

**Minutes of the Academic Senate Research Committee  
15 February 2011**

Present: Cinabro, Avrutsky, Biswas, Gretebeck, Kreipke, Lanza, MacArthur, Mordukhovich, Stemmler, Thomas, Wang, Wildman, Wurm, Dunbar

Absent with Notice: Benkert, Whittum-Hudson

Guests: Dean Wardell, Jon McGlone

We approved the minutes from the previous meeting with minor changes. The chair noted that the change on the policy on Restricted Research as we suggested at our last meeting was adopted by the Policy Committee and communicated to the Vice President for Research. She is moving to implement the policy based on the broad agreement. The Dean of CLAS did send in response to the Provost a list of suggestions on research incentives.

We began with Dean Wardell who shared with us a draft of a Compact between graduate mentors and mentees. The format is a bunch of bullet points and a few paragraphs of introduction and concluding material. The idea is for this to be a template which graduate programs could pick from, edit, add to and/or subtract from to produce a customized Compact for their own unique discipline. The draft was crafted by the dean and reviewed by a couple of graduate school committees. Basically it is meant to make clear the responsibilities an adviser has to students and vice versa. It covers not only authorship/publication issues, but also almost all other aspects of the mentor/mentee relationship that are normally not discussed openly. The Dean suggested that going over this would be an opportunity for mentors and mentees to have a meaningful discussion about their relationship and reduce the possibility of future misunderstandings. Dean Wardell plans to get response to this draft from the Policy and Faculty Affairs Committee before bringing it to the graduate programs. He hopes to do this by the end of the school year, thus programs would have the summer and fall to create their own versions and such Compacts would be in place by the end of 2011. The committee was supportive of the specifics of the draft and the implementation plan the Dean out-lined.

We next took up the move of the Computer Science Department(CS) from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences(CLAS) to the College of Engineering (COE). Ivan provided some context to the report from the COE Executive Committee, which was shared with us. The largest bunch of COE faculty, 44/95, expressed no opinion on the move. CS will not physically move, and we are told that it will be moved as a unit retaining the resources it used to have while in CLAS. The next largest fraction, 33/95, of the faculty were in favor noting that the COE would be strengthened by the additional faculty from CS and the expectation that there would no negatives. Another group, 16/95, unanimously from Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, expressed no opinion as they thought more information is needed. They asked about the CS budget, differences between the COE and CS within CLAS curriculum, whether this move was in anyone's plan before it was suggested, whether changes are needed to the COE by-laws, would there be impact on the already over burdened research support staff within COE, how new lines in the COE would be apportioned, and the role and impact of the move on CLAS. Basically they were concerned about the lack of implementation details.

Christian echoed this based on notes he took at the Open Forum on the move of CS that he attended, and shared with all of us. While there were strong expressions of support for the move, many basic questions were raised for which there were no answers. Among many those that specifically had to do with research were how support for research including disposition of

indirect costs would change, and whether there were differences between research expectations in the Promotion and Tenure process between CLAS and COE.

The committee does not oppose the proposed move of CS, but we are disturbed that some basic details seem to have not been thought about. We thought that most of these could be easily dealt with, but are further disturbed that the short time frame, 7 March is mentioned as a date that a final decision will be made, leaves very little time for discussion and fact finding. It could be true that the impact of this move could be quite small and will be barely noticed, but when some basic questions cannot be answered it seems clear that not enough thought has been given to some of the consequences of moving CS. Specifically the Research Committee recommends that before the decision on the transfer is made documented information is presented to explain how the resources that support and are generated by CS research will be redistributed among CLAS and COE, and how differences between research expectations, if there are any, will be handled for CS faculty currently being considered for promotion and tenure.

The committee chair will draft a note to the Policy Committee stating the above and send it for committee review within the next few days.

Jon McGlone joined us and told us about new NIH requirements having to do with public availability of published results of NIH funded research. Basically published results also have to be placed on PubMed Central which is like a pre-print archive. Many journals handle this automatically. They will take the final manuscript, not the published version to which they typically hold the copyright, and submit it after some time, usually six months, to PubMed Central. A few do not, and it is the PI's responsibility to get the published results to PubMed Central within one year of publication date. Jon shared with us many resources to help explain and tools to help make the process easier.