



RESEARCH CHALLENGE COMMITTEE
December 07, 2010

Present: Anton Komar, Barsanjit Mazumder, Joanne Goodell, Nigamanth Sridhar, William Wilson, Ziona Austrian, Jerzy Sawicki (Chair)

Absent/Excused: Maria Krasniansky, Mark Tebeau, Tim Long, Joanne Belovich

Guests: Crystal Weyman, Craig Zullig

1. Approval of Agenda for the December 07, 2010 meeting. Approved and seconded as submitted.
2. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2010. Approved and seconded as submitted.
3. Updates on Issues – Jerzy Sawicki
 - a. Research faculty appointments

A draft proposal was distributed to the Committee for discussion and revision as necessary. The Chair emphasized that research faculty are funded from *soft* dollars and when the dollars are no longer available faculty funded under this category can be discharged from CSU or have to find their own source of funding. Under the current contract, only the College of Urban Affairs has Research and Public Service faculty. The Committee expressed reservations about the term appointments indicating that there has been difficulty hiring faculty under these conditions as people are reluctant to apply because they know the job is not permanent and could disappear at anytime if the grant funding is lost.

The Committee recommended that the last paragraph of the draft document be revised to say “Research faculty members *may* supervise students at various levels in related

research projects, and participate in seminars, conferences and similar activities.” The statement that research faculty may teach a class has been eliminated.

The Committee voted 7-0 to send the document forward, as revised, to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies for presentation to the Provost and ultimately adoption by Cleveland State University.

b. Indirect Cost Recovery (IDC)

A proposal from the College of Business was distributed as a trial for one year in the Business College only. The proposed distribution numbers were out of alignment with the Committee’s intent for a permanent IDC distribution range.

The current IDC rates for CSU were distributed to the Committee as well as the rates for University of Cincinnati (UC), Ohio University (OU), and University of Akron (UA).

The rates ranged from nothing at UC to 18% at OU, with a wider range of departments/colleges receiving funds from the IDC recovery. The Committee put forth two potential revisions to the current distribution:

- i) PI 10%, Dept 10%, College 10% VP for Research 20% and General Fund 50%; and/or
- ii) PI 5%, Dept 5%, College 10% VP for Research 20% General Fund 40% and Center(s) 20%.

Under the Centers distribution scenario a faculty member would have the option to apply for a grant as an individual or as a center.

Further discussion of the IDC was tabled to allow the Committee sufficient time to: i) define “center(s)”; ii) establish a policy on how a center would be created; and iii) how to obtain the necessary “*digits*” from the Controller’s Office in order to receive grant funds and make expenditures into and out of a center account.

4. Sub-Committee’s Reports and Updates

a. PeopleSoft (PPS) Issues & Publicizing Resources – Joanne Goodell

Dr. Goodell distributed an information sheet with issues and possible solutions. The Committee stated that PPS should be in real time with real-time ordering and budget information rather than the current weeks delay. Possible solutions include the proposed grants management system (anticipated live date December 2011). The grants management system will include pre and post award functions as well as billing and receivables currently done by hand in the Controller’s office. Bill Wilson, IS&T, stated that the current PPS system can do the on-line requisition function, but when it was originally beta tested, the testers did not see the value and the function, although live, has not been utilized. Dr. Goodell, and the Research Committee members volunteered to be testers if/when/where Bill can arrange. The sub-committee will also convene a group from OSPR, payroll, controllers and grant managers to work on the transaction register

and gift & grant reports, which currently are very difficult to decipher to make them more user friendly.

There was additional information on the sheet outlining changes in Sponsored Programs (OSPR), and hopefully, future changes for OSPR with the addition of staff, review and revision of website, broader use of SPIN (Sponsored Programs information Network).

b. Faculty Summer Salary Calculation & Indirect Cost Distribution – Barsan Mazumder

Dr. Mazumder distributed a fact sheet from UC, whereas summer salary is referred to as Extra Compensation based on number of hours worked rather than calendar year (9 months). Using the extra compensation definition rather than summer salary will allow CSU to increase the current rate. The issue was tabled to obtain more information which will be presented in the next meeting.

c. Graduate Tuition Surcharge – Joanne Belovich

The Committee recommended a waiver of the tuition surcharge for non-residential graduate students paid from grant (soft) funds. The Committee stated that if the surcharge were waived, there would be more money for the University to hire graduate assistants and it would not cost the University because some assistants are paid out of grant funds. On average grantees paid more than \$160,000 in non-residential surcharges. The committee also recommended tuition match for full stipends on grants which would allow the money to go further; and provide full stipends to those that may only be offered TGs, thereby increasing the quality of admits and/or increasing the ration of PhD/MS admits.

d. Compensation policy for Post-docs and Research Associates (grant funded positions) and Grant hiring issues – Anton Komar

Dr. Komar distributed an information sheet showing the NIH recommended minimum wages, CSU suggested minimum wages, and wage ranges for technicians in the union at CSU for Science and Engineering.

Dr. Komar stated that although the CSU wages appeared lower, the NIH wages do not include fringe benefits (33%). Research Technicians at CSU are unionized and have set job descriptions and pay ranges, regardless of the funding stream (soft/hard dollar). Currently the Post docs and Research Associates are promoted based on individual performance, publication, training, achieving milestones, and number of years at the institution. The Committee would like to add factors such as, degree of specialization, discipline, funding availability, and a comparison of salaries/stipends paid by other universities to arrive at a fair compensation standard.

5. Development of Agenda for next meeting

a. Prepare/submit final recommendations before next meeting

- b. Discussion and approval by RCC
- c. Continuation with existing and new issues

6. Scheduling meetings in Spring semester

The recording secretary (Barbara Bryant) will send meeting availability requests for February (no meeting in January), March, and April 2011.

7. New Business

There was no new business discussed

Meeting adjourned at 4:32 pm