

**University Research Council**  
**Approved Minutes**  
**November 9, 2012**

**Present:** Rani Alexander, Jeffrey Arterburn, Salim Bawazir, Susan Beck, Vimal Chaitanya, Rebecca Creamer, Muhammad Dawood, Alexander “Sam” Fernald, Richard Fortin, Kathleen Huttlinger, Shanna Ivey, Collin Payne, Robert Smits, Steve Stochaj

**Absent:** Joanne Esparza, O.D. Hadfield, Stephen Hanson, Cathy Kinzer, James Robinson, Laura Thompson

**Guest:** Kristian Chervenock

1. Approval of Minutes for October 12, 2012

Minutes were approved as presented.

2. International Travel – Kristian Chervenock

Director for Study Abroad, Kristian Chervenock spoke to URC about the NMSU policy and approval process for international travel. This process was set up, with safety in mind, for any faculty members, students or staff who were traveling abroad especially to any country listed on the Department of State’s website with a travel warning. Mr. Chervenock said Associate Provost for International and Border Programs, Dr. Cornell Menking, will be reviewing the current travel policy in collaboration with the Risk, Security and Assessment Committee, to see if the policy should be revised to honor travel advisories where particular regions/areas are deemed unsafe for travel rather than the current blanket policy that restricts any student travel to countries on the Department of State Travel Warning List.

3. Inviting Interim President Pacheco to URC

The President’s office suggested that the URC meeting date best for President Pacheco would be April 12, 2013 following the legislative session unless a special meeting date is preferred or the President becomes available on a Friday during session. It was mentioned that President Pacheco has met with Faculty Senate. VPR Chaitanya suggested that URC should prepare for the visit by creating a presentation that lists faculty researcher’s suggestions and concerns, both positive and negative.

Discussion commenced regarding potential topics which include the status of research, research processes, what to do to get research processes back on track, and the drop in research faculty causing research numbers to fall. VPR Chaitanya said he was told that faculty numbers have not dropped, but that the P.I.’s writing proposals have, which may be one reason why the research numbers are falling. He also believes that faculty incentives and ease of processes has affected the falling numbers. Chair Ivey said the USDA just sent out a RFA so for the year 2012, no USDA opportunity to propose existed. Jeff Arterburn said NSF has programs changing as well with some having only once a year submission.

VPR Chaitanya sees several challenges for faculty researchers including incentives, and secondly, processes make it challenging when it comes to management of their grants and contracts. Chair Ivey told URC that the Council of Associate Deans for Research (CADRe) will be composing a white paper on faculty incentives. Sam Fernald suggested that the research deans could use faculty feedback by consulting with URC. VPR Chaitanya suggested if URC agrees, that Chair Ivey and Dr. Fernald both being on CADRe by their position appointment, assist with this project. Dr. Arterburn had four suggestions to be included on this white paper which include:

- a mechanism to enhance a P.I.'s salary associated with each funded grant as an administrative appointment/supplement. For example a P.I. with a funded grant >\$100K direct annual costs could receive an annual enhancement of \$5000 (for example) in their salary for the duration of the funded project period;
- salary release time, can be either during the academic year with course buy-out, or during the summer with funds going into an account for the P.I.'s discretion for which he can pay himself or hire research support;
- some control of a portion of the F&A costs should come back to the P.I. for expenditures that are associated with indirect costs, set up with an index to be used at the P.I.'s discretion;
- when dealing with a large multi-disciplinary/multi-institutional grant, special negotiations of institutional support should include a hotline to the Provost to assist in arranging this.

VPR Chaitanya responded saying he has shared a simple plan with the President, Provost, and CADRe which included a salary enhancement. The salary release time funds, stay with the department, then they can reward you. He agreed that some portion of the F&A should come back to the researcher as was the case at University of Central Florida where the P.I. received 10% before the college and administration received theirs. He also suggested for a salary incentive, that the amount of overhead that goes to each college be determined, and then the Provost or President decide how many faculty members can receive a research incentive award per college according to the funding brought in. The deans of each college could select a committee of peers to review and select the members to receive this incentive award. The amount would be added to the base salary permanently.

Dr. Arterburn said his preference would be to receive an administrative supplement associated with the funded grant in recognition of the additional effort required for reporting and administering the grants. He agreed that the incentive award would be appreciated as well but he felt that the grants administrative supplement would encourage more proposals to be submitted. VPR Chaitanya suggested seeing how peer institutions are handling this so that there is supporting information when the incentive paper is written.

Chair Ivey suggested these ideas be summarized and submitted to CADRe for support in their researcher incentive white paper. *This topic will be an action item at the next meeting.*

#### 4. Following up on Research Processes Issues Committee

Chair Ivey said two or more volunteers are needed to work on the Research Processes Issues Committee. Along the same lines was the call sent to URC asking for volunteers to work on the Administration and Finance subcommittees for their strategic plan. Chair Ivey asked if anyone had volunteered. She said many issues in the interview strongly pertained to the research processes issues as well. She said VPR Chaitanya is requesting volunteers to work on both so

there is no overlap or redundancy. It was noted that at the last URC meeting, Joanne Esparza had volunteered as the Physical Science Laboratory (PSL) representative. Past Chair Steve Stochaj volunteered as well. Chair Ivey said this is a good way to potentially influence processes and be a part of improving them for researchers. Dr. Stochaj gave a brief summary of the Research Processes Issues Committee to update new-term members. Chair Ivey said the easy fixes were what they tried to address; however the larger issues were put aside because Administration and Finance needed to study them. URC volunteers will be working closely with VPR Chaitanya to help resolve. With the current interim administration willing to support researchers, a window of opportunity is open to try and change these processes that impede research.

5. Special Researchers' Time During President Interviews

Chair Ivey pointed out the Presidential Search Listening Sessions and encouraged everyone to attend.

6. Chair Elect Discussion

Tabled topic to appear on the December agenda.

Minutes by Frances Schumacher