

University Senate Research Committee Meeting  
August 28, 2015  
1:00 – 3:00 PM  
156 CL

In Attendance: E. Chasens, S. Dytman, M. Goodhart, G. Huber, L. Matsumura, P. Morel, M. Redfern, P. Smolinski, M. Spring, A. Vieira

People in attendance introduced themselves.

M. Redfern stated that the Research Committee will be the primary vehicle for bringing research issues to the University Senate.

M. Spring stated that in time the committee will have to develop procedures such as the publishing of minutes, write mission statement, etc. He recommended review of the University Senate bylaws.

P. Morel remarked that the committee meetings in April and May may have to be moved to conflicts with holidays. This will be considered at a later date.

M. Redfern stated that he is the Vice Provost for Research in Provost's office and has ongoing operational and strategic missions in research. The main operational efforts are through the Office of Research. He introduced George Huber who is Vice Provost of Research Conduct & Compliance.

M. Redfern gave the following overview on research issues:

- New personnel in operational positions include Jennifer Woodward who is Associate Vice Provost for the Office of Research, Don Shields is Associate Vice Provost for Initiatives and Alan DePalma is the Head of Export Control. Ryan Champaign, who is under Don Shields, is the designated person for research opportunities.
  - Don Shields goes to talk with departments, particularly in the lower campus, and is charged with identifying new funding sources for Department faculty. The SOM already has an office, led by Michelle Broido, that does these things for the SOM.
- University Strategic Planning
  - There are four subcommittees: Education, Research (Chaired by M. Redfern), Community Engagement and Diversity.
  - Tasks of the Strategic planning research subcommittee:
    - Developing a plan for faculty engagement in the strategic planning process. The faculty will be asked for input into defining University-wide strategic planning objectives related

to research. The University Senate Research Committee may be asked to reach out to their respective areas for input and will be the primary vehicle for communication with Faculty Senate.

- The subcommittee has been tasked with coming up with “examples” that the Chancellor will present to the University’s Board of Trustees. One of these was the big data initiative, which involves medicine, cyber security, physics, among other disciplines.
- M. Redfern stated that strategic issues include corporate engagement, the support of centers such as SAM, the Innovation Institute, the Center for Energy and looking for opportunities, for example, advanced manufacturing, clinical trials, cyber security, humanities and social sciences (interfacing with the sciences).
- Operational matters: Mark Redfern chairs a Policy Review Committee that is tasked with reviewing current policies related to partners, conducting research and research translation.
  - This includes the areas of patents, industrial relations, copyrights and conflict of interest. Three subcommittees will be addressing these issues
  - The review of current policies includes the benchmarking of other universities and putting together a faculty engagement plan to solicit input. The faculty engagement plan will involve meetings with individual faculty and town hall meetings
  - It was noted that changes to University policy changes must go through several committees such as the Faculty Senate, the University Research Council and the Council of Deans.
  - M. Redfern stated that some of the goals with regard to operation aspects of the Office of Research are to improve communication between the Office and school and department administrators and to improve the training of administrators and Office personnel. Other goals are to improve interactions between different offices associated with research such as IRB and research accounting and to improve efficiency through technology for example the electronic MTA form
- There is also a visitor agreement working group which is coming up with agreements for different types of visitors who are involved in research at the University.

M. Spring stated that some of the Provost’s committees have automatic senate members. Perhaps some members of University Senate Research Committee should be on these working groups. Faculty feedback early in the process may avoid later issues.

M. Spring stated that PI Dashboard (CSSD business intelligence) software is something that this committee should be aware of. Mark Redfern was not aware of this and will check on its status.

George Huber of the Research Conduct and Compliance Office stated that the most important goal is the education of faculty in research regulations and needs to improve. Another goal is trying to make things easier for faculty through integration and streamline decision making. Broad goals are collaborative decision making, integration, transparency and efficiencies.

### OTHER ISSUES

P Morel stated that there are other issues that were brought up at faculty assembly at the end for spring term that should be mentioned before this meeting concludes.

M. Goodhart stated that these include the Chancellor's letter on to commercialization of research and consideration of the AAUP principles commercialization of research. Faculty voiced three main points:

- The Nature of research and how it is understood
- How we think about communities that faculty serve through research
- The nature of commercial collaboration (AAUP principles)

The question was raised if Pitt has any guidelines governing academy –industrial partnerships?

It was mentioned that University Senate Research Committee may want to compare the AAUP principles to the proposed Pitt principles.

M. Redfern stated that there is a draft of a set of principles with the Chancellor for comment. The aims of these are to represent the best interest of students and faculty and that the translation of IP is for public good.

M. Goodhart stated that the nature of research is different in different academic communities, for example, the social sciences and humanities are different than the physical sciences, and policies need to take into account all kinds of research. Also, community engagement involves many communities including business and industry, consumers and social communities.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski

Minutes approved by: Penny Morel