

**FINAL REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
FOR FY-09**

Submitted by Hume A. Feldman, Physics & Astronomy

As Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC), I have summarized below the committee's action regarding charges for the year 2008-2009. Members of the committee this year included:

Chair: Hume Feldman, Physics & Astronomy (2009)
Townsend Peterson, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology (2011)
Ric Steele, Applied Behavioral Science, (2011)
Lorie Vanchena, , Germanic Languages/Literatures (2011)
Ivana Radovanovic, Ivana, Anthropology (2011)
Steven Maynard-Moody, Political Science (2009)
Ron Barrett-Gonzalez, Aerospace Eng. (2009)
Jonathan Clark, History (2009)
Jennifer Church-Duran, Libraries (2009)
Bozenna Pasik-Duncan, Math (2009)
Jill Kuhnheim, Spanish (2010)
Raj Srivastava, Business, (2010)
Steve Warren, Interim Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies
TBD, Graduate Student Representative
TBD, Representative from KU Medical Ctr (KC campus)
Ex-officio: Josh Rosenbloom, Associate Vice Provost, KUCR
Bill Sharp, Director, Research Integrity, KUCR

The members were assigned to memberships in subcommittees

1. GRF Subcommittee (Charge #1 #5 & Specific #1, #2, #3)
Ron Barrett-Gonzalez, Aerospace Eng. (Chair)
Jill Kuhnheim, Spanish
Raj Srivastava, Business
Steve Warren, Interim Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies
2. Restricted Research & Pre-Proposal Subcommittee (Charges #2 & #3)
Steven Maynard-Moody, Political Science (Chair)
Ivana Radovanovic, Anthropology
3. ACTC Subcommittee (Charge #4)
Bozenna Pasik-Duncan, Math (Chair)
Jennifer Church-Duran, Libraries
4. Initiative 2015 (Specific Charge #5)
Mary Lynn Hamilton, C&T (Chair)
Lorie Vanchena, Germanic Languages/Literatures
- Open Access Subcommittee (Specific charge # 4)
Townsend Peterson, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology (Chair)
Ric Steele, Applied Behavioral Science
Jennifer Church-Duran, Libraries

CHARGES TO THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE FOR FY-09

STANDING CHARGES

1. Monitor the administration of the General Research Fund (GRF) and make recommendations, as needed, to ensure its effectiveness and appropriate utilization. Specifically, the committee should:

- a. Update the list of the GRF recipients for the previous spring and ensure it is posted to the Research Website. For each GRF award, this list should include the name and affiliation of the project director and the title of the project, the award amount, and the date of the most recent previous award, and accomplishments stemming from GRF funding.
- b. Review and clarify 1) general policies related to GRF, 2) GRF reporting requirements, 3) the composition of committees that evaluate GRF proposals, and, where necessary, 4) the policies of specific entities and units related to the GRF fund, and 5) clarify the amount and percentage of total GRF funds that are distributed as faculty awards.
- c. Identify issues with general GRF policies, forward suggested modification of policies to FacEx, and seek Faculty Senate endorsement for proposed changes to these policies.
- d. Identify issues with the GRF policies of specific entities and units and communicate the need for changes in the policies to those units.

Report to FacEx concerning actions taken in respect of this charge by April 1, 2009.

2. Monitor the implementation of the University's policy on Restricted Research (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX), including policies and procedures for handling requests for exceptions.

- a. Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.
- b. Maintain a current record, open for review, of the review actions taken by the Restricted Research Committee and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research.
- c. Include in the final report a listing of each restrictive grant or contract considered during the year, containing (1) the title of the project; (2) the name of principal investigator or project director; (3) the source or sources of funds for support; (4) approval or disapproval by the Restricted Research Committee; and (5) a brief statement of the reasons for the approval or disapproval.

3. Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited. Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

4. Work with ACTC and consider needs for and issues with research to computing and telecommunications, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures. Monitor the implementation of the recommendations made by the Task Force on Research Computing. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx by April 1, 2009.

5. Continue consulting with KUCR on the modification and adaptation of the online database for reporting (and compiling) the outcomes of GRF awards. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx by November 1, 2009.

SPECIFIC CHARGES

1. Conduct a comprehensive third-year review of the effective use of GRF funds and accomplishments made by each unit/entity on campus during. Make recommendations for reallocation of GRF funds as necessary. Report findings and recommendations to FacEx by March 17, 2009. (The report from the FY 06 review may be found on the governance web site at <http://www2.ku.edu/~unigov/research06FP.html>).
2. In relation to standing charge 1c and specific charge 1, above, review the current policies for allocation of GRF funds among units and how units allocate funds among applicants. Consider specifically whether these policies unfairly disadvantage particular kinds of scholarship or particular units and whether particular unit allocation mechanisms are consistent with the university policies for allocating GRF funds. Report recommendations to FacEx by April 1, 2009.
3. Continue to investigate mechanisms by which the total pool of money for the GRF and the percentage distributed to faculty can be increased in order to encourage even more research and scholarship. The total pool of money available for the GRF has not increased in the last seven years. Report recommendations to FacEx by April 1, 2009.
4. Develop a policy designed to promote open access to KU scholarship. The policy would outline a process to collect, preserve, and disseminate scholarly articles of KU faculty through KU ScholarWorks. Recommended policies should be discussed by governance and the KU research community. Report recommendations to FacEx by February 16, 2009.
5. Examine Initiative 2015, “Discovering and Innovating” Recommendations #2 – 5. Determine what part governance should play in implementing these recommendations. Report recommendations to FacEx. (ongoing)

The subcommittees submitted the following reports:

1. GRF Subcommittee
2. Restricted Research Subcommittee
3. ACTC Subcommittee
4. Initiative 2015 Subcommittee
5. The Open Access report has been submitted in March 2009.

***GRF Subcommittee Annual Report
University of Kansas Research Committee for FY 09***

1. Recommendations

- a. Since the College experienced some transfer of faculty, reallocation will be necessary next year to accommodate it. The Committee recommends that the Deans of the school of Music, Architecture and CLAS should review the allocation of faculty and propose a division of the funds previously allocated to school of Fine Arts for GRF grants and that FSRC and the GRF subcommittee should review this proposal in the Fall.
- b. KUCR maintains data on awardees, however, there is no plan to “go live” with this information. Next year FSRC or through GRF subcommittee will need to enlist KUCR in a discussion of what data elements the committee would like to capture about outcomes, so that a system can be designed to capture this to support future decision making.

2. Overview and Tasks:

The GRF Subcommittee was tasked with several charges, including:

1.1 Standing Charges:

1.1.1 Monitor General Research Fund

1.1.2 Determine the Disposition of Online Database of GRF Awards

1.2 Specific Charges:

1.2.1 Third-Year Review of the GRF Funds

1.2.2 Review GRF Allocation Policies

1.2.3 Investigate GRF Fund Expansion

The subcommittee met several times and worked to piece together the patchwork of procedures across campus which are used to allocate GRF funds within schools and colleges.

3.2. Standing Charges:

3.1 Monitor General Research Fund

The General Research Fund (GRF) monitoring process was hampered by several "structural" procedures which manifested themselves in KUCR. Unfortunately, archival databases of data on the GRF were stored in a language which is not supported by current personnel at KUCR. Staff changes as of late induced a "loss of corporate memory" in that these records were no longer available in their entirety.

With that said, changes are underway to "ensure" that no memory loss occurs in the future. Accordingly, four areas have been established:

3.1.1 Update GRF Recipient List

The GRF Recipient List is reportedly being continually updated by KUCR as they are made. These include the name and affiliation of the project director, title of project, award amount and date of most recent previous award and accomplishments stemming from GRF funding. This list, according to KUCR, is currently being generated and will go "live" in Fall 2009.

3.1.2 Clarify General GRF Policies

The general policies of the GRF are reiterated to all investigators along with reporting requirements, composition of committees that evaluate GRF proposals, and the policies of specific entities and units related to the GRF fund and the clarification of the amount and percentage of total GRF funds that are distributed as faculty awards. Appendix A shows the current distribution of the GRF funds for FY '07 - '09

3.2 Determine the Disposition of Online Database of GRF Awards

As mentioned above, the online database of historical GRF awards is not available due to an unusual confluence of circumstances with in KUCR. However, Appendix A contains the financial breakdown of the awards given from FY 07 - 09.

3.2 Specific Charges:

3.2.1 Third-Year Review of the GRF Funds

The GRF funds continue to aid the University mission in promoting a high level of scholarship. Towards that end, the GRF is currently supporting a myriad of faculty members and projects across campus. Because of the loss of corporate memory, a complete and objective review is not possible. However, some specific cases can be examined.

3.2.2 Review GRF Allocation Policies

There is a patchwork of policies across the University for different colleges and schools. In general, most GRF procedures are fairly localized. Appendices B - E show several examples. The following is taken straight from KUCR's website describing the overall competition, how the funds are allocated and contact information.:

General Research Fund Competition (GRF) FY 2010

The General Research Fund (GRF) is a competitive award program that provides funding for the advancement of the university's research program. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies provides funds to each school or college and assists in the administration of these funds. Each entity has been delegated the responsibility for awarding its funds. Each entity determines proposal criteria and has its own review committee, guidelines, application forms, application process and submission deadline. The Faculty Senate Research Committee is responsible for reviewing reports submitted by each school or college outlining the progress each entity has made in meeting its research goals. The allocation of funds to all entities for the following three-year period will be determined by this review.

Each faculty member on the Lawrence campus is eligible to submit one GRF proposal to his or her school or college as the principal investigator. Awards will be made based on the merit of the proposal, which includes the scholarly excellence of the proposal and its benefit to the university and to the individual researcher. Each entity may add additional proposal criteria as they deem appropriate. All funds are awarded for a one-year period (July 1 to June 30) and may be used for summer salary, student or GRA salary, supplies and travel. The State of Kansas does not allow payment of tuition with these funds.

In the table below you will find the contact and submission information for each entity. Please contact the applicable entity for detailed application information.

College/School	Contact Information	Deadline
Architecture	Patti Baker pmbaker@ku.edu 785-864-3114	February 20, 2009
Business	Charly Edmonds cedmonds@ku.edu 785-864-3841	January 30, 2009
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Behavioral Humanities Life Sciences Physical Sciences Social Sciences	Natalie Berger nberger@ku.edu 785-864-3681	February 2, 2009
Education	James Lichtenberg jlicht@ku.edu 785-864-9656	February 13, 2009
Engineering	Amanda Ostreko amandao@ku.edu 785-864-2932	February 13, 2009
Fine Arts	Lois Greene greene@ku.edu 785-864-1712	February 13, 2009
Journalism	Ann Brill abrill@ku.edu 785-864-7656	February 27, 2009
Law	Cheryl Saladin csal@ku.edu 785-864-9203	February 13, 2009
Library	Lyn Wolz lwolz@ku.edu 913-897-8572	March 6, 2009
Pharmacy	Rick Dobrowsky dobrowsky@ku.edu 785-864-3531	February 13, 2009

3.2.3 Investigate GRF Fund Expansion

It is the considered opinion of this subcommittee that the financial climate is not conducive to expansion of the GRF. Rather, the Faculty should count itself lucky if the GRF funding levels even held remotely steady.

Summary of the GRF Policies and Processes

Since one of the GRF sub-committee charges is to monitor the GRF, the sub-committee decided it would be useful to compare different criteria, procedures, and allocation of funds for the GRF according to guidelines provided by different schools or departments. Below is a summary of what the sub-committee learned about guidelines in various disciplines:

CLAS

Criteria and Goals: See attached lists below (this appears to be an area where we might make some recommendations for consistency)

Procedures: Each school or college appoints a review a committee, allowing flexibility for how funds may be used to further research in a particular school or college.

Eligibility and Proposal Submission, and Budget requirements: differ within Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Life Sciences (I have details, none of this seems significant).

Guidelines for review committees are different according to different units

How funds are allocated: Humanities only funds salaries with GRFs and has a cap figure of \$5,888 , comprised of a maximum of \$4,600 in salary and \$1,288 for fringe costs (awards were based on actual cost of 4 weeks salary up to a maximum of \$4,600, which equates to an academic year salary of about 45,000 – the cap is old).

Natural Sciences allocates through departments, they do not allow for salary funding and see this mainly as money to pay GRAs. The Social and Behavioral Sciences allow for a variety of uses of the funds.

Fine Arts:

Criteria and Goals: 1.) Significance of proposed project –original, innovative, creative and or scholarly

2.) research/creative plan including: clarity of objectives, plan reflecting adequate knowledge of the subject, Description of methods, likelihood of successful completion of project within time, budget, facilities described.

3.) Qualifications, scholarly/creative productivity, and previous results.

Also: 4) Evidence of external submission activity

5) Other review criteria include: early career faculty, pilots project with plans for larger, proposal requests funds to complete a project funded elsewhere, seeks to renew or continue a previous GRF with compelling justification, proposal is well-written and clear to a wide audience.

Procedures: Each school or college appoints a review a committee, allowing flexibility for how funds may be used to further research in a particular school or college.

Eligibility and Proposal Submission, and Budget requirements: differ within Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and Life Sciences (I have details, none of this seems significant).

Guidelines for review committees are different according to different units

How funds are allocated: for summer salary, student or GRA salary, supplies and travel; a range of funding levels: 2,590 -8,488. (for example)

I. CLAS Review Criteria

A. Review Criteria for Social Sciences

Significance: What is the importance of the project to the proposer's discipline or the interdisciplinary endeavor? Will the project lead to subsequent scholarly publications and/or grant related research activity?

Research/Creative Plan: Are the research objectives clearly stated? Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of related literature? Does the research plan describe the research methods adequately? Does the research plan address the research objectives? Is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion within the time, budget, and facilities limitations suggested?

Qualifications of Proposer: Is the proposer qualified to complete the proposed research? Has he or she shown evidence of scholarly capability and productivity? Has past GRF support produced results?

Evidence of Scholarly Activity: Applications will be regarded unfavorably if the applicant has shown no record of scholarly productivity. Applications will also be regarded unfavorably if the applicant has not attempted to secure external support for research projects if available. It is recognized that outside support is less available in some disciplines than in others but applicants are encouraged to investigate funding opportunities and to apply for external funding whenever possible. Applicants who have received prior allocations from the General Research Fund must state the results of the two most recent projects. If a renewal is sought, the applicant must report the progress already made and the expected completion date. If a project has been abandoned, the reasons must be stated in detail. Ordinarily, abandoning or failing to complete a prior project without adequate explanation will cause disapproval of subsequent applications.

Readability of Application: In the past some faculty members have presented applications in highly technical and complex language. Such proposals might prove problematic to intelligent scholars of good will but of various sub-specialties. An application must be designed so that all members of the Review Committee can read and understand.

Additional Review Criteria: In addition to the major criteria listed above, certain other factors are given consideration in the review process.

Faculty Early in their Professional Careers or Senior Faculty Developing a New Line of Research: General Research Funds are modest relative to the amount requested for projects, the number of faculty members, and the volume of applications. There is thus a disposition to fund faculty members in the early years of professional development or senior faculty developing a new line of research.

Pilot Projects: Proposals for pilot projects, which represent the first step toward larger-scale investigations with the potential for external funding, are regarded favorably. An applicant who submits a proposal for a pilot project should state the expected source of the outside funding and the efforts that will be made toward securing such funding.

Consideration will be given to applications that are submitted concurrently with proposals to outside agencies for funding of the same project.

Completion of Projects Funded Elsewhere: If a project was funded elsewhere and requires modest support for its completion or needs funds to match support already provided by the outside grant, it will be given special consideration.

B. Review Criteria for Behavioral Sciences

Scientific/Scholarly Importance/Significance: What is the importance of the project or the questions addressed to the proposer's discipline or the interdisciplinary endeavor? Will the completion of the project lead to significant scholarly publications? (20 points maximum)

Quality of Research/Methodological Rigor: Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of the relevant literature and represent adequate methodology to address the research objectives? (20 points maximum)

Applicant's Previous Record of Scholarly Accomplishments Relative to Seniority: Given the applicant's time in the field, does he/she have an adequate record of scholarly accomplishments? Given the accomplishments of the applicant, is there a reasonable likelihood of successful completion of the project? What has been produced by past GRF funding for the applicant? (20 points maximum)

Potential for Outside Funding: Is there a reasonable chance (given the constraints of available funding in different areas) of obtaining outside funding? What is the applicant's history of obtaining outside funding? Has the applicant made attempts to obtain outside funding where such support is available? (20 points maximum)

Faculty Within 10 Years of Post Ph.D. or Senior Faculty Beginning New Line of Research (15 points maximum)

Other Relevant Special Considerations: e.g., need for bridging funds between grant periods, joint projects that may lead to large outside funding. (5 points maximum)

C. Review Criteria for Humanities

Scholarly Importance (40 points maximum): What is the importance of the project or of the questions addressed in terms of the applicant's discipline? Will completion of the project lead to significant scholarly publications or artistic achievement?

Quality of Research and Methodology; Feasibility (30 points maximum): Does the research plan reflect adequate knowledge of the relevant background and professional literature? Is the methodology appropriate to the research or artistic objective? Given the scholarly record of the candidate (see IV and VI on the application), is there a clear likelihood of successful completion of the project in the time indicated?

Research and/or Creative Record of Applicant (to include recent success in GRF-funded projects and in applying for outside funding) (30 points maximum): Given the applicant's time in the field, does she or he have an adequate record of scholarly accomplishment?

NOTE: The Humanities Research Committee expects applicants to meet standards imposed by external funding agencies, i.e., applicants should follow instructions about page limits, C.V. content, explanation of methodology, etc.

D. Review Criteria for Physical Sciences

1. Significance/scientific merit
2. Research record of applicant
3. Feasibility of proposed project
4. Potential for outside funding
5. The Associate Dean may wish to consult with Department Chairs concerning any aspect of the proposal or with regard to particular issues regarding the PI.
6. Additional Review Criteria

The **primary criterion is the merit of the research proposal**. The following factors may also be considered.

- a) A consideration should be given to faculty “in the early years of their professional development who have not previously enjoyed substantial support.”
- b) Individuals are not limited with regard to the frequencies with which they apply for support from the GRF. Renewal of the same project will require special justification and generally is not encouraged.
- c) Multi-investigator proposals are encouraged. However, the proposal should focus on support for one of the investigators. The funds are too limited to spread over an entire group of investigators.
- d) If a proposal from another entity is more appropriately reviewed by one of the departmental GRF committees in the Physical Science Entity and that committee recommends funding, the funds must come from the original entity.

E. Review Criteria for Life Science

Successful proposals will meet the following criteria:

F. The proposed research is feasible and will likely lead to an important advance in the research discipline. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*

G. The proposed research will likely lead to the submission of a competitive proposal for extramural funding. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*

H. Past GRF awards have resulted in publications and funded proposals from extramural agencies. *Note: this criterion is given exceptional weighting.*

I. The proposer has a successful research record.

J. The proposal is clearly written and carefully assembled.

K. Special consideration will be given to faculty members early in their careers.

II. Goals

A. Goals for Social Sciences: Increase number of grants/fellowship proposals submitted and awarded. Increase the percentage of GRFs that lead to grant/fellowship proposals. Increase in scholarly publications associated with GRF proposals.

B. Goals for Behavioral Sciences: Increase number of grants/fellowships submitted and awarded. Increase in scholarly publications attributable to GRF proposals.

C. Goals for Humanities: Encourage major new projects for research. Promote research by junior faculty. Increase number of successful grant applications.

D. Goals for Life Sciences: Enhance a faculty member’s chances of success in securing extramural funding. Furthering of research objectives, discovery, funding of graduate students, and resultant publications and presentations at conferences will follow as a result.

FSRC Restricted Research Report 2008-2009

Charges:

2. Monitor the implementation of the University's policy on Restricted Research (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX), including policies and procedures for handling requests for exceptions.

- a. Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.
- b. Maintain a current record, open for review, of the review actions taken by the Restricted Research Committee and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research.
- c. Include in the final report a listing of each restrictive grant or contract considered during the year, containing (1) the title of the project; (2) the name of principal investigator or project director; (3) the source or sources of funds for support; (4) approval or disapproval by the Restricted Research Committee; and (5) a brief statement of the reasons for the approval or disapproval.

3. Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited. Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx (ongoing).

Subcommittee comment: No requests for a committee review of restricted research decisions were made or considered. The policy appears to be working.

The following is a report from Nancy Biles from April 14, 2009:

In 2007, there were 5 initiatives that went to committee that we did not yet have results to report last year:

1. NSF IGERT - Nagel and Subramaniam submitted. Nagel was funded. Subramaniam was not.
2. Beckman Young Investigators - Michael Johnson and Yang Zhang submitted. Neither was funded
3. NIH CBPR - Fawcett submitted and was funded.
4. Pew Scholars Program - Zhang submitted in November 2007. No word from sponsor, but assume not funded.
5. NSF MRI - Brown, Clark and Gogineni submitted. Clark was funded, but left KU. Award transferred to Joe Evans. Brown and Gogineni were not funded.

For 2008, there were 86 total announcements.

Of these 86, 2 were later suspended. The first was an NEH initiative that the Hall Center informed us they would administer. The second was an NIH initiative, and it was determined after the announcement that KU-L was not eligible to be the lead institution. This was forwarded to KUMCRI for dissemination to their researchers.

We received no interest for 54 announcements.

We received interest, but not over the required number of proposers for 23 announcements. Of these, 1 did not go forward with a proposal submission to the agency.

Announcements required a committee:

1. Camille Dreyfus Teacher Scholar Awards, February 2008
2. Berkland and Detamore submitted pre-proposals, Detamore chosen to proceed, but was not funded
3. Camille Dreyfus Teacher Scholar Awards, February 2009
4. Berkland and Detamore submitted pre-proposals, Detamore selected again and submitted in February.
5. Beckman Young Investigators
6. Fiorentino, Weis, Jackson and Forrest submitted pre-proposals. Forrest and Jackson selected to go forward in October 2008.
7. 4. Pew Charitable Trusts
8. Carrasco (KU-L) and Mishimune (KUMC) submitted pre-proposals. Mishimune selected to go forward for November 2008 deadline.
9. Microsoft Research New Faculty Fellowship
10. Depcik, Dorman, Kulkarni, Karanicolas, Vyatkina (KU-L) and Symons (KUMC) submitted pre-proposals. Vyatkina selected to go forward for November 2008 deadline.
11. NSF MRI
12. Hui, Hirmas, Bowman-James, Peterson (Acquisition), Sequin (Development) submitted pre-proposals. Bowman-James, Peterson and Sequin selected for January 2009 submission to NSF.
13. NSF PIRE
14. Bai, Farokhi, Gogineni, Minden, Myers, Spencer, Vieglais submitted pre-proposals. Gogineni, Myers and Spencer selected. Will submit for the full proposal deadline in August 2009.

**ACTC Subcommittee
Faculty Senate Research Committee – Spring 2009:**

4. Work with ACTC and consider needs for and issues with research to computing and telecommunications, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures. Monitor the implementation of the recommendations made by the Task Force on Research Computing. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx by April 1, 2009.

I contacted Donna Tucker, current Chair of ACTC, about their activities. Donna has interacted with several administrators and had a few in to speak directly to the committee. Overall, they have found it difficult to connect to policy issues and Initiative 2015. In her opinion, it is moving target and the ACTC is concerned that any recommendations would be obsolete by the time they were passed by Faculty Senate.

In terms of the Task for on Research Computing Report, the Provost made several commitments in his response:

1. Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, Steve Warren, to proceed with a search for an appropriately titled officer of the university who will serve as the university's point person for high performance research computing needs institution-wide.
 - a. Status - completed: Rick McMullen hired
2. Vice Provost for Information Services, Denise Stephens will continue with her current search for a person for her organization who will be responsible for the support, integration and maintenance of the infrastructure of research computing.
 - a. Status - completed : Dilawar Grewal hired
3. Creation of collaborative arrangement will enable us to focus the needs of the research computing community
 - a. Status: uncertain. No clear indication of the level integrated planning occurring between Information Services, KUCR and RGS. ACTC may have more information
4. Appoint a committee of faculty to report to the VP Research and to Provost, directly, issues related to high performance computing that we need to address and to give feedback on implementation and procedures.
 - a. Status: unknown ACTC may have more information

Both within the Task Force report and the directions of Initiative 2015, issues of infrastructure support and planning were stressed as critical.

KU has always approached information technology services through a combination of centralized and distributed support strategies. These traditionally operate relatively independent of one another at the campus, college, school, department, and major unit level. Even when functional dependencies exist among the services, the financial resources, infrastructure, support structures and services can remain relatively disconnected. This traditional practice of independence and disconnectedness is being challenged by the interdisciplinary nature research and teaching today, ever-increasing financial pressures, and the increasing benefit to working more collaboratively. In order to genuinely meet the demands of research (as well as administrative and academic)

computing at KU – there are fundamental structural concerns that must be addressed – in terms of planning, funding and governance.

Information Services has launched a new program titled “Initiative One” that is designed to centrally coordinate certain information technology issues across campus.

Initiative One overview: (from the web site <http://www.initiativeone.ku.edu/>)

“Initiative One is a strategy for maximizing KU's information infrastructure through coordinated planning, purchasing and service delivery. KU's information infrastructure includes the technologies, information resources, and relevant human expertise necessary to advance a premier research university environment. Initiative One is a KU-wide initiative led by Information Services”

Initiative One pursues the following operational outcomes:

- Coordinated software purchasing and licensing
- Coordinated desktop workstation purchasing and support
- Coordinated implementation and hosting of enterprise applications
- Coordinated information storage and back-up
- Coordinated document management / imaging
- Coordinated Web server hosting
- Coordinated training and certification of technology specialists to assure consistent service quality

Initiative One engages in the following approaches in pursuit of the stated aims:

- Formation of representative steering group
- Inclusive planning on a proactive timetable that engages all of KU
- Focus on identifying and creating institutional efficiencies for KU
- Review and re-visioning of current funding models, policies and practices as necessary to achieve KU aims
- Collaboration, coordination and cooperation as necessary to achieve KU aims
- Develop common standards for infrastructure, services and support

As presented - there is strong potential in this approach. At a recent Faculty Senate meeting – Vice Provost Denise Stephens announced a series of advisory boards to be formed with membership across campus. The seven advisory groups include:

- Desktop Acquisition and Imaging
- Desktop Support
- Enterprise Document Imaging (will convene in fall):
- Enterprise Document Management
- High Performance Computing
- Network Architecture:
- Storage

At this same meeting, Dilawar Grewal notes that the campus backbone will be upgraded to 10 gigs this summer – with connectivity to I2 and to the Lambda grid. More details will follow over the next few months.

FSRC Committee, Initiative 2015 Subcommittee Final Report

Charge to the Subcommittee:

Examine Initiative 2015, “Discovering and Innovating” Recommendations #2 – 5. Determine what part governance should play in implementing these recommendations. Report recommendations to FacEx. (ongoing)

Issues and Actions Recommended:

Subcommittee members Mary Lynn Hamilton and Lorie A. Vanchena gathered initial feedback from colleagues in different departments and colleges on Recommendations 2-5.

Recommendation 5, which states that KU “should make major efforts to promote collaborative interdisciplinary research and creative activities,” generated the most responses. Colleagues generally identified existing barriers to collaborative interdisciplinary research and suggested ways in which such research could be encouraged and rewarded.

The subcommittee recommends developing a university-wide survey for faculty to collect not only data on existing barriers to collaborative interdisciplinary research and creative activities but also ideas for overcoming these barriers and promoting, realizing, and rewarding collaboration across KU’s campuses, with industry partners, and with other institutions around the world.

Below are excerpts of Recommendations 2-5 and initial responses and ideas that have been generated in our meetings and conversations with colleagues.

Recommendation 2: Raising the Research Bar. *KU should identify and emphasize research and innovation in areas in which we have great depth, which lend themselves to multidisciplinary study, and that represent emerging opportunities. KU should actively recruit researchers with demonstrated excellence to enhance these programs.*

Governance could help devise ways to help identify areas of research excellence, creating opportunities for creative conversations focused on identifying innovative and emerging areas of research and encouraging proposals for hiring “teams of researchers” in chosen areas “whose programs are synergistic and will collectively elevate our existing strengths, or whose scholarship bridges intellectual gaps between already recognized programs.”

Recommendation 3: Communication. *KU should expand public communication efforts and create novel communication forums that will continually inform the state and nation that KU is a transformative leader in discovery and innovation. Pioneering modes of communication will be utilized such as innovative internet formats and advertising enterprises. The goal is to inform and impress Kansans, U.S. and world citizens, and the international community of scholars about the exciting research and accomplishments at the University of Kansas.*

This recommendation also includes the statement: “Research dissemination to academic peers can be enhanced by creating web-based open publishing formats.” This overlaps with the work done by the FSRC subcommittee charged with developing a policy designed to promote open access to KU scholarship.

Recommendation 4: Training. *KU should generate enhanced support for graduate students to make us more competitive in attracting the best and brightest junior research scholars. To further set us apart, KU should develop more innovative and multidisciplinary integrated education and research programs across the campuses.*

Governance could be involved with devising ways to encourage faculty and programs to explore possibilities for innovative and multidisciplinary education and research. This recommendation seems to draw on departmental and program expectations.

Recommendation 5: Collaboration. *KU should make major efforts to promote collaborative interdisciplinary research and creative activities involving its faculty and students. These efforts should include increased collaborations within and between KU's campuses, with industry partners, and with other institutions around the world.*

Cross-appoint every willing new faculty member (and current ones) in at least two departments and one research center of their choosing.

Remove the disincentives in the annual promotion, merit and P&T processes and forms for collaborative work, i.e., reward (rather than rank as less) multi-authored papers and grant proposals.

Limit the GRF to interdisciplinary proposals that will lead to larger extramural interdisciplinary proposals, or at least fence off half of that fund for interdisciplinary activities.

These measures, which could be part of the “necessary environment” needed to “eliminate impediments,” should be spelled out in Recommendation 5, which should also include detailed solutions for overcoming barriers. Otherwise the recommendations remain far too general to be implemented and far too conservative to foster significant change.

Governance could help encourage collaborative interdisciplinary research within and between KU's campuses by collecting information from faculty and programs that helps identify impediments to research collaborations.

This initiative requires a change in culture. To create collaborative, wide-scale interdisciplinary relations, the faculty will need to agree on action or the success will be minimal.

To draw on people from different disciplines but related interests, we could identify Institutes or Committees that would respond to current issues or hot topics and/or draw together potentially disparate groups that can think differently about issues.

If the university is to embrace this Initiative, there needs to be rewards for collaboration. While in the physical sciences collaboration might be expected, there is no such expectation in the social sciences. This expectation would need to be university-wide.

General Responses to Initiative

Faculty are generally open to the idea of collaboration and would welcome wonderful, innovative graduate students. They recognize that we have limited finances.

It is in the best interest of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, the faculty, and the university to approach Initiative 2015 slowly. Given that the Initiative calls for a change in culture within the university and that the university will be experiencing a change in leadership and potential direction, tackling the tasks suggested by the Initiative requires a deliberative approach.

The Initiative does invite the sort of thinking that inspires creativity.