

**University of Massachusetts Amherst
Research Council of the Faculty Senate
David Ostendorf, Chair
2004-2005
Minutes
April 15, 2005**

Present: D. Gilbert, R. Keen, M. Lowance, D. Ostendorf, W. Patterson, L. Sievert
P. Utgoff, J. Zamora, A. Mangels, C. Sprague, N. Khan, B. McCandless

The Minutes of March 11, 2005 were accepted as distributed.

Vice Provost for Research: Bruce McCandless reported that an offer is pending from the Personnel Office to Nick DeSteffano for CVIP Directorship. In addition, the Chair noted that the text of Joyce Hatch's speech to the Faculty Senate concerning the curriculum fee is on the Faculty Senate webpage. This speech is a reflection of how Administration views the fee. He encouraged Council members to compare Administration's view to the Research Council's view that also is on the Faculty Senate webpage in the form of a memo concerning what the Council believes should be done.

Administration & Finance: Andy Mangels reported there would be one more round of reminders to PIs concerning percentage of effort reports. He also indicated that the retroactive pay increases for unit members were in process. Two questions were raised about retros. First, Mason Lowance noted an email exchange concerning the practice of obtaining the funds for retroactive pay raises for teaching and research assistants from RTF accounts. The reply was that TAs and RAs are not in the same unit as faculty but that RAs, at least, were understood to have been receiving 100% of their raises all along. Second, Dorothy Gilbert asked whether deans could legitimately obtain the funds for retroactive pay raises from PIs' RTF accounts for faculty who had been grant-funded during the time period covered by the retros but whose grants were now overspent or expired. The reply was that PIs' RTF funds belong to the University and that if Mangels had been directed by a dean to use a PI's RTF account to fund such a retro, he would have done so. Council members observed that PIs' RTF money is used as seed money for new grants, as bridge money to continue the research between grants, and for other purposes vital to further the University's research mission. "Taxing" or "raiding" PIs' RTF accounts would be a powerful disincentive for research and would probably result in "blood in the streets." Mangels said that some grant sponsors will be approached to provide funds for the retros if unspent grant funds had been returned to the sponsor. A suggestion for the future to encumber unfunded raises from sponsors prior to expiration of grants was thought to be logical but not possible.

Graduate Dean: Nigar Khan reported that the Graduate School had done a survey of students asking such questions as whether students were happy with department advising and research. The results identified two issues: 1) financial assistance and 2) academic and research facilities. The results also indicated the belief that students need to receive support for the full length of time they are in school.

Office of Grants and Contracts: Carol Sprague reported that grant awards were above last year's levels, although the higher amount could be attributed to one grant-the Chair's \$5 million dollar grant. The number of proposals submitted was down a bit, but not a major change. Several large proposals have gone through: NanoTech, Homeland Security, and a proposal from the School of Public Health. Jim Ayres has retired and his permanent replacement is being sought, although the Office has been authorized to replace him temporarily.

Compliance Coordinator: Bruce McCandless reported that the Lab Clean Out and Start up Policy was passed on April 4 by the Institutional Chemical Safety Committee. He noted the high cost if investigators leave unknown substances in their labs. If the grant is overspent, the charge for clean out will go to the investigator's department.

Policy Committee: Paul Utgoff reported on two matters. The first was revisions in the procedure for dealing with charges of misconduct in research and scholarly activities (Doc. T91-035A). ORI had audited the UMass policy to see if it was comparable to ORI's own. They found 31 small deficiencies that were in need of attention. So most of the proposed changes involve tightening things up. He moved to approve the revised policy. Motion was passed unanimously. Second, he moved to send to Paul Kostecki a recommendation for creation of a web-based showcase of the completed research and scholarly accomplishments of Amherst Campus faculty. The showcase would extend back 10 or 11 years, which would then fill the gap between the published books of accomplishments, and would extend into the future year by year. Discussion with the Union to use AFRs for the faculty accomplishments has been undertaken. Using AFRs would mean that faculty would not have to be surveyed about their accomplishments a second time. Motion was passed unanimously.

The Chair moved endorsing approval of the Mass NanoTech Institute. He noted that the Research Council, along with other councils, was charged with evaluating the Institute and recommendations. Discussion centered of the upfront contributions of the Chancellor, PIs, and others and on how the RTF return will be negotiated. Motion was passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30.

Respectfully submitted,
Dorothy Gilbert, Recorder