RESEARCH COUNCIL MINUTES
November 4, 2010

MEMBERS:

Name	Present	Absent	Name	Present	Absent
Anderson, Terry	X		**Fulmer, Hal**	X	
Clark, Eddie	X		**Andrew, Damon**	X	
Davidson, Barry	X		**Cochran, Maryjo**	X	
Findley, Henry M.		X*	**Edwards, Judson**	X	
Fretwell, Cherie	X		**Tatum, Lance**	X	
Green, Denise	X		**Non-Voting Members**		
Jackson, Margaret	X		**Stewart, Henry**	X	
Krach, Kathleen (vtel)	X		**White, Ray**		X
Robertson, Ben	X		**Jeffrey, Don**		X
Schraeder, Michael A.		X	**White, Dave**		X
Shaffer, Chris		X	**Fulmer, Judy**	X	
Shelton, Sam	X		**Whitlock, Mike**	X	
Spurlock, Amy	X		**Ingram, Earl , ex officio**	X	
Spurlock, Jeff	X		**Barron, Dianne, ex officio, Chair**	X	

*With Notice

GUESTS: Dr. Gordon Mosley for Dr. Henry Findley

I.   Call to Order
Dr. Barron called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. She asked Mrs. Beth Sasser to call the role.

II.   Approval of Agenda
Dr. Andrew moved to approve the agenda. Dr. Clark seconded. The agenda was approved.

III.   Business Items
A. Purpose and Responsibility of the Research Council
Dr. Barron welcomed the council members present and thanked them for their commitment to serve on the Research Council. Dr. Barron stated that the purpose of this council is to look horizontally across the institution and extract the elements of research for assessment and improvement. She stated that this past spring and each spring hereafter the council is charged to assess the level of faculty and student research elements and note improvements and areas where improvement is needed in the upcoming year.
Dr. Ingram addressed the Council and reiterated his gratitude to the Council and emphasized the value of the Research Council. He challenged those present to grasp the meaning of research and the role it plays in the doctoral programs, both current and those to come. He stated that research is important in many ways to our institution, now and in the future.

B. Subcommittee Report- Preparation of the Research Council webpage—Dr. Denise Green
Dr. Barron advised that there would be discussion to come up on this item, so she asked to move this item to a discussion item. Dr. Green agreed.

C. Presentation on Sponsored Programs (OSP)—Judy Fulmer, Director OSP
Dr. Barron introduced Mrs. Judy Fulmer. Mrs. Fulmer provided a report on externally supported research activities. Mrs. Fulmer stated that the primary type of sponsored program involves public service-type programs. In the document provided by Sponsored Programs the amount of research grants is grossly under reported due to the way they are coded.   In years past, sponsored programs were reported only after funding. At funding, accounting procedures required the assignment of a code. Most of the codes are public service codes and there are no accounting codes for pure research proposals. Additionally, the accounting codes are too broad to identify any research components embedded within public service grants.   There is a need to re-examine the accounting codes so that research proposals / research components within public service grants can be tracked from proposal through funding and implementation.   Research reports are made using the accounting codes. Dr. Andrew suggested the formation of a subcommittee to define what activities constitute

research so that an improved system of coding classifications can be suggested. Dr. Andrew agreed to chair the subcommittee. Members of the subcommittee were identified as: Judy Fulmer, Dr. Denise Green, and Dr. Lance Tatum.   The subcommittee is to meet and be prepared to report their conclusions at the next Research Council meeting. They also suggested that someone from Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness serve on the subcommittee.

Faculty loads seem to be the primary barrier for improving the level of research proposals submitted. It was recommended that if Troy University desires that faculty pursue additional research grants, faculty loads will need to be additionally reviewed in order to allow faculty members to have the time necessary to write. Despite barriers to research proposals submitted, Troy University has had success with faculty and students research submissions being funded.

 Dr. Terry Anderson advised that the MPA program has a course in their program that includes Grant Writing and Grant Contracts. She stated that every time she teaches this course she has an influx of faculty members who ask if they can sit in on this course. She stated that often times the faculty does not know where to begin to look for the Grant and Contracts, how to coordinate with the Sponsored Programs Office, how to develop a budget. She asked if it would be in the privy of this council to develop an in-house seminar on Grants. Dr. Barron suggested that the University offer a weekend through the Faculty Institute. Dr. Ingram asked when Dr. Anderson would be prepared to offer a Seminar through a webinar to the University. Dr. Barron stated that Dr. Anderson's recommendation for an in-house seminar was an excellent idea and that we would work on this issue. She stated that faculty development is one of the areas that this council is charged to facilitate. She added that we would work on getting a seminar scheduled.

Dr. Green stated that if faculty were allowed to receive compensation from funded grants that would be an incentive that could positively impact the number of research proposals submitted and funded. Dr. Ingram suggested that Judy Fulmer, Dr. Dianne Barron, Dr. Sam Shelton and Dr. Damon Andrew create a work group to discuss faculty compensation awards within research projects and grant writing.

Dr. Andrew stated that research or grant writing also has to be supported at the micro-level through the faculty professional development plan every year. Intentions to do research or write a grant should be evaluated to determine if it should be considered part of the faculty member's full time load.   If a reduced load is given, then the faculty member is receiving a form of compensation.   There must be accountability that accompanies load reduction and compensation. The research or grant writing process should be evaluated on the year-end faculty evaluation. Research must be integrated throughout the entire system to work. Dr. Barron stated that the lack of an clear definition of approved levels of compensation make it very difficult for the Deans to manage research and grant activities. This is an area for further discussion.

D. Presentation by Institutional Review Board Chair – Dr. Eddie Clark

   Dr. Eddie Clark presented the report of the Institutional Review Board. He stated that there has been an increase of proposals coming through the IRB. He stated that the students are really doing a good job with their research review requests for human subjects. He stated that all IRB proposals come through the chair and are reviewed to determine review requirements. The chair lets the applicant know if it the proposal is exempt, expedited or if a full review is required. The IRB continues to work with applicants to assure that all required materials are submitted in order to determine what type review is required. Only full packages are sent forward for review.

E. Presentation by Associate Provost on University's Assessment of Research Across the University-Dr. Dianne Barron
   Dr. Barron gave a brief overview of the present status of research activity at the University and the goals for research. The report was also shared with the SACS Substantive Change team in August. One of the objectives that the University will want to work toward is to adopt an official mechanism that would allow each faculty member to report their research and scholarly activities. A voluntary survey was sent to all faculty members asking them to self report all scholarly activities. Based on the information received, the results were analyzed and objectives created in order to move the University forward. Dr. Barron presented a power-point presentation that summarized the current research activities across the University. Two years of self-reported data was provided and the research-to-faculty ratio increased from 6.8% to 7.3% with the overall goal of 8.0%. The faculty-to-research goal is on track.

Research activity conducted during 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 was reported by College to highlight the most active areas of interest. Three separate categories of research were presented: Published Referee, Refereed, and Peer-review. The majority of faculty research activities reported was peer-reviewed. However, in this last year an increase was shown in published refereed research. Dr. Anderson asked if Dr. Barron felt that due to the fact that the University has had an influx of new faculty hires, who are not as experienced with research, that they may be focused on producing peer-reviewed articles first. Dr. Barron stated that could be the case or that faculty now have more time as a result of teaching load reduction for additional collaboration. One of the University objectives is to increase the percentage of published-referee research by College and by Campus location. A goal of a 2% increase was arbitrary set. We are finding that meeting this goal may be harder than initially anticipated. Many faculty scholarship activities are community focused. In summary, faculty members are actively engaged in research and scholarly activities. We now need a common mechanism or software package that is able to capture and report our successes.

There will be a presentation on Digital Commons, a faculty vitae tool, on Friday, November 12 at the IT Conference Room at Parklane beginning at 2:00 p.m. Everyone is invited to attend.

F. Presentation by Faculty Development Committee Chair – Dr. Hal Fulmer

Dr. Hal Fulmer presented the Faculty Development Committee's report on financial research support. Faculty members are elected and serve as reviewers and approvers of the faculty research proposal requests. Dr. Fulmer stated that he facilitates the review process and chairs the committee. He provided an overview of funded proposals that related specifically to research for spring and summer 2010. The Faculty Development Committee also provides grants that are not related to research. He stated the number of total grants offered in spring/summer 2010 was: 45 paper presentations, eight research and summer research grants, and two paper presentations were funded. There is a $1,000 total cap per faculty member. We continue to provide most of our support in the paper presentation area. The spring semester is the primary semester faculty tends to submit more research grants. Summer research grants are typically stipends where faculty members are conducting research and use the stipends to buy-out teaching time in order to conduct their research. An increasing number of proposals are occurring in the paper reprint cost. Our fall proposals have not included a number of research grants. Dr. Fulmer noted that we were fortunate to receive additional money this year to award. That allows us to grow the number of people that can come into the house as it is a University wide program. Our goal every year is to give all the money away and to support all requests. Dr. Fulmer advised that the Faculty Development Committee usually disperses funds twice a year, sometimes three times and that there is a cap on the amount of funds one faculty member may receive. The cap allows the committee to distribute the money across more individuals, so that one proposal or one person is not receiving all the funds.

IV. **Discussion – Webpage**
The following g areas were discussed for possible inclusion on the Research Webpage:
A. Common Calendar Section: Provide a calendar for posting research related training opportunities for faculty and students; University sponsored venues to showcase faculty and student research; seminars, forums, brown-bag sessions, poster sessions, colloquiums, and symposiums held within colleges. Ask deans to provide information for research calendar.

Dr. Denise Green reported on the Subcommittee Report of the Preparation of the Research Council webpage. The subcommittee has met and discussed the items above. They will continue to develop ideas to increase the amount and various venues for encouraging and highlighting research activities.

B. Research Support Section: Provide links to potential sources, policies and procedures related to research – Thesis guidelines, IRB Policies and Procedures, AOP for teaching reduction, and Faculty Handbook

Again, the discussion involved creating the Research Council webpage to include a Research Support Section which would provide links to potential sources, policies and procedures related to research to include the Thesis guidelines, IRB policies and procedures, the AOP for teaching reduction, as well as the Faculty Handbook.

C. Develop a Research Forum Section: Showcase faculty and student research – *Digital Commons*

The discussion again focused on the Research Council webpage to include a Research Forum Section. This section would provide a snapshot of the types of faculty and student research being conducted throughout the

University. The webpage subcommittee will develop recommendations for areas of inclusion on the Research webpage.

D. Proposed webpage address: http://www.troy.edu/research

Dr. Barron advised those present that she was working with Mr. Mike Foster of IT to create the webpage and that the proposed address would be http://www.troy.edu/research.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.