COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
November 9, 2005
325 Burruss Hall
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.


Others: R. Farley

1. Approval of Agenda: Agenda was approved

2. Approval of Minutes of, October 5, 2005: Minutes were approved as written.

3. Committee Tasks for 2005-2006: The committee has discussed addressing the following topics during AY 2005-06: 1) adequacy of research space; 2) approval of IBPHS and ICTAS charters; 3) center reviews – reexamine procedures; selected center reviews; how reviews are done; and 4) completion of revision and consolidation of policies on centers; 5) grievances; 6) conflict of interest/conflict of commitment; 7) incentives to faculty for research productivity (along the model of continuing education); and 8) consulting practices and outreach to attract top-notch faculty.

There was consensus that the business of the previous year should be completed before any new tasks are started. It was determined that the ICTAS/IBPHS charter approval should be the first priority.

Mr. Hall noted that the ICTAS reporting structure had been altered since the fall when a draft of the charter was presented to the Commission on Research and that the institute was no longer being considered a university center since it reports directly to the dean of engineering.

After discussion, the following motion was passed unanimously:

*The chairman of the Commission on Research shall meet with the Provost as soon as possible to determine the reporting structure of ICTAS and IBPHS and to determine the Commission’s purview in regard to these university-level institutes. If it is determined that the Commission on Research does have oversight responsibility, the institute directors should present their revised charters at the December meeting of the COR.*
4. **Proposal Signature Policy:** The acting Chair read an e-mail note from Professor Jack Lesko complaining that the signature policy enacted by the Research Division in April of 2005 is not being followed. (The key element of the approved policy is that the only two signatures required on a proposal approval form are those of the principal investigator and the dean or his or her designee. See policy OVPR-02-05). He cited a frustrating example of having to get all department head signatures on a large proposal he submitted the previous month. Dean Nessler informed the Commission that the Colleges had unanimously rejected implementation of the OVPR policy. He said that it was his understanding that each College now had a second form that supplemented the OSP proposal approval form to signify department head consent to the proposal submission. After discussion, the Commission took no action. The acting Chair agreed to notify Professor Lesko of the results of the Commission’s discussions.

In discussing the policy, it was noted that OSP management is taking actions to try to better retain its employees. The Commission noted its support of taking whatever action necessary to improve the ability of the office of sponsored programs to support the needs of the faculty researchers.

5. **Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 4:30PM.