

2004-2005
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE
UNIVERSITY SENATE

Respectfully submitted by:

Professor A. Terrence Conlisk
Committee Chairperson
April 22, 2005

University Research Committee
Annual Report to the University Senate
April 22, 2005

Function of the University Research Committee

The University Research Committee (URC) is a joint committee of the University Senate and the Council on Research and Graduate Studies of the Graduate School, and is one of the few direct connections between these two bodies. The structure, responsibilities, and organization of the URC are given in Faculty Rule 3335-4814. The principal responsibility of the committee is to “encourage and stimulate scholarly research and creative activity and foster a close relationship between education and scholarly research.” In addition to its advisory duties for the University Senate and Graduate Council, the URC advises the Senior Vice President for Research.

The Committee’s 2003-2004 report was presented to the University Senate in April, 2004. The information in this report covers URC activity during the period of April, 2004 through March, 2005. Professor David Bromwich, Department of Geography and Byrd Polar Research Center, served as Chair of the URC through June, 2004. At its May 20, 2004 meeting the Committee elected Professor Terrence Conlisk of the Department of Mechanical Engineering to serve as Chair for 2004-2005. The Committee roster is attached (attachment 1).

Routine Business of the URC from April, 2004-March, 2005

May 20, 2004

Research Faculty Track Proposal

The Research Faculty Track proposal passed a Senate vote by a margin of 53-for to 47-against. The lack of oversight in the proposal is a weakness that the University Senate will be responsible for tracking, but Professor Bromwich believes that the URC did have substantial input into the structure and wording of the faculty rule. Professor Perry noted that he believes the proposal passed because of the work done by the URC. The white paper on the Research Faculty Track proposal (attachment 2) will be sent to the Deans, Chairs and College Research Officers with the message that the Office of Research is available as a resource if they have questions about the possibility of hiring research faculty.

Undergraduate Research

Mr. Aftab Pureval, Undergraduate Student Government (USG) President, and Mr. Mike Goodman, outgoing USG President joined the May 20, 2004, meeting to discuss undergraduate research at Ohio State. In light of the collective statement made against the Research Faculty Track proposal by undergraduates voting at the recent Senate meeting, Professor Bromwich felt that it was appropriate for the URC to discuss the general issue of undergraduate research with student leaders. Mr. Goodman stated that the undergraduate vote was consistent with student concerns that the establishment of the Research Faculty Track would take away from the quality of undergraduate education

and that we would be taking a step backwards in terms of the balance between research and undergraduate education. He believes that there is no accountability for the direct cost to undergraduate academics and that there should be a better way to centralize undergraduate research. Mr. Goodman noted that the USG has established the first-ever undergraduate research grants with \$25,000 in funding made available by the Provost. There was a discussion of how to bring the NSF REU program, which would provide opportunities for OSU students to participate in NSF REU programs at other universities, to the attention of undergraduates. Professor Perry felt that it might be helpful to limit efforts on publicizing NSF REU programs to a smaller, more select number of students. He also pointed out that the Denman Undergraduate Research Forum is a barometer of the increasing numbers of students participating in undergraduate research.

Some of the colleges, such as Optometry, do not have undergraduates, but would like to have them involved in some of their research with the hope of attracting them into their programs. Watching how students perform in the classroom often provides a good perspective on how well those students will perform in a research setting. Faculty members in some fields have difficulty engaging undergraduates in legitimate research because it often takes several years to get trained persons entering the lab. If there were a process to verify the commitment of undergraduates to a research program that could be helpful in getting researchers to be more inclined to invest the time to train undergraduate students. It was suggested that students should first look at a general research program and progress through the ranks by assisting graduate students. Mr. DiSanto invited Mr. Pureval to visit the OSU Research Foundation to learn more about how the Research Foundation and the research enterprise functions.

Tuition and Fees

There was a limited discussion of the idea of putting tuition and fees on research grants. By next fall we should see some of the results of the cost of putting tuition and fees on grants. If the cost of tuition and fees continues to rise, the tradeoff between using graduate students and hiring post docs will be significant. Our motivation for doing this should be to provide additional resources. Our competitors are already adding tuition and fees to grant proposals and it does not seem to make them less competitive. The Office of Research has been trying to convince the Deans to subsidize tuition and fees and that has been happening to variable degrees.

November 29, 2004

This was Professor Conlisk's first meeting as Committee Chair. He would like the Committee to be proactive on issues such as export controls. One matter likely to come before the URC this year will be the Freeman report, which deals with OSU's system of funding doctoral education. Professor Gunther noted that he has fiscal issues that he wishes to bring to the Committee.

Office of Research Update

Dr. Robert McGrath, Senior Vice President for Research, spoke about the focus in the Office of Research--enhancing research productivity across the board and being responsive to the needs of the research community. He discussed the Large Interdisciplinary Grants Program recently sponsored by the Office of Research and noted that he would like the next round of processes to include proposals from a larger cross-section of the community.

Dr. McGrath is also interested in how we support our interdisciplinary centers. There are already quite a few centers and there are opportunities to form new centers. Each of the colleges has its own policies on centers, but Dr. McGrath would like to put forth models that would allow us to handle centers in a more consistent fashion.

Export Controls

Dr. Todd Guttman, Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, and Mr. David Doty, Associate Director of the Engineering Experiment Station, spoke to the Committee about export control regulations compliance. Export control regulations have been in effect since World War II, but increasing levels of scrutiny by oversight agencies post 9/11 have made this a more pressing issue for universities. The regulations are intended to prevent information from getting into the wrong hands and apply to "dual use" items that are for both civil and military or strategic use and are listed on the Commerce Control List (CCL). Also covered under the regulations are items that are "defense articles" or a "defense service" that have military-related uses and are listed on the US Munitions List. These items include commodities, firearms, the technology to create them, and the software to run them. An export is considered an actual shipment or transmission of items out of the US. Deemed exports are 1) release of technology or source code to a foreign national in the US or abroad or 2) considered to be an export to that person's home country. Therefore, the knowledge gleaned by a foreign co-PI or graduate student could be considered a deemed export. An export license must be obtained before an item on the CCL or US Munitions List may be exported. Failure to do so may result in institutional and personal liability, which could include fines and/or jail time for OSU administrators.

Several federal agencies came out with a white paper in April, 2004, recommending that an export control compliance clause be incorporated into all DOD contracts and calling for a reexamination of the license exemptions in the export control regulations, including the fundamental research exemption. The federal government will work with universities to address these issues, but we need to do a better job following their regulations. Within OSU the Office of Legal Affairs, OSURF, the Engineering Experiment Station, the Office of Business and Industry Contracts, and the Office for Technology Licensing are working together on an export control policy and an export control process that would follow federal guidelines, but will not be too burdensome to faculty. Dr. Guttman noted that web-based education and presentations to faculty groups are some ways in which this information can be communicated to faculty and discussions have begun with the Graduate School on this topic. He and Mr. Doty would like to return to speak with the Committee about this issue after there is something more substantive to share.

GA Leave Policies (discussion at meetings 11/29/04 and 2/1/05)

Anne Massaro from the Office of Human Resources is chairing the work group charged with developing leave policies for graduate associates, fellows, trainees and postdocs. The policy stems from recommendations made in the 2001 Graduate Quality of University Experience Report and centers on improving compensation and benefits for GAs, fellows and trainees. The group has been studying how we might implement some type of leave policy for graduate associates. They have looked at issues related to what type of policy we would want to have in place, how we would track the time, what types of policies our peers have, what would fringe benefits constitute, etc. The work group has worked with the Graduate School and has held focus groups in an effort to develop a consistent policy that can be applied campus wide. They requested that the URC comment on the draft document, which addresses short term leave of three days or less. The Committee members' questions and comments included the following:

- Who would pay for this? Do we need a central pool of funds?
- What happens currently? *Current fringe rate includes health insurance and retirement, but doesn't have any type of leave benefit associated with it. A leave benefit may be put in place and tracked for one year. At that point we would decide how much to increase the rate.*
- What happens to IDC? *It goes back to the colleges.*
- What are our peers doing? *It's very complicated to track with CIC institutions because some of them are unionized.*
- You need to distinguish a catastrophic situation from a short term situation.
- The Research Foundation has a modest pool of funds that can be tapped to replace regular staff members.
- You need consistency among GAs and consistency among GRAs because they're two different types.
- Does the University decide what defines a work week for a GA?
- I work more than 40 hours a week and so do my graduate students.
- With RAs they say they'll make up the work later and some do--but for those who don't there must be some sort of sanction.

The work group was asked to provide benchmarking data on leave policies for GAs, fellows and trainees from other institutions to the URC for review prior to the February 1 meeting.

Ms. Massaro and Dr. Lamar Murphy, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School, attended the February 1 meeting to further discuss the draft program statement. A draft document prepared by the workgroup made several recommendations. Among them are that within an initial two-week period, the departments accommodate the leave as appropriate and proportionate to the needs of the situation. Beyond the initial two-week leave period, a central pool of funds would be available to units/departments to accommodate extended leaves (average of three – six weeks).

The funding estimate for the leave program is \$313,000 annually. For FY06 the workgroup proposes funding the program with central funds, while data on usage and costs are determined. In FY07 and after, an assessment mechanism will be needed to determine the amount per college. One estimate of an assessment against current GA stipend dollars: at the current estimated cost and current GA stipend payroll, the assessment would be approximately \$0.0033 per \$1.00 of GA stipend, which would be an average of \$6.00 per GA headcount per month. This cost would go into the benefits overhead rate.

In some cases we could be leaving money on the table as the NIH will cover leave costs for T-32 fellowships if the university has a standard leave policy. However, we must be cautious that any policy adopted be applied uniformly to the entire University.

Professor Collins pointed out that the approval process remains at the local level, but believes that it should be consistent with the faculty approval process.

February 1, 2005

OSURF Board Member (discussion at meetings 2/1/05, 3/10/05)

There are four faculty members on the OSURF Board and the University Research Committee (URC) is responsible for electing new faculty members to the Board. One of the four faculty members rotates off the Board each year. Professor Norton Neff's appointment will expire in June, 2005. He is from the College of Medicine and Public Health. The remaining faculty members on the Board are: Professors Frank C. De Lucia, Steven A. Ringel and David B. Huron from Physics, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and School of Music, respectively. Other members of the OSURF Board include the President (Senior VP for Research); Vice President (Dean of the Graduate School); Provost; Trustee member from OSU Board of Trustees; two alumni members from Alumni Advisory Council; and one outside member appointed by the President. Mr. DiSanto spoke briefly about the responsibilities of OSURF Board members and noted that it is important to have campus-wide representation on the Board. The Board members provide input to Mr. DiSanto, Executive Director of the OSU Research Foundation, on how to best support our funded researchers and research initiatives. Service as an OSURF Board member is a good opportunity to learn more about the research enterprise at Ohio State, including the Research Foundation, the Office of Responsible Research Practices, University Laboratory Animal Resources and Tech Partners/Tech Licensing. Mr. DiSanto noted that if possible we should have nominations and nominee background materials ready for discussion at the March 10 URC meeting. Mr. DiSanto explained that the time commitment required of Board members is modest—there are only three meetings per year; the Board has several committees and an Executive Committee; voting is usually done by e-mail.

Prior to the March 10, 2005, meeting members of the URC received nomination materials on the candidates who were nominated to fill the position on the OSURF Board that will be vacated when Professor Neff's term expires. The Committee members discussed the

nominees' credentials at the March 10 meeting and it was decided that a vote will be taken during Spring Quarter.

Discussion of Freeman Committee Interim Report on Graduate Education

Dean Richard Freeman from the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS), is Chair of the Freeman Committee on Graduate Education. He joined the February 1, 2005 meeting, along with Executive Vice President and Provost, Barbara Snyder, to discuss the Freeman Committee interim report on graduate education. The Committee has spent a considerable amount of time looking at several issues. Two items from the Provost's charge (#3 & #4 below) to the Committee, required that a set of metrics be developed by which the quality of PhD programs can be assessed and further:

(3) Recommended a sustainable funding model for graduate education that will align state subsidy with quality. Priorities for investment are a) programs that are already ranked as very good or excellent; b) additional programs that are essential (VII) for any great public research university (whether already strong or not at OSU); and c) programs that make unique contributions to or derive unique strength from the State of Ohio.

(4) To generate resources for investment, propose a set of criteria by which I could consider the following options for programs deemed as too weak to be sustained at their current level: a) eliminating programs; b) strategically reducing the size of programs; c) freezing programs at their current size; or d) merging programs.

Dean Freeman stated that we're spending hundreds of millions of dollars on graduate education and \$70 million on tuition and fees alone, but he questioned whether we are putting our money where we should. We receive doctoral subsidy for graduate education from the Ohio Board of Regents, which looked at how many graduate students there were in Ohio in the years 1994 and 1998. OSU had 42.2% of them and that number has been locked into their formula every year since then for doctoral subsidy only. If the numbers of doctoral students FTE go beyond a specific level, the University does not receive additional subsidy from the state.

When budget restructuring began it became advantageous for units to add students. We have since learned that the budget restructuring model works for undergraduates, but not for graduate students. The return per credit hour per graduate student goes down if a program remains constant under budget restructuring. We won't get more money from the State and we soon won't be able to afford tuition waivers. The cost of having a graduate student is getting close to that of hiring a post doc.

It will cost \$120K to review six programs in MPS alone. There are 100 PhD programs at OSU so there is not enough money to review every PhD program. Dean Freeman believes OSU is much better than its reputation, but that our current funding model isn't necessarily reflective of quality. If you believe in excellence you can't believe that everything is equal. He noted that a report on Graduate Education by former Dean

Randall Ripley of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences says much the same thing.

The Ohio Board of Regents' model combined with the funding model is unique. He cited the example of Northwestern, which is well-funded, does outside reviews of its programs, and discards programs frequently. We need to figure out how we can make the process fair when we compare the many different types of programs that exist at Ohio State.

Questions asked of the Provost and Dean Freeman included:

Q: Why were several colleges, particularly Engineering and Agriculture not represented on the Freeman Committee? A: The Freeman Committee grew out of a series of discussions at the Council of Deans meetings last year. The Deans were comfortable with the idea of having the Committee consist of a small group of volunteers and all those volunteering for the Committee were accommodated.

Q: Couldn't any precedent for ranking PhD programs be found in national standards? Metrics already exist for evaluating graduate programs. Will the Freeman Committee distinguish which are more valuable? A: Each Dean on the Committee is running a test of two of his/her programs (pilot of 12 programs); they're looking at NRC data and Dean Freeman would like to get statisticians involved in the process. The process will be refined over time and will run in conjunction with an AAU initiative so that we can look at similar programs at other institutions. Further, the metrics identified by the Committee in its interim report may not work for all PhD programs. Thus, input from individual academic units regarding the nature of the metrics is encouraged.

Q: Is there a target figure for the number of PhD students at OSU?

A: There is no real hard and fast number – we're looking for more headroom for good programs to be able to add students.

Professor Clark expressed his concern that we appear to be targeting PhD programs when the growth is in Masters programs. These students are absorbing resources from PhD programs. For instance, there are 2,700 students who will be terminal Masters degree students at best; however, many of these students will take more than 50 credit hours so will be counted in the PhD programs. We have 22 more Masters programs than PhD programs. Dean Freeman stated that the issues related to Masters programs will have to be addressed, but at this point the Committee is looking at PhD programs.

The Provost pointed out that many Masters programs are for professional degrees (e.g., MBA). As to the issue of new graduate programs, she stated that we would not want to stifle new programs if they are good. The Provost feels that this is an attempt to fix the funding formula. The assessment of quality varies across PhD programs and if we fund the lowest quality program at the same rate as we fund the highest quality program, it doesn't make sense.

March 10, 2005

At its March 10, 2005, discussion of the Freeman Committee Report continued. Professor Conlisk informed the URC that he wanted to formally respond to the Freeman Committee Report and appointed a URC Subcommittee consisting of Scott Pearson (Chair), Nicholas Hall, Gordon Aubrecht, Richard Gunther, William Clark (ex-officio) and himself to draft the response. The draft report should be ready by the first meeting of Spring Quarter.

Concerns and Comments Regarding Freeman Report

- Several individuals expressed concern with Metric 1, the quality of students admitted. The sentiment is that they are more interested in the quality of students we graduate. Some felt that the GRE is not necessarily an objective measure -- as an example, the Humanities will have higher expectations on grades across the board than will science and engineering.
- There may be a bias against colleges not involved in any of the pilots.
- The Admissions Office handles 5,000 applications per year and the Graduate Admissions Office handles 20,000 per year so competition is much more intense at the graduate level. In 1B- the Quality of Graduate Education is determined by US News and World Report, which ignores international students. There has been a drop in applications from foreign countries and this could also make recruiting a more diverse student population difficult.
- The real issue to be dealt with is the funding of graduate students. We get a fixed amount of money from the Ohio Board of Regents and every student taking over 50 credit hours at Ohio State goes into a doctoral program count. However, just because the state gives money to us on that basis, there is no reason we have to distribute money on that basis. For example, we could look at percentages in areas where students are getting PhDs, then at Masters programs and produce a funding formula that reflects what we are really doing.
- The system being proposed is not unlike that which is already in effect in the Fisher College of Business. It does differentially affect the various programs, however, it produces accountability.
- A department may rank poorly on some of the metrics, but that same department's national society could consider it to be one of the top departments of its kind in the country
- One of the driving factors for initiating the Freeman Committee was the rapid growth of the research enterprise at Ohio State. We won't want to create a policy that will stifle this growth. The content and fiscal implications of the recommendations of the report should be analyzed.
- Professor Clark made two points related to the Ripley Report that Dean Freeman referred to at the February 1 meeting:

1. Page 1/bottom paragraph 3 -- The suggestion was made that the Graduate School Dean should be a member of President's Executive Committee – the Graduate School Dean is still not a member of the President's Cabinet.
2. The table on Graduate schools is no longer valid – most of the schools listed as reporting to the Vice President for Research at their respective universities are no longer reporting that way, but are now separate entities.

March 10, 2005 Additional Items

Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Childcare Proposal

Professor Susan Fisher, Secretary of the University Senate, requested that the URC comment on the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee (FCBC) Childcare Proposal. Professor Conlisk believes that the proposal is more in line with what our peers are doing and would also help in attracting faculty. Dr. Wycoff questioned what the impact on research was. Professor Aubrecht said that colleagues who have had problems getting their children in childcare think this would be worthwhile. Professor Medeiros pointed out how important it is for parents to have convenient and easy access to childcare. Parking would also have to be provided close to the childcare sites. Ms. Vogel thought that using the early childhood education students to help staff the sites would be an excellent idea and would provide those students with valuable learning opportunities.

Scattering sites around campus was thought to be a good idea, however, Professor Vandre pointed out that not every building is an appropriate place for children (for example, the new Biomedical Research Tower or a BSL-3 Lab). Professor Conlisk noted that perhaps the FCBC could respond with a list of buildings that would be appropriate for childcare facilities.

There was concern that the costs for childcare would (or could) eventually be priced out of the range of staff and that units that do not have much money to dedicate to start-up costs for a childcare facility would be left out.

Conflict of Commitment Policy

In response to a request from Professor Susan Fisher that the URC comment on the draft Conflict of Commitment policy, Dr. Todd Guttmann, Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, was invited to discuss the draft policy with the URC. He stated that Federal sponsors require a financial conflict of interest policy as part of the award management process. The NSF recommended that we establish a separate conflict of commitment policy and at the 2003 NIH proactive site visit, the NIH reviewers also made this same recommendation. The deans and chairs have been asking for assistance with this issue because University rules don't really address it. Representatives from Math and Physical Sciences, Engineering, Law, Humanities, and the Graduate School (represented by Professor William Clark) sit on the committee that has drafted the conflict of commitment policy.

Key points of the policy provide that:

- The faculty member has a primary responsibility to the University for his/her professional allegiance and academic activities.
- The policy is based on the academic practice in his/her discipline.
- The policy is based on the disclosure process.
- It is not meant to impact consulting or academic freedom, nor is it meant to be paternalistic

Professor Clark gave the following example of a conflict of commitment: Fulltime faculty member #1 has a colleague, faculty member #2, who was approached at a conference in Europe by a student. The student said he knew of faculty member #1's work because faculty member #1 was on the faculty there at another institution in Europe. This is a conflict of commitment.

Writing a textbook is not a conflict of commitment. Dr. Guttman noted that current University policy allows for that and this policy will not impact that at all.

A general discussion of consulting followed. We don't really define the term consulting in any of our policies. Faculty members are permitted to work one day per week as consultants, but some seem to be working more than this as consultants. Their chairpersons are interested in having a University policy to refer to if this becomes an issue. There is always a concern when faculty are consulting that some funneling of University technology will go to outside start-up companies. Dr. Guttman noted that some departments do have specific policies in place governing consulting activities. Pathology, for instance, does not allow outside consulting.

Several scenarios were addressed by Dr. Guttman:

- If you organized a three-day short course at another university during an on-duty quarter, is this a conflict of commitment? Speak with your chair - if this is accepted practice within your discipline, there may not be a conflict.
- If you take part in a regular course at another university for which they have no faculty expertise in that discipline and you receive an honorarium, is this a conflict of commitment? Delineate the responsibilities from your primary position.
- If you are further developing someone's existing technology is this a conflict of commitment? No.
- If you are teaching at OSU all day and teach one class at Capital at night, is this a conflict of commitment? Yes.

2004-2005 University Research Committee Roster

Carole A. Anderson, ex officio
Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Faculty Resources and
Interim Dean, Graduate School

Gordon J. Aubrecht
College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Department of Physics
Faculty Council-Regional Campus

Loren E. Babcock
College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Department of Geological Sciences
Faculty Council

David A. Berntsen
College of Optometry
Council of Graduate Students

Kathleen A. Boris-Lawrie
Veterinary Medicine
Department of Veterinary Biosciences
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

William A.T. Clark
Graduate School

Daniel E. Collins
College of Humanities
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
Faculty Council

A. Terrence Conlisk, Committee Chairperson
College of Engineering
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty Council

Frank J. DiSanto, ex officio
The Ohio State University Research Foundation
Executive Director
Associate Vice President, Office of Research

Richard P. Gunther
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Department of Political Science
Faculty Council

Nicholas G. Hall
Fisher College of Business
Department of Management Sciences
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Dean P. Lacy
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Department of Political Science
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Nancy Liao
Neurobiotechnology Center
Undergraduate Student Government

Richard L. McCreery
College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Department of Chemistry
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Lydia Medeiros
College of Human Ecology
Department of Human Nutrition & Food Management
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Myroslava Mudrak
College of the Arts
Department of History of Art
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Robert J. McGrath, ex officio
Office of Research
Senior Vice President for Research

Janet M. Myers
Office of Research
Staff for Committee

Scott Pearson
College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
Department of Ag, Environmental & Development Economics
Council of Graduate Students

Kirsten Raehal
College of Medicine and Public Health
School of Biomedical Science
Council of Graduate Students

Thomas J. Rosol
Office of Research
Senior Associate Vice President

Richard Torrance
College of Humanities
Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures
Faculty Council

Dale D. Vandre
College of Medicine and Public Health
Department of Physiology and Cell Biology
Faculty Council

Susie Vogel
College of Veterinary Medicine
Inter-Professional Council

Sigrid Wagner
College of Education
School of Teaching and Learning
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

John W. Wenzel
College of Biological Sciences
Department of Entomology
Council on Research & Graduate Studies

Peter Wyckoff
Ohio Supercomputer Center
Research Scientist
Senior Vice President for Research Appointee

Vacant
Council on Research
& Graduate Studies

Vacant
Postdoc

University Research Committee (URC): White Paper on Proposed Research Faculty (RF) Track. March 7, 2004.

The goals of the URC white paper regarding the RF track are:

- To explore the issues surrounding the creation of the RF position
- To protect existing rights of tenure-track faculty and students, as well as the academic integrity of faculty governance
- To ensure that broad control of implementation is vested with individual Tenure Initiating Units (TIUs)

Introduction:

The URC sought and received a wide variety of input from strong opposition to strong support for the RF proposal. There was also a wide range of opinions on the URC. A summary of the potential benefits and perils of the proposed RF track are presented in the appendix at the end of this document. The most often expressed concerns are listed below. The URC proposes a number of safeguards (in italics below) that may allay some of these concerns.

Specific Concerns Associated with Existing Proposal and Implementable Solutions:

Title: A number of people have objected to the “research faculty” title. *The URC believes the title (research assistant professor, research associate professor, etc.) must be retained.*

Rationale

There is little purpose for these positions without the proposed title. One of the major justifications for the creation of this faculty track was the necessity of the title to assist in the competition for research funds.

Funding: Concerns were expressed over the funding of these positions, especially when these positions start or when there is a lapse of funding from sponsored grants and contracts. *Individual departments or colleges should have the option of flexibly allocating funds for the use in hiring of, supplementing the salary of, purchasing equipment/supplies for, etc., research track faculty.*

Rationale

There is the possibility that RF might have a brief lapse in funding at some point in their career that would necessitate the use of non-sponsored funds for the purpose of supplementing salary, etc. This could occur due to no fault of the investigator, e.g., the federal government fails to allocate funds to a particular institution in a timely manner. Given that these faculty members will be providing units with funding in excess of their salary requirements, i.e., through indirect cost recovery, it is reasonable to allow some flexibility in which funds are used to support these individuals.

Options

- Exclusion of specific sources of funds within a department from use to support research faculty positions. This would prevent the use of specified funds for defined purposes such as start-up funds, supplementation of salary, etc.
- Decisions would be made on an individual basis by a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty.

Classroom Teaching: There was considerable apprehension expressed over the duties of RF in relation to teaching. This is not the intent of the RF positions. This activity should only be done rarely/occasionally. *Individual units should restrict teaching primarily to activities such as graduate seminars, clinical activities, etc.*

Rationale

Given that individual departments/colleges have very different needs for teaching, individual units should specify their teaching limitations. Still, opportunities might exist for erosion of tenure or coercing research faculty to teach to the detriment of their research. In all cases, limits or restrictions are required. Individual units should select from the following options via a majority vote of the tenure-track faculty.

Options

- Disallow classroom teaching of any kind.
- Create specific restrictions on teaching loads, limiting teaching to seminars, brief lecture series, guest lectures, clinical instructing, etc.
- Restrict the percent effort for teaching that could be provided by a regular research faculty for a given number of quarters per calendar year plus an annual cap on the total number of courses taught by all research faculty in a department.

Graduate student advising: This was another area where strong opinions, both for and against, were expressed. *Research faculty should be categorized similar to clinical faculty for purposes of graduate advising and serving as members/chairs of thesis or dissertation committees.* However, research faculty cannot vote on graduate student governance.

Rationale

Research faculty must be able to supervise graduate students in order to conduct their research. The research faculty track is similar to the clinical faculty in terms of permanency, purpose within the University, etc. By using guidelines already established for clinical faculty, the safeguards are in place to ensure that research faculty are appropriately categorized (*M* or *P*) based on their abilities, time commitments, and commitment to individual graduate students.

Options (as already established for clinical faculty)

- Serve as category *M* faculty after application to serve as a graduate faculty member
 - Acts as advisor for master's students.
 - Serves on doctoral examination committees at the discretion of the Graduate Studies Committee.
- Be granted Category *P* status with approval of the Graduate Studies Committee and the Graduate School.

Governance/Committee service: *Research faculty should be able to attend faculty meetings. They should not have voting rights for hiring or for promotion and tenure decisions of tenure-track faculty.*

Rationale

Decisions made at faculty meetings may affect the research conducted by research faculty. Given that the departments/colleges will be receiving indirect cost recovery from RF, they should not be excluded from decisions that would affect their research.

Transfer from RF track to tenure track: *Follow existing proposal, where research faculty can compete for an open tenure-track position.*

Rationale

Research faculty should not be discriminated against.

Limits on number of positions: The URC strongly believes that *the number of research-faculty positions should be limited* to prevent elimination of current or future tenure-track faculty positions. Individual departments should choose among options available by a majority faculty vote.

Options

- Create ratios for tenure track-to-research faculty positions.
- Require each individual hired for a regular research-track faculty position to have a tenure-track faculty sponsor.
- Limit the number of regular research-track faculty to a specific number of positions.

Summary:

The URC believes that the proposed regular research-faculty track will be of substantial benefit to the University as it continues its quest to become a top-ranked research institution. This designation will enable research faculty to compete more effectively for sponsored grants and contracts by appropriately enhancing their status within the University, and providing motivated RF to conduct leading edge initiatives. Improved research funding will help the University offset the decline in funding from the State of Ohio. Nonetheless, there are many possibilities for potential erosion of regular tenure-track faculty. The *safeguards outlined above* are designed to prevent these potential abuses by maximizing the control on the creation of research-faculty positions by the regular tenure-track faculty within each TIU.

Appendix:

*** Potential Benefits from RF Track:**

1. Increase external funding for a TIU with the concomitant indirect cost return, equipment, students, and prestige that accompany that funding. The RF positions allow individuals the time to write competitive proposals.
2. Many TIUs at OSU want to use the RF track as an opportunity to expand.
3. Emphasizes a higher level of commitment on the part of OSU for individuals seeking external funding compared to research scientists.
4. Being able to attract individuals who are very effective researchers, but may not be suitable candidates for tenured positions, either due to a lack of interest in teaching or other faculty activities, or due to a non-traditional background which makes transition to a tenure-track position unlikely
5. Provides a mechanism to hire research-focused spouses of tenure-track faculty (dual career couples), and to hire faculty from other countries who are past those countries' mandatory retirement age but who are still very productive in research.

*** Potential Hazards to Tenure-track Faculty Posed by Establishment of RF Positions:**

1. Research faculty compete with tenure-track faculty for resources such as office or laboratory space.
2. Research faculty that receive partial salary support from a TIU could reduce funding available to tenure-track faculty who fulfill the central missions of OSU.
3. Research faculty that volunteer to teach may choose the more desirable, upper level courses, relegating tenure-track faculty to the complementary but less desirable teaching assignments.
4. Research faculty may seek funding opportunities that alter proportional representation in a TIU of fields that are well funded versus those that are less well funded.
5. Research faculty, if permitted to vote on policy issues, may represent divergent interests compared with the long-term goals of tenure-track faculty

**A PROPOSAL FOR A SYSTEM OF HIGH QUALITY,
DISTRIBUTED CHILDCARE FOR THE CHILDREN OF FACULTY
AND STAFF AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

Submitted by the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Jan. 2005

OBJECTIVE To make an expanded and distributed system of high quality childcare a cornerstone of The Ohio State University's strategies:

1. to attract and retain highly qualified faculty and staff
2. to increase diversity within the faculty and staff populations
3. to make the university a force for creation and support of community within Columbus

Response of the University Research Committee

The University Research Committee (URC) views distributed child care as being extremely important to the OSU community. The Committee recognizes the benefit of having a convenient system of child care available to all of the University community.

The Committee is of course concerned at the high cost of putting a facility in each new building. Moreover, some buildings may not be appropriate to house such facilities; laboratories that deal with hazardous chemicals for example.

The URC feels that the placing of these facilities should not be restricted to new buildings and suggests that the FCBC may want to establish a set of metrics by which existing space within the University may be utilized.

Specific discussion included:

Gordon Aubrecht commented that the cost of childcare could eventually be priced out of the range of staff. John Wenzel commented that people without much money would be left out and I got the sense that he meant units, as opposed to individuals.

Lydia Medeiros said that as a parent, she believes access is one of the most important factors in choosing childcare (her examples were that fevers don't wait for class to end or for an experiment to be completed); she also said that parking close to the childcare

facilities would be important

Susie Vogel said using early childhood students to staff the centers is an excellent idea and others agreed with that.

There was also discussion about not offering childcare at certain sites and Terry Conlisk raised the question of whether we could ask the FCBC to respond with a list of buildings that might be appropriate for childcare centers. Dale Vandre mentioned that some places like the new BRT and the new BSL-3 building on West Campus wouldn't be good places for childcare facilities.

With input from the URC, respectfully submitted by A. Terrence Conlisk, Chair URC

March 30, 2005

Conflict of Commitment Policy Response of the University Research Committee March
30, 2005

The University research Committee recognizes the need for a more extensive policy than is currently in place. Recent cases where faculty have represented themselves as faculty at more than one institution is disturbing and requires attention. In this regard the term “teaching” should be expressly defined in the policy in a manner consistent with the notion that faculty cannot “teach” in two places at the same time. The term “teaching” should not refer to the presentation of short courses and workshops which often constitute professional practice. Professional practice should also include outreach “teaching” services at other institutions. Examples of what constitutes competition with services “provided by an academic or service entity within the University” should be included within the document. A working definition of what constitutes “consultation” should be included in the document. The fact that the writing of text books is not included in the policy should also be stated.

With input from the URC, respectfully submitted by A. Terrence Conlisk, Chair URC