Faculty Senate and other interested parties.
    Dr. Droegemeier commented that there is real support to implement these changes. The first faculty member to get an IGERT proposal will receive a $10,000 bonus. Possible questions are “Why do we have to incentivize research, as taxpayers, if we are already paying faculty a salary?” and “are across-the-board raises an effective tool?”

• Other
  o Dr. Droegemeier stated that priorities for the next several years in the VPR Office are CARD, CRPDE, DSI, and large center-type initiatives. After “building the car”, now we need to start winning some races. He will attend the Deans’ Meeting on 12/7 and discuss a 2nd Pillar.
  o Undergraduate Research: Dr. Droegemeier, Joy Pendley, and David Ray will meet soon to discuss this topic.
  o An effort will be launched soon to support the nomination of faculty for national awards such as the National Medal of Science which is important for entry into the AAU.

CRPDE Update: Dr. Knoedler gave a brief update on CRPDE.

• Thematic Mapping
  o Dr. Devino provided handouts on thematic mapping for Computer Science, Anthropology, and History. Moving forward the plan is to work with others to define the data and transform it into “visual” form. There are a number of different challenges including maintenance of a database and updates of faculty profiles. Dr. Droegemeier stated that this was not an easy task. He brought this before ORAU and they are very interested in how we’ll accomplish mapping, challenges with terminology, etc. It took several passes to get it right. It will take awhile before we have a product and questions remain of who does what on this project.
  o It was mentioned that key faculty are missing and questioned whether this was a “living” document? Dr. Droegemeier answered that Research Liaisons should
have provided correct information and Dr. Knoedler noted that departments may have made a conscious decision to leave off names.

- **New Programs**
  - Dr. Knoedler talked about new programs such as INSPIRE, CREATIV with information listed on the CRPDE website. She attended the EPSCoR Track I Workshop and a theme needs to be decided. The current theme is “Biofuels”. What happens to the Biofuel area? Does it work on its own? Dr. Droegemeier commented that the seed is planted and then they’re on their own to continue.
  - Following from ASPIRE 2020, there are plans, spearheaded by Todd Fuller, to rejuvenate the Arts & Humanities working group.

- **Faculty Mixer**
  - The inaugural Faculty Mixer is tentatively scheduled for January 20 at 4:30-6:30 p.m. with a formal invitation to be sent out soon. Goals are to help faculty make connections among departments and after the first one is held hope is that faculty will take over the continuation. Dr. Knoedler would like feedback regarding the mixer. Will this fall flat?
  - Questions were raised whether faculty will talk to others or break off into their familiar groups? It was suggested that they be modeled after the President’s Associate Dinners theme-wise or an open house like the College of Education does and it was noted that some colleges already do this.

**CARD Update**: Mr. Grimsley provided handouts and gave a brief update of projects.

- **Advisory committee, criteria matrix, etc.**
  - Mr. Grimsley has met with most colleges and began working with individual faculty with plans to foster collaboration between CRPDE and CARD.
  - A selection matrix was created to help guide the decision for project engagement within CARD. The matrix contains 13 questions, will force discussion and won’t be “scored”.
  - CARD has a “do no harm” mission and plans to set up an advisory committee. They will not focus on Engineering only and are beginning to map out themes, filter and identify matches. Lots of great discussions with Architecture and Journalism have ensued.

**CARD APS**: Dr. Droegemeier provided handouts for the Policy on Internal Consulting-CARD and A Concept for Applied Program Support-CARD.

- **Discussion ensued regarding the handouts.**
  - Branding to be used, span several disciplines within consulting pool. Suppose the Policy on Internal Consulting-CARD becomes a policy OU-wide instead of just CARD? We have to follow A-21 guidelines with a system set up of checks and balances.
  - Dr. Droegemeier stated that we are proposing a new construct, known as Applied Program Support (APS), which is similar to SRI but would be applicable only to activities associated with CARD, i.e., only projects that are of an applied R&D nature and approved for inclusion in CARD.
- Concerns were raised about the percentage of funding taken out for consulting. Ms. Deaton stated that consulting arrangements that would come through OU would be charged full IDC.
- Will consulting rates be determined by salary? The department chairs have not seen the proposed plan. We will have to have uniformity. Will dollars go to PI instead of department? How will PIs with split appointments be handled?
  Someone has to “own” the project. Splits are done by percentage on the pink sheet. Is notion of “PI” still valid? What is the department going to use this money for? What is their involvement?

**Next Meeting:** Date TBD, Charlie Conference Room.