

University Senate Research Committee Meeting
1 November 2017
1:00 PM
156 CL

In Attendance: E. Chasens, K Fike, M. Goodhart, K Kohli, R. Melhem, P. Morel, D. Salcido, P. Smolinski, A. Spenceley N. Spice, M. Spring, J. Woodward.

Corrections to the minutes of the October meeting were made including the correction of Mark to Mark Stofko and the inclusion of Lauren Terhorst and K. Kohli in the list of attendees. Pending these corrections the minutes were approved.

J. Woodward stated the Conflict of Interest Policy will be sent back to the Conflict of Interest subcommittee to review that the intent had not been altered by the SVC and legal counsel. After review by the subcommittee and barring any significant changes, the draft will be presented to this committee, hopefully in a couple of weeks.

J. Woodward also stated that although the Intellectual Property and Visitors Policies are coupled, there is an effort to temporarily separate the Visitors Policy from the IP Policy so that there is a functioning visitors policy. When the draft of the Visitors Policy is complete it will be sent to this committee for comment.

There was a general discussion of various aspects of effort reporting with specific questions on certification of effort of personnel at other institutions. It was recommended that Beverly Zern of the Office of the Controller be invited to discuss aspects of effort reporting. Specific questions of concern to faculty will be sent to her.

Action Item: B. Zern will be contacted to attend a future committee meeting to discuss effort reporting.

P. Morel introduced the draft of the Pitt Principles and stated that in her view the sentence under the Pursuit of Knowledge statement “The University appreciates and recognizes excellence in all form so scholarship and encourages the production of socially useful knowledge in cooperation with partners in academia, in the public and private sectors, and in society at large.” seems to imply that research that has no immediate application to society is not valued. M. Goodhart stated that was not the intent. The intent was to emphasize that community based and social research was valued. The committee engaged in a lively discussion of the topic. M. Spring stated that his reading of the statement led him to think that was research without immediate application was being denigrated. He suggested that the statement be reworded as sentence “The University appreciates and encourages the production of socially useful knowledge in cooperation with partners in academia, in the public and private sectors, and in society at large.” A motion was made that his rewording be suggested to the University Senate. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimous approval.

Action Item: A posting will be made on the Senate web site soliciting comment on the Pitt Principles and a note will be sent to Frank Wilson.

D. Salcido asked if research technical support personal fall under the jurisdiction of the Research Committee and how are job classifications and other aspects of employment determined? J. Woodward stated that technical personal generally fall under the staff designation in the office Human Resources (HR). She further stated that HR is currently in the process of reviewing and revising job classifications.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:17 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Patrick Smolinski and Penny Morel