University Research Council
Approved Minutes
November 19, 2010

Present: Jeffrey Arterburn, Derek Bailey, Susan Beck, Joseph Berning, Wanda Borges, Vimal Chaitanya, Phillip DeLeon, Pierre Orelus, Meghan Starbuck, Steve Stochaj, Enedina Vazquez, Patricia Wojahn, Karl Wood, Jack Wright, Michael Young

Absent: Katherine Giles, Shanna Ivey, Kevin Melendrez, Curtis Monger, Collin Payne, Igor Sevostianov

Guest: Norice Lee (Library)

1. Minutes from October 15, 2010 were approved by adding Derek Bailey who had attended but was noted as absent.

2. Inter-Library Loan – Susan Beck and Norice Lee

    At the URC meeting held in October, Jeff Arterburn who serves on the Research Processes Issues (RPI) committee suggested that "delays with inter-library loans" should be considered for inclusion on the issues list. Dr. Arterburn contacted the library and provided URC with a summarization. Library representative Susan Beck invited Norice Lee to visit URC.

    Department Head for Library Access Services, Ms. Lee thanked URC for inviting her to speak about inter-library loans. She said the library has had increases in turn-around time but there are many factors involved. They can track the turn-around time using the ILLiad system which tracks year-round. She looked at November 1st through November 18th, the tail end of a peak period. The time of the semester can skew the turn-around time.

    Articles (what researchers are most interested in) have an average turn-around of 7.35 days which come via email PDF attachment. For books (and returnable items) it is 13.3 days which come through the mail or courier. After adjusting for outliers, the turn-around time is 4.31 days for articles and 11.35 for books. Since 2007 it has been difficult for the Library to do system maintenance due to reduction in staff, so Ms. Lee went back 5 years to when they were able to do that maintenance and the amount of time hasn't really changed. She said the busiest time in the semester is October.

    Dr. Arterburn added that peak times also happen during grant submissions times which are October, February and June. He mentioned a scenario where a researcher waited three weeks to receive an article that he needed in order to submit a proposal. Ms. Lee said that the library might have difficulty locating the article or background work to verify a citation. If there is urgency relating to a request(s), such as a grant deadline, it is always recommended that the requestor inserts a note in the request form, but preferably contacts the ILL Unit Head and/or Dept. Head to see if requests can be streamlined.

Ms. Lee was asked to describe the article request process on the ILL side from start to finish. She said all borrowing requests come in through the ILLiad portal and are queued for processing. Staff members verify each request to determine whether or not it's owned by our library. If not owned, it moves on to the copyright clearance queue. Any needed permission fees are compared with the cost of purchasing the article directly from a document delivery supplier (if available). Although document delivery is the "faster" option, in most cases the library chooses the most cost effective route, since it absorbs all interlibrary loan and document delivery costs. If an article is not purchased through document delivery, it is routed within ILLiad to interlibrary loan, at which time they proceed with identifying owning libraries. Up to five libraries can be entered into the e-workform that is ultimately sent out to other libraries in order to obtain the article. Each potential lending library has three days to fill the request, or it bounces to the next library. If in electronic format, the lending library's license terms will dictate how they can deliver the article to us. If in print format, they will typically scan and deliver it to us. In either case, however, it could still come through the mail. Sometimes the request will come back unfilled, due to a variety of reasons, and then the library will have to re-verify, resubmit, etc., to other libraries. Once ILL receives the article (whether in print or electronic format), it has its own scanning, posting, and notification processes to complete before it is accessible to the requester. Ideally, obtaining an article is a very fast process, but based on all of the steps described, there may be a number of snags that would result in delays--some of which are controllable and some are not. The library is considering joining a consortium to get better access to articles. Ms. Lee mentioned GWLA (Great Western Library Alliance) which would allow the researchers to collections with a 36 hour turn-around.

Wanda Borges suggested that URC write a letter of support stating that NMSU should join GWLA. Karl Wood made the motion that the letter should be written by Susan Beck and it was seconded by Wanda Borges. A draft letter will be provided to URC at the next meeting.

3. NMSU Research: Accomplishments, Challenges, and Future Directions

   Vimal Chaitanya presented URC with the Board of Regent's annual research presentation that the VPR provides every October. It included strategic accomplishments, comparison of submissions, awards, and expenditures by year; and research expenditures of major units from FY 2000-2010. The presentation also listed opportunities, challenges, visibility, and impact.

   Dr. Chaitanya said with regard to the total awards received reaching $198M (up from $154M last year) that NMSU should recognize the major effort being put forward by our research faculty. He said that for the past several years, student enrollment, number of degree programs, and course offerings have all increased substantially; however faculty lines have remained the same.

   He also told URC about an analysis that Jim Peach conducted on how research and development affected the economy. According to the model and software Dr. Peach used, NMSU research created the following:

Impact Summary	2010 Research Expenditures NMSU			
ImpactType	Employment	Labor Income	Value Added	Output
Direct Effect	1,140	$97,970,224	$86,140,984	$163,075,622
Indirect Effect	431	$16,662,333	$26,404,665	$48,438,880
Induced Effect	712	$23,582,234	$44,575,025	$76,604,535
Total Effect	2,283	$138,214,790	$157,120,674	$288,119,038
Computed using IMPLAN PRO Version 3				

Source: Arrowhead Center, Office of Policy Analysis, October 2010

Dr. Chaitanya mentioned that President Couture has requested one or two top research faculty provide a brief summary of special projects to the Regents at board meetings. Also planned are research media events to help celebrate major research accomplishments that bring in over a million or so in funding that are in the University's strategic areas.
Dr. Chaitanya plans on holding several events with the first taking place December 3rd to celebrate "Algal Fuel for Aviation" awarded by the Air Force Research Laboratory. More information on this will be announced as it becomes available.

4. Internal Grant Opportunities Funded by VPR

Graduate Research Enhancement Grant (GREG) was announced for Spring semester funding. This is intended to attract and retain outstanding graduate students at NMSU. Another call will go out mid-Spring for Fall semester funding.

Interdisciplinary Research Grants (IRG) was announced and has a deadline for submission of December 13, 2010. The start date for funding is Spring 2011. Another call will be announced in the Spring semester with a mid-March submission deadline.

The Rising Star Award which was requested by URC to the VPR to fund soft-sciences, will be announced in January. Vice President Chaitanya said that he will raise the award amount from $3,000 to $5,000.

5. Update on Subcommittee Conducting GAP Analysis on ARGIS & COGNOS

At the URC meeting in October, Chair DeLeon suggested a subcommittee be formed to conduct a GAP analysis on ARGIS and COGNOS. Meghan Starbuck, Patti Wojahn and Shanna Ivey volunteered to support this and Bill Harty agreed to work with them to provide needed information. Meghan Starbuck updated URC saying that Shanna Ivey, Bill Harty, Cherri Lambeth and she had met and put together a plan on the GAP analysis. They looked at the reports from both software systems with a P.I.'s perspective. What reports are needed, how long it takes to run the reports, and what is missing for both. Attention will be given to encumbrance issues, spend rates, and other issues. Shanna Ivey has an account where they can pull the data and Bill Harty will put the information into ARGIS from Banner, run the report, and then do a side-by-side comparison of the two systems. Dr. Starbuck is hoping to have this information ready for a near future meeting.

6. Update on Provost Wilkins/International Recruitment Meeting

   Draft notes from the international recruitment/credential evaluation meeting with Provost Wilkins were provided to URC. Some discussion commenced and comments made included:

   - Disappointment that the decision was to "try it" for a year and see what the numbers reveal even though some programs might be hurt
   - URC should find out why administration is mandating the records be evaluated
   - The impact of the transcript evaluation is being felt with departments feeling the loss
   - Applications counted by a department indicate the figures provided by Student Success/Admissions seem to be distorted

   Steve Stochaj volunteered to draft a letter using support from Phillip De Leon's letter to the Academic Deans for URC to consider.

Minutes by Frances Schumacher