

Research Council Agenda – Attachments
Monday, September 10, 2001

- A. Bylaws Defining the Research Council
- B. Article for the Faculty Senate Newsletter
- C. Documents Related to the Meeting with President Fly
 - Status
 - Letter from Doug Birdwell, June 20, 2001
 - Presentation by Doug Birdwell, July 9, 2001
- D. Issues Related to F&A
- E. A Perspective on JICS
- F. Committee Description and Assignments
- G. Matrix of Committee Assignments
- H. Research Council Members and Contact Information
- I. Faculty Senate Charge to the Research Council, FY 2001-02
- J. Faculty Senate Retreat: Research/Graduate Issues Focus Area

Attachment A

Excerpted from the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Last revision May 7, 2001

<http://web.utk.edu/~senate/Bylaws.html>

N. Research Council. Membership shall consist of no fewer than 15 appointed faculty or faculty/administrator representatives chosen by the Committee on Committees for staggered three-year terms. In addition, there shall be three graduate students selected by the Graduate Student Association. Ex-officio members shall include the chief academic officer responsible for research, the Associate Vice President of the Office of Research, the Dean of Libraries and college level administrators with responsibility for research (or their designees). The composition of the Council shall reflect balance among externally funded and institutionally supported research, between research and other creative activity, and between disciplines. Members must be actively engaged in research or other creative activity and must (1) hold full-time or continuing part-time appointment with the rank of assistant professor or higher, and (2) perform academic duties consisting of at least half-time teaching, research, service or departmental administration. Ex-officio members shall be the Dean of Libraries and up to two additional designees. The Council members shall elect the Chairperson for a one-year term. The Chairperson must have served at least one year on the Council prior to election. The members of the Council may elect co- or vice Chairpersons.

The Research Council acts as an advisory body to the chief university officer for research. The Council shall promote excellence in research and other creative activity through the study and recommendation of policies. The Council shall sponsor programs to communicate an understanding and appreciation of research and other creative activity to the University community and the community at large. The Council coadministers some programs of the Office of Research as requested by the chief university officer for research. Areas of concern include research incentives and support, intradisciplinary and interdisciplinary research activities, compliance with State, Federal and University regulations governing the conduct of research, rights to and commercialization of intellectual property, the broad range of research infrastructure including all forms of telecommunications and computational support, and other appropriate matters. Further, the Research Council shall concern itself with the institutional policy on research grants and funding, with copyright and patent policy, with protection of investigators, with the protection of human subjects of research, with the protection of experimental animals, and with policies affecting compliance of research activities with environmental and occupational health and safety requirements. Further, the Research Council shall encourage publications and the development of specialized research facilities for intercollegiate and/or interdisciplinary uses and with any other policies pertaining to research programs. The Council shall also encourage the advertisement of research successes of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville researchers. When appropriate, the Council shall report its actions for approval to the Faculty Senate.

Attachment B

TO APPEAR IN FACULTY SENATE NEWSLETTER TO ALL FACULTY

Research Council

The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate state that the Research Council "acts as an advisory body to the chief university officer for research" and that it "shall promote excellence in research and other creative activity through the study and recommendation of policies." It also sponsors "programs to communicate an understanding and appreciation of research and other creative activity to the University community and the community at large" and "coadministers some programs of the Office of Research as requested by the chief university officer for research." This mission is reflected in the Council's structure. The standing committees on Policies & Procedures, and on Research Infrastructure address issues whose solutions can help to create a more productive research environment. Examples include the Workstation Refresh Program, which is administered by the Division of Information Infrastructure but was created upon the recommendation of the Research Infrastructure committee, and the proposed Faculty Development Program, which was co-developed by the Policies & Procedures committee and the Faculty Senate's Professional Development Committee. The Research Promotion & Education committee works on outreach, enhancing the visibility of the benefits of UT research to society. Special Panels of the Research Council exist to coordinate the Provost's Research Awards, the SARIF Summer Special Research Assistantship and equipment awards, the EPPE (Exhibit, Publication, and Performance Expense) awards, and center evaluations. Additional information about these award programs can be found using links from the Research Council web site at <http://www.ra.utk.edu/rc/utkres.htm>.

The University community has seen a large number of changes this year, including the creation of new Centers of Excellence and smaller President's Initiatives to enhance UT's research and teaching capabilities, as well as the departure of a President, some new faces in our administration, and a state budget that is significantly less than desirable. Although it is too easy to focus upon the problems that our University faces, I want to point out four people whom I believe are strong reasons for optimism. I have known Emerson Fly, our newly appointed interim President, since 1990. He is honest, he listens, and I have confidence he can and will make good decisions in tough situations. He can provide strong leadership, and he knows, and is known by, our Board of Trustees and Nashville. He is listening to our faculty, both through the Faculty Senate and by individual contacts. Loren Crabtree is our new Provost, and to date I have heard him speak once, at a recent Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting. I like what I heard, and all of the faculty members who have met him that I have asked also like him. He believes strongly in shared governance and open communications, and he has committed to maintaining close contact with the faculty. Peter Alfonso joined the administration as Associate Vice President for Research in the Spring. I must admit that I put him "on the spot" during his first meeting with the Research Council by asking him questions about policies that his former boss, Wade Gilley, was implementing. I liked his answers, but I don't believe that Wade Gilley would have approved. We have three leaders who have established an open and honest dialogue with the faculty, and this has already produced results. The search process for a new President is one area, where the faculty provide input through the advisory council and have direct representation on the search committee. The fourth person is Governor Sundquist, who has provided a strong voice for fundamental changes in our state's tax structure. Governor Sundquist has also demonstrated that he listens to our faculty, as the changes in the role of the advisory council and the representation of the faculty on the search committee are in response to faculty input. Our University is in a difficult position because of the state's budget, and the cumulative impact of too many inadequate budgets, but there are also significant opportunities, opportunities that rarely occur, because we have capable leaders who have committed to working with the faculty to make our university a far better institution.

The Research Council is initiating two efforts this year that relate directly to the Centers of Excellence, other University centers and multidisciplinary research programs, and all faculty who manage externally funded research. The first is a review of current procedures governing the creation, operation, and review of research centers and an effort to define uniform policies and procedures to replace the existing mix of guidelines and organizational structures. The second is a study of the allocation of Facilities and Administrative (F&A) receipts generated by externally funded research contracts and grants, with particular

emphasis upon methods for reinvestment of F&A in our research infrastructure and enterprise. Allied problems that will be studied include the availability of startup funds for new faculty, the absence of discretionary funding for faculty, and incentive mechanisms to attract faculty to work with research centers. Many problems exist in these areas. These include the variation in the methods of distribution of research incentive funds (RIF) across both the Knoxville campus and between campuses, the competition between departments and centers for a portion of F&A returns, and the absence of a uniform method of funding start-up packages for new faculty. Any recommendations will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for debate, and if approved by the Faculty Senate will be forwarded to the administration.

Several other topics will be considered by the Research Council during the year. These include a continued follow-up to the faculty leave policy that has been proposed by the Faculty Senate, a study of the issues surrounding staff leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants, the impact of various restructuring initiatives on the Research Council, university supercomputer initiatives, appropriate measures of university progress, and stipends and benefits for graduate students. Additional information can be found on the Research Council's web site at <http://www.ra.utk.edu/rc/>. Interested faculty or staff can contact the Research Council to provide input or for additional information through the current chair, Doug Birdwell, at birdwell@hickory.engr.utk.edu.

Attachment C

Policies & Procedures Related to Research Centers Status and Charge to the Research Council

Doug Birdwell
Chair, Research Council

September 10, 2001

The university has several different types of research centers: THEC-designated Centers, recently created Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives, Centers and other entities created through procedures established by the Office of Research, a Joint Institute operated by the Science Alliance, and possibly other entities that function as centers of research. The majority of these centers are subject to periodic review and renewal using standardized procedures implemented by the Office of Research and the Research Council.

The university should strive to meet high standards of fairness, effective assessment, uniformity, and accountability in its administration of research centers. In meeting these standards, the university's goal should be to maximize the probability of success, the visibility and stature, and the attainment of center goals in all cases. The university can provide invaluable services to centers through a periodic and impartial assessment of each center's goals, of its business and strategic plans, of its financial security, of its resource requirements and utilization, and of the quality and balance of its personnel and research products. Where weaknesses are identified through peer review, the university can assist centers by providing access to the talents of business, finance, and academic personnel as required.

Currently, none of the programs that the university uses to review and offer assistance to centers during their life cycles meets all of these standards and goals. The Research Council and Office of Research provide impartial assessments of the academic qualities of its centers and treats all centers with reasonable uniformity, but it does not do as well when assessing a center's business or strategic plans or its financial security. In particular, many of its centers operate with virtually no financial support from the university, other than space and utilities. The processes implemented by Wade Gilley and his administration were worse. They did not provide uniformity: These processes ignored the existing center policies and procedures, and, according to Dwayne McCay, in three instances centers were established and funded outside of the procedures implemented by Wade Gilley. The absence of a clearly delineated and fixed center development program at the beginning of the process led to objectives and funding goals that became excessively fluid during the review and selection process. Fairness, accountability, and impartiality have been called into serious question because of the excessive secrecy of these processes. Universally acknowledged standards of peer review were violated when individuals who submitted center proposals were asked to review competing proposals. And, an organization that stood to benefit directly from the selection of center proposals aligned with its interests, ORNL, was involved in the decision process.

Many of the problems inherent in the Large Centers of Excellence and the President's Initiatives processes implemented by Wade Gilley were discussed during a meeting on July 9th between Doug Birdwell, Gayle Baker, Ann Mayhew, Dwayne McCay, and Emerson Fly. The problems that are inherent in the existing Policies and Procedures and their implementation by the Office of Research and the Research Council are already evident to those in the Research Council who have participated in the Center Reviews Panel. As a consequence of the variety of center programs in the university and the problems that have surfaced, one of the charges to the Research Council this year is to develop recommendations for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers. This task is assigned to the Research Council's Policies and Procedures Committee. As a starting point, the committee can utilize the information gleaned from the July 9th meeting, recent and current practices within the Office of Research and Information Technology and the Research Council, and the existing manual documenting policies and procedures for center reviews.

A goal for this academic year is to bring a proposal to the Faculty Senate to adopt uniform procedures governing the life cycles of multidisciplinary centers. This proposal should include a revision of the existing policies and procedures manual. The key individuals of the Office of Research and Information Technology and the Provost should be consulted during this process in order to develop policies and procedures that both they and the faculty can support. If the Faculty Senate adopts the proposal, the Provost and President could then present it to the Board of Trustees for approval as university policy. A preliminary report from the Policies and Procedures Committee should be provided to the Research Council during this term.

J. Douglas Birdwell
Chair, Research Council
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-2100

birdwell@utk.edu
865-974-5468

June 20, 2001

Mr. Emerson Fly
Acting President
800 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0180

President Fly:

You said in your letter to the University community that now was a time to reassess our progress and fine-tune the process of change that has swept our campus during Past President Gilley's tenure in office. As Chair of the Research Council, I want to begin that process. Over the past year, a large number of our top researchers have committed time and energy to proposal development for Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service (formerly Small Centers of Excellence). As the review and awards processes have evolved, several faculty members, and the Research Council, have questioned the closed-door procedures that were adopted and the failure to disclose participants in the process. Recent events have produced a heightened awareness of the potential for inequitable conduct and poor decisions in a closed-door environment operating with unique rules and procedures. I am asking the Research Council to review these procedures and processes, and to summarize their findings along with recommendations for change. My intent is to improve the processes that govern research centers by developing fair and open procedures that the University community can implement and use in future efforts to create or review centers of excellence and similar entities.

Between August and May, the University's objectives and the strategy for Center/Initiative implementation have been moving targets. Originally targeted to establish two to three Large Centers with five year budgets up to \$25M each, the Large Centers effort created nine much smaller Large Centers that forced faculty to scrap and redesign implementation strategies and budgets. The Small Centers effort, which began with the Fall 2000 term, seemed to disappear for a time, and resurfaced as the President's Initiatives effort with much different objectives and funding scope. These changes of direction have resulted in wasted efforts by the faculty members who have been involved in the processes, a considerable amount of frustration, and questions as to whether the results can achieve the original goals and what the eventual benefits will be. The process also appears to have created one or more Centers as byproducts, more by fiat rather than through an orderly review and decision process. This has reduced the availability of funds for faculty teams whose proposals participated in the full evaluation process. The Center for Law, Medicine, and Technology that has been featured in recent News-Sentinel articles appears to be one of these cases.

The changes in direction and scope, and the closed-door decision processes that have occurred during the solicitation, review, and awards processes have consequences. These include:

- reduced faculty productivity,
- heightened frustrations and reduced faculty morale, including the loss of distinguished faculty,
- lost opportunities to pursue other avenues of funding, and
- rework made necessary by substantial changes in funding and scope.

Several faculty members have pointed to the creation of one or more Centers that did not undergo a formal review process as evidence of a faulty process that endangers the reputation and quality of our institution and its research.

I am proposing a review of the existing methods to identify both their strengths and their flaws. I hope that by doing this, the Research Council can help to establish, through the Faculty Senate, the University's administration, and our Board of Trustees, uniform policies and procedures governing the creation and life cycle of centers and other multidisciplinary entities within The University of Tennessee.

Past President Gilley and Vice President McCay bypassed the established Center proposal and evaluation procedures, which have been managed by the Office of Research and the Research Council, and the results of that decision have raised concerns that many faculty believe are legitimate and require inquiry.

Examples of these concerns include:

- the fluid objectives and funding goals for centers and initiatives,
- the secrecy of the review process,
- the degree of influence during the selection process of special interests such as ORNL, and the lack of communication with various academic units on campus, excluding many of the research faculty from the process,
- the failure to return reviews of proposals to faculty authors when requested,
- the creation of Centers outside of the procedures created and published by Wade Gilley and Dwayne McCay,
- the movement of an existing Center (the Joint Institute for Computational Science, JICS) to ORNL prior to the availability of state-funded space and without coordination with campus research groups that utilize JICS resources,
- the possibility of inappropriate or misguided influence over newly established Center structures and initiatives, and
- the lack of uniformity of oversight procedures for Centers.

I believe it is appropriate for the Research Council to initiate a review of the Center and Initiative proposal review and selection processes that were used by Past President Gilley and Vice President McCay, and by their staff. Our objectives are to document these processes for presentation to the Faculty Senate, and to make recommendations based upon our findings that we hope will lead to a more uniform, accountable, meaningful, and open process that can be followed when centers are established or reviewed and renewed in the future.

On behalf of The University of Tennessee Research Council, I am writing to request access to and a copy of all records associated with:

- creation of a process or processes proposed or used for UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service proposal solicitation, evaluation, selection, funding, and oversight,
- preparation of solicitations of proposals for the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service,

- selection of reviewers of proposals for the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service, for all stages of the review process,
- reviews of proposals, including all communications with reviewers, for the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service, for all stages of the review process,
- discussions and decisions leading to the awards creating the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service,
- announcement and funding of the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service, and
- guidance provided to and oversight of UT Large Centers of Excellence or President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service, and

including those records associated with unfunded proposals under either program and any other Centers funded or relocated by Past President Wade Gilley, Vice President Dwayne McCay, or their offices or staff.

I hope that you can respond to my request within the next two weeks, as I want to have the review process well underway this summer. If you believe more time is needed to identify, gather, and copy the requested materials, please let me know.

I plan to create an Ad Hoc committee of the Research Council to conduct a review of the processes that culminated in the funding of the UT Large Centers of Excellence and President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service. The objectives are, first, to compare these processes with broadly accepted practice and standards of conduct. As a baseline for comparison, the processes used by the Office of Research and Information Technology and the Research Council's Special Panel on Centers Evaluation, and the established peer review and decision processes used by federal funding agencies and organizations that accept submissions for archival publications will be used. Deviations from this baseline will be documented and evaluated. Second, I anticipate that the Ad Hoc committee will make recommendations to the Research Council that will lead to a proposal to the Faculty Senate to adopt uniform procedures for review of proposals to establish, fund, review, and renew or abolish multidisciplinary centers within The University of Tennessee.

Sincerely,

J. Douglas Birdwell
Chair, Research Council

Strategic Review of Center Initiative Processes

— □ □ —
Doug Birdwell
Chair, Research Council

UT Research Council

1

9/5/2001

Vision

- Adopt uniform procedures for review of proposals to establish, fund, review, and renew or abolish UT centers.
- Ensure that an equitable and accountable process based upon widely accepted academic practices is followed in all future UT center review efforts.

UT Research Council

2

9/5/2001

Objectives and Methods

- Document current practices and widely accepted academic procedures.
- Address faculty concerns about questionable methods.
- Make recommendations for adoption of standard practices.
 - Research Council -> Faculty Senate -> President & Board of Trustees

UT Research Council

3

9/5/2001

Standard Practices

- Based upon
 - Federal research program development and review procedures (DoD, DoE, NSF, ...)
 - Accepted practices of academic journal editorial boards (IEEE, Pergamon, ...)
- Requirements
 - Fairness
 - Effective Assessment
 - Uniformity
 - Accountability

UT Research Council

4

9/5/2001

Standard Practice Components

- Program Development
- Proposal Reviews
- Award

UT Research Council

5

9/5/2001

Standard Practices – Program Development

- Initial program proposal undergoes a review and selection process
- Program parameters are frozen after public announcement or solicitation
 - Technical scope
 - Timetable
 - Review and selection criteria
 - Anticipated size and number of awards
- After this point, all communications with potential bidders are public and for clarification only.

UT Research Council

6

9/5/2001

Standard Practices – Proposal and Manuscript Review

- Review by unbiased experts
 - No connection to proposal teams
 - No personal bias
 - No financial or other personal or institutional impact
- Disclosure of members of review panel
 - Varies across agencies
 - Public disclosure of participation
 - No association between an individual and a particular review
- Return of review contents to proposal teams

UT Research Council

7

9/5/2001

Standard Practices – Awards and Publication Decisions

- Public disclosure of decision process and the participants
- Accountability
 - Review and selection criteria have been followed
 - Award guidelines have been followed, subject to budget authority

UT Research Council

8

9/5/2001

Today's Situation: 3+ Center Processes

- Research Council's Special Panel on Centers Evaluation and ORIT/Assoc. VP Research
- Large Centers of Excellence
- Small Centers of Excellence / President's Initiatives to Improve Teaching, Research and Service
- Other Activities

UT Research Council

9

9/5/2001

UT Research Council and ORIT/Assoc. VP Research

- Charge: "To evaluate Research Centers on an ongoing periodic basis and recommend to the Associate Vice President for Research the disposition of renewal requests; to perform the same evaluation for new applications for Research Center status."

UT Research Council

10

9/5/2001

Large Centers of Excellence

- Process managed by Past President Gilley and Vice President McCay.
- Intent vs. Result:
 - Original Target: 2-3 Large Centers with \$5M/year budgets for 5 years
 - Result: 9 much smaller Centers with \$1-2M/year budgets for 5 years (2 years firm commitment)
- Approximately 20 full proposals were developed, involving multidisciplinary teams of faculty
 - A large percentage of the faculty productive in research were involved.

UT Research Council

11

9/5/2001

Small Centers of Excellence / President's Initiatives

- Process managed by Past President Gilley, Vice President McCay, and Vice Provost Mayhew.
- The Small Center process disappeared, and reappeared as President's Initiatives
 - Dramatically different objectives, funding per center, and scope.
 - A large number of faculty were involved, wrote proposals targeting program objectives that had shifted, and basically wasted their time and energies.

UT Research Council

12

9/5/2001

Other Activities

- Ideas were proposed and funded "outside the box". An example: Reed / Center for Law, Medicine, and Technology.
- An established Center (Joint Institute for Computational Science, or JICS) was moved to ORNL space, its work and mission were changed, and its director was removed without review by established processes or consultation with affected faculty and research groups.
- There is a possibility that inappropriate and/or misguided influence over newly established Centers exists and continues (Food Safety Center and Center for Genomics and Bioinformatics).

UT Research Council

13

9/5/2001

Faculty Concerns – Part 1

- Fluid objectives and funding goals for center and initiative processes
- Secrecy of the review process
- Influence of special interests
- Reviews of proposals by individuals with self-interest
- Failure to return reviews to proposers

UT Research Council

14

9/5/2001

Faculty Concerns – Part 2

- Creation of centers outside of even the procedures established by Gilley and McCay
- Movement of an existing center to ORNL prior to availability of state-funded space and without coordination with affected campus research groups.
- Possible inappropriate or misguided influence over center structures and initiatives
- Lack of uniformity of center oversight.

UT Research Council

15

9/5/2001

A Cynic's View of Gilley's Approach

- If it was here when I came, it's no good.
- Use an "open competition" to disguise and legitimize the decisions I make to strengthen linkages to ORNL and St. Jude's.
- Rely on my friends and contacts within ORNL and St. Jude's to provide information for the basis of my decisions.
- Control the flow of information to keep outsiders in the dark.
- Change my stated objectives frequently to keep everyone off-balance.

UT Research Council

16

9/5/2001

Fluid Objectives and Funding Goals

- Large Centers Process
 - Faculty teams wrote proposals based upon \$25M/5 year funding model.
 - Changes forced faculty to scrap and redesign implementation strategies and budgets.
 - The 4:1 match was announced in the end game.
- Small Center / President's Initiatives Process
 - Funding model changed (dramatically reduced), and was never adequately publicized.
 - Target audience changed (increased emphasis on teaching & service; increased emphasis on portions of the academic community that were excluded from Large Center Process)

UT Research Council

17

9/5/2001

Programmatic Impact

- Restructured Large Centers are unlikely to achieve their original goals, upon which funding decisions were presumably based.
- Even the reduced goals are doubtful; a 4:1 match with "new" (as opposed to "re-labeled") funding is unlikely.
- It appears that several Small Center proposals have been left in limbo, with recommendations to ORIT to seek alternate sources of funding.

UT Research Council

18

9/5/2001

Human Impact

- Reduced faculty productivity.
- Heightened frustrations and reduced faculty morale, including the loss of a distinguished faculty member.
- Lost opportunities to pursue other avenues of funding.
- Rework made necessary by substantial changes in funding and scope.

UT Research Council

19

9/5/2001

Secrecy of the Review Process

- The Research Council objected at their October 9, 2000 meeting, where Dr. Garrison presented information on the center process:
 - "Committee members voiced concerns about the secretiveness of the review process, citing the open records law in Tennessee, the need for consultation with the faculty on procedures, and the need to provide appropriate feedback on unfunded proposals." (<http://www.ra.utk.edu/rc/octmin.htm>)

UT Research Council

20

9/5/2001

Secrecy of the Review Process

- Despite repeated requests for reviews of my proposal, and the assurance of Dr. McCay that they would be delivered one week after the awards were announced, I have never seen the reviews.
- No official disclosure of the composition of the review panel(s) has been made.

UT Research Council

21

9/5/2001

Allegations of Improper Review Procedures

- It has been rumored that at least one Large Center proposal was reviewed by the author of a competing Large Center proposal.
- Review, or input to the selection process, by members of ORNL who stood to gain from selection of particular proposals.
- Lobbying for selection of some proposals by Dr. Madia, ORNL Director and UT-Battelle President and CEO. ORNL is a direct beneficiary of several of the funded Large Centers.

UT Research Council

22

9/5/2001

Allegations of Improper Review Procedures

- Recommendation written by Dr. McCay to fund the Center for Law, Medicine and Technology, based upon (according to 3 sources) a proposal that has been variously described as "a few pages", "a draft", and "a concept". The recommendation appears to have been made without checking the background of the proposal: for example, such a check would have found that several proposed members of the board of advisors had not agreed to serve. From an e-mail from Dr. McCay dated 6/26/01:
 - "The recommendation I wrote for the Center that you mention (CLMT) was made based on a request from the President to review the proposal and consult with the Dean's (sic) of law and medicine with regard to the merits of the proposed ideas. We accomplished that and made the recommendation to the President and he acted on that recommendation."

UT Research Council

23

9/5/2001

Influence of Special Interests

- There are strong indicators that personnel from ORNL, and possibly from St. Jude's, held substantial influence over the Large Center selection process.
- Conversely, at least some UT Deans and Department Heads were excluded from the process and denied both involvement and information.
- The process opens UT to the criticism that Large Centers were selected based upon existing ties to ORNL or St. Jude's rather than their technical and business merits.
- Such a process could also deny Tennessee the most benefit for its investment.

UT Research Council

24

9/5/2001

Centers Created Outside the Defined Processes

- It is clear from news reports that the Center for Law, Medicine and Technology was created without regard for established processes.
 - Diligent review would have disclosed that at least some advisory board members had not consented.
 - Diligent review would also have questioned the qualifications of Ms. Reed as center director.
 - If it is true that the CLMT was reviewed and approved based upon a draft or sketch of a proposal, this demonstrates a disregard for the capabilities, expertise, and dedication of the University faculty.
 - Approval and funding of CLMT denied funding to other meritorious proposals by University faculty.**

UT Research Council

25

9/5/2001

Movement of JICS to ORNL

- JICS is now in ORNL-owned space performing ORNL work with UT funds. Dr. Halloy was removed from his position as JICS Director.
- The research projects on the Knoxville campus that interacted with, used, or depended upon JICS resources do not appear to have been consulted, and have been left to pick up the pieces
 - Cummings, Baker, Birdwell, Dongarra, ...
- Dr. Alfonso is now supposed to find \$1.3M / year to support access to ORNL's computing facilities – access that is questionable based upon past history and that supports demand that could probably be better served by local (UT) clusters with less cost.
- The decision to move JICS appears to have been made in isolation by Drs. McCay, Poore, and Zacharia (ORNL).

UT Research Council

26

9/5/2001

Inappropriate / Misguided Influence over New Centers

- The Center for Food Safety, the Center of Excellence in Structural Biology, and the Center for Genomics and Bioinformatics have released solicitations for proposals to University faculty.
 - Common themes: \$10K/yr and \$40K/yr awards.
 - CFS requires that all collaborators be affiliates of CFS.
 - CFS and CESB stress collaboration with ORNL.
 - CESB requires that a future proposal go through CESB.
- The commonality points to common input to the processes.

UT Research Council

27

9/5/2001

Inappropriate or Misguided ?

- \$10K / \$40K award ceilings are probably too low to do more than write a proposal. The common numbers are indicative of a common source.
- CFS and CESB solicitations display a world-view that collaboration with ORNL is a worthy goal that should have priority – a view that may not be shared by Center directors or faculty.
- All solicitations ignore the implication that faculty involvement with Centers can drain academic departments of revenue (RIF).
- Without adequately addressing the flow of revenue, the Centers are likely to fail due to absence of faculty support.

UT Research Council

28

9/5/2001

A "Bottom Line"

- Administrators and "advisory boards" can add management and business expertise, but ...
- Faculty are the best source of information about appropriate funding levels, appropriate collaborators, and appropriate vehicles.
- Issues regarding distribution of research funds and RIF returns must be resolved before a large fraction of faculty are likely to participate.
- Few individuals are likely to work to build an empire for someone else.
- This guidance is available to anyone willing to engage the faculty. The current directions indicate top-down rather than shared governance.

UT Research Council

29

9/5/2001

A Lack of Uniformity

- An established and functional structure exists for faculty and administrative oversight of centers.
- A second structure has been, or is being, set up to provide oversight of "Large Centers".
- We don't know where the breakthroughs and "big bucks" will come from; we should provide the same level of assistance to all.
- The technical oversight needs to come from the faculty, with input on management and financial issues from other sources of expertise.

UT Research Council

30

9/5/2001

The 21st Century

- Opportunities for growth will be exploited, or missed, by our faculty, and not by the University administration.
- The University administration can enable more rapid growth by providing seed funding, incentives for multidisciplinary scholarship, and infrastructures conducive to the attraction, retention, and development of productive faculty.
- The process can be fostered by open processes and shared governance, or hindered by balkanization, secrecy, and botched execution, such as we have seen over the past two years.
- Regardless of the impacts of state budgets (or their absence), much of UT's success in achieving its objectives will be determined by our own actions.

UT Research Council

31

9/5/2001

Review of the Records

- The Research Council has made a formal request for all records associated with the Large Center, Small Center / President's Initiatives, and other similar processes initiated by Past President Gilley and Vice President McCay.
- The faculty have not been served well, are frustrated by the chain of events, and are disgusted by what they have seen to date. They deserve an unbiased analysis of the past and adoption of policies and procedures to prevent a recurrence.
- The citizens of our state have a right to expect accountability, and it is best that the faculty undertake this responsibility to put our home in order.

UT Research Council

32

9/5/2001

Recommendation

- Delivery of requested records to the Research Council.
- Review by Research Council with a report to the Faculty Senate.
- Recommendations formulated by Research Council and presented for adoption by Faculty Senate, and ultimately by the University administration and Board of Trustees.

UT Research Council

33

9/5/2001

Attachment D

Discussion Topics --- Research Infrastructure / F&A Restructuring
8/27/2001

1. F&A financial information provided by Peter Alfonso ("last year"; FY 1999-00 or 2000-01 data?)
 - \$12M gross F&A receipts to UT
 - \$9-10M net F&A receipts due to cost sharing (21-23% over 5 years)
 - 25% of net F&A returned to generating units as Research Incentive Funds
 - 23% to ORIT, of which \$1.1M funds SARIF (approx. 8.5%)
 - leaving 50%, which appears to go into a general fund
 - F&A enters UT without restrictions on by when it must be spent, but much of it ends up in E accounts, which must be spent by the end of the fiscal year.
 - Sylvia Davis is probably the person most familiar with financial and legal issues that impact F&A.
2. Changes requested by Peter Alfonso
 - Increase ORIT funds by \$500K -- majority to go toward grant/contract matching requirements (currently \$300K allocation)
 - Establish SARIF funds for Memphis
 - Cap flow of RIF to deans and department heads that is used to meet operating costs.
 - The impact of the state budget restrictions is not known.
3. F&A can be defined as reimbursement for costs associated with performing work on contracts/grants that cannot be attributed to a project as direct costs. (This is not an exact definition as provided in government FARs.)

Examples:

- Physical facilities (maintenance, utilities, furniture, ...)
 - Financial functions (department, college, university)
 - Computational, networking, and telecommunications resources (that can not be charged directly, either due to inability to account for use or statutory limitation)
 - Library and database resources
4. F&A funds are generated by PIs.
 - A portion needs to return to them so they can grow their enterprises.
 - The returns are a valuable incentive to PIs.
 - No return sends a message to PIs that they are taxed to provide funds for other activities. PIs and their contract monitors find ways to avoid the tax.
 - Contracting agencies regard F&A as a tax on doing business with UT that should be avoided if they see no benefit.
 5. Minimize delays in F&A feedback loops.

- Part of this delay is due to delays imposed by federal agencies. According to Peter Alfonso, they do not pay F&A until the end of their fiscal year (Sept. 30).
 - PIs often do not see any RIF until late April / early May, and it is placed in an E account where it must be spent by June 30.
 - The purchasing deadline on all requisitions requiring bids usually leaves 3-6 weeks from the time RIF are available until the time they must be committed.
6. F&A recoveries should not be placed in accounts that zero out at the end of each FY.
 - By current practice, a lot of F&A funds are placed in E accounts that must be zeroed out and closed at the end of each fiscal year.
 - F&A should be used as payments into revolving accounts to accommodate long-term recovery of large expenditures.
 - UT has no realistic depreciation policy related to expected lifetimes of equipment, nor does it have a mechanism for the orderly replacement of old equipment.
 - Faculty members, and other entities that receive a portion of F&A, should have accounts for this purpose. The balances of these accounts should survive fiscal year roll-overs.
 7. Faculty F&A accounts could be "birth-to-death" accounts, established with any start-up package when faculty members are hired and re-absorbed when they leave.
 8. Departments, colleges, campuses (Memphis), and centers are in competition for a portion of F&A. Some existing recipients have justification (all RIF used to support research). For others the status quo is the result of a history of inadequate funding. This can not be immediately corrected and requires careful financial planning.
 9. Should centers operate as cost centers with separate F&A rates (in addition to the institutional rate)? Centers would then survive on their ability to attract external funding and on PI perceptions that value received for associating with a center equals or exceeds increased F&A burden. What are the issues that must be considered in realizing this?
 10. There are ethical issues associated with Centers of Excellence's (COE) current efforts to attract PI associations:
 - Use of COE funding to attract "listings" of current external funding to COE to satisfy a match requirement imposed by the University and legislature.
 - "Listing" of current externally funded research projects by Centers when they have no material participation.
 - Efforts to fund proposal development (at very low levels) in exchange for F&A revenue stream and "listing" without adequate disclosure.

- Similar efforts to attract PIs when PIs do not have the authority to commit F&A funds to a COE.
11. Utilization of F&A to offset costs of unfunded or under-funded research activities needs to be addressed. This is the last issue listed, but is by no means the lowest in importance; these internal R&D (IR&D) funds are critical to many departments in the University. EPPE, SARIF, contract/grant matching requirements, and other activities that are funded using F&A fall into this category. A valid question in the existing structure is whether the efforts funded by F&A receipts all meet the test of being legitimate IR&D or support of infrastructure that is justifiable to government auditors in agreeing upon F&A rates, or if some activities may in fact be money laundering.

Attachment E

A Perspective on JICS, UT, and the Relationship with UT-Batelle

Doug Birdwell
Chair, Research Council

September 10, 2001

Executive Summary

During the summer term, the Joint Institute for Computational Science (JICS) was moved from its Knoxville campus location to space within the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), which is operated by UT-Batelle. This was done, at least in part, to fulfill Tennessee's commitment, made as part of the UT-Batelle bid to the Department of Energy, that a Joint Institute for Computational Science would be established at ORNL in a building constructed using state funds. However, the decision to move JICS was done with minimal input from either the faculty or employees of the university who are assigned to JICS. The move was also accomplished well before the state-funded building's completion, and in fact, before the groundbreaking. The new location of JICS makes it more difficult for faculty on the Knoxville campus to interact with JICS personnel and involve JICS personnel in their research, and for UT students to take courses previously offered by JICS. Currently, UT is funding a university organization that resides at ORNL, in ORNL space, and that appears to perform primarily ORNL-related work.

Some individuals within both UT and ORNL believe that the creation of a computational science program, with input from several fields that rely on high performance computing, is a worthwhile goal. I believe that, given the backgrounds of a number of researchers within UT and ORNL, an emphasis on and support of computational science research activities is appropriate. The decision to move JICS to ORNL, and a related financial commitment by UT in high performance computing, appear to support this belief. According to Jesse Poore, Director of the Science Alliance, UT has agreed to an approximately \$1.3M annual funding commitment in the area of computational science. Of this, \$500K is a direct payment to ORNL to support maintenance and operations of their high performance computing facilities. An additional \$800K comes from externally supported UT research projects on activities that utilize ORNL facilities. The annual payments are in exchange for free access to approximately 20% of the capacity of the ORNL "teraflop" facilities by university researchers.

These executive decisions were made largely without faculty input, and funds have been committed that, especially in the current budgetary environment, will be provided to ORNL at the expense of other activities at the university. At the January 29, 2001 meeting of the Research Council, Brice Bible (DII) told those present that he wished to form a technical advisory group of faculty for input on high performance research computing. The first meeting of this group occurred on February 28, 2001, where Christian Halloy, then director of JICS, gave a presentation and led a discussion covering options that could be followed to meet the high performance computing needs of

university researchers. No consensus formed, although sentiment appeared to favor a parallel approach that simultaneously supported cluster computing on campus and provided access to high performance computing assets either on campus or at ORNL. Unfortunately, as late as July 9, 2001, when I talked with him, Jesse Poore did not know about this meeting or the discussions that took place. The decision to move JICS to ORNL and commit university funds to support ORNL facilities was apparently made by Dwayne McCay, Tom Zacharia (ORNL), and Jesse Poore. Of these individuals, only Dwayne McCay was at the February 28, 2001 meeting, and only for a portion of the meeting. Judging by Jesse Poore's lack of knowledge of the February meeting, the decision process does not appear to have incorporated any faculty input from the technical advisory group.

The decision to move JICS and support ORNL's high performance computing initiative, has placed all of the university's eggs in one basket. With the loss of JICS from the Knoxville campus, the only support provided to campus research projects requiring cluster computing is through occasional visits by JICS personnel to campus. Contrary to the sentiments expressed at the February 28th meeting, all new central funding for high performance computing is directed toward ORNL facilities. A select few university researchers who utilize these facilities obtain access to free computing resources, underwritten by the university, at the expense of other activities the \$500K annual fee paid to ORNL could have supported within the university. The technical advisory group has not met since its first meeting.

Conversation with Jesse Poore, Director, Science Alliance

Jesse Poore asked to talk with me regarding my concerns about JICS' move to Oak Ridge, and I called him at home on August 3rd. We talked for about an hour. Jesse Poore's request probably came as a result of a presentation I made to Emerson Fly, with Dwayne McCay, Ann Mayew, and Gayle Baker present, on July 9, 2001. At this meeting, I stated that JICS had been moved to ORNL and that JICS personnel were performing ORNL work, even though they were still funded by UT. I also stated that the decision to move JICS was made without the input of the UT faculty members who interact with JICS and are affected by this move. Jesse Poore requested the opportunity to discuss JICS with me in an e-mail, where he stated: "Rumor has it that you have been misinformed or underinformed." Based upon the information he provided and my discussions with others, I do not believe I was. I stand by my statements of July 9th; in addition, I believe there are significant issues involving the large commitment of UT funds to ORNL, which must certainly occur at the expense of other UT programs in the present environment.

History related by Jesse:

When Jesse took the job as head of Science Alliance, JICS was funded by Science Alliance. Then, Dwayne McCay and Lee Reidinger asked Tom Zacharia (ORNL, Director, Computer Science & Mathematics Division) and Jesse Poore to be co-directors

of a new JICS. They were to help design the JICS building at ORNL and figure out ways to make the new JICS prosper.

For a time during the past year Christian Halloy, the former director of JICS, was relocated to a new group called Scientific/Research Computing within ORIT and was to report to Dwayne McCay. For unknown (at least to me) reasons, this new venture did not work out, and Dwayne McCay asked Jesse Poore to take responsibility of the "old" JICS and Christian Halloy. Jesse Poore stated that Christian Halloy did not ever get satisfaction from Dwayne McCay, and that the process was out of control. Christian Halloy told me that Dwayne McCay never followed through with the commitments that he made to Christian.

Involvement of the Research Council:

At about the same time as the abortive attempt to start the Scientific/Research Computing organization within ORIT, the Research Council became involved in discussions regarding the future of high performance computing. Brice Bible addressed the Research Council at their January 29, 2001 meeting. From the minutes describing this presentation:

"High performance research computing: The SP2 computer has been operating at 90% utilization. Bible would like to do more in high performance computing area and plans to form a technical advisory group of faculty for input. Gayle Baker suggested that he consider representation from Research Council's committee on Research Infrastructure."

A meeting was subsequently held on February 28, 2001, where Gayle Baker and Doug Birdwell participated as representatives of the Research Council, along with several members of the faculty who are active in high performance computing. Christian Halloy made a presentation at that meeting that covered both utilization statistics of the UT IBM SP/2 and possible upgrade paths involving both replacement or upgrades to the SP/2 and installation of a computing cluster. The subsequent discussion yielded no definitive answers, but a consensus appeared to be emerging that the University should divide its resources between centrally-supported cluster computing and central support for access to large parallel computing resources, possibly on the next generation ORNL teraflop computing facility.

A lot of concerns were expressed at the February 28, 2001 meeting about the appropriate utilization of UT's financial resources in high performance computing, inadequate and possibly misdirected support by DII for research computing, the benefits that might be garnered by a few faculty by "buying into" the ORNL facility versus the possibly more widespread benefits of a locally owned and operated computing cluster, the lower cost per computing unit of cluster computing, and the risks associated with support of the ORNL facility due to restricted access and security requirements. It was very clear by the end of this meeting that additional discussions with the faculty who would be affected by these funding decisions were essential, and that no option had a clear majority of support.

Both Bruce Bible and Dwayne McCay attended this meeting. Christian Halloy gave an oral report to the Research Council at the March 26, 2001 meeting at the request of Faye Muly. The minutes summarized this as follows:

"Christian Halloy spoke about the support of scientific high performance computing activities at UT and the need for increased support in terms of professional personnel and computing hardware. He described the services provided by the staff of JICS (Joint Institute for Computation Science). Currently, the main hardware in support of high performance computing, the IBM SP2, is operating at capacity. Options for the future are another large computer and/or PC clusters. Another alternative may be to use machines at ORNL. Halloy and Doug Birdwell discussed various alternatives. Concerns were raised that UT needs to be cautious in becoming too dependent upon ORNL".

JICS' Move to ORNL:

Unfortunately, Jesse Poore was not present at the February 28, 2001 meeting. According to Jesse Poore, Dwayne McCay did not tell him about either the existence of the meeting or the discussions that occurred there. Rather, when Dwayne McCay asked Jesse Poore to assume responsibility for JICS and Christian Halloy, Jesse Poore told me that he wanted to make JICS significant in computational science, and that there was no point in waiting for the JICS building at ORNL -- that he should just "get on with it."

A subsequent decision was made, apparently by Dwayne McCay, Tom Zacharia, and Jesse Poore, to move JICS to ORNL and into ORNL office space. Christian Halloy was removed from the directorship of JICS and, according to Christian, was not consulted when the determination was made that JICS was to move. Rather Christian Halloy and the other UT employees of JICS were informed that the move was to take place, and that Christian was no longer the director of JICS, with very little advance notice. (This information is based upon discussions I have had with Jesse Poore, Christian Halloy, and Kwai Wong, who is also a UT employee in JICS.) JICS is now located within ORNL in building 3546 in the Computer Science and Mathematics Division, which is directed by Tom Zacharia.

Jesse Poore stated that the point of the move was to get JICS operating as the front-end to access the ORNL computing facilities and to build up the research arm. One would question whether it is UT's research arm or ORNL CSM Division's research arm Jesse was thinking about. Jesse told me that the big plan was to make 20% of the capacity of the ORNL teraflop machine available to UT researchers. He told me that if UT will begin spending heavily on computational science research activities, Tom Zacharia will make the computer time available to UT in essentially unlimited quality -- meaning, approximately 20% of the available computer resources. It is not clear if there is any written agreement to these terms between UT and ORNL.

According to Jesse Poore, a part of this agreement between Jesse Poore, Dwayne McCay, and Tom Zacharia is that UT will spend approximately \$1.3M annually on computational science research activities related to the ORNL computing facilities. Of this \$1.3M, approximately \$500K is money that must be either found from new sources or redirected from ORIT funds and paid to ORNL to help support operation of the computational facilities and support personnel. The remaining \$800K is to be identified as portions of UT researchers' external contract funds that will be spent on UT faculty members and UT graduate students. A condition, however, is that the UT graduate students must spend at least a significant portion of their time at ORNL. It appears that no external funding for high performance computing that does not involve ORNL can count toward the \$800K.

Summary:

While I agree that enhancing UT's and ORNL's capabilities in computational science and fields that rely on high performance computing is a worthwhile goal, that manner in which these decisions and commitments were made does not speak well of the University. Of the \$1.3M annual funding commitment, \$800K is flexible and is at the discretion of PIs of externally funded grants and contracts. This is appropriate; PIs should choose to utilize ORNL resources when it is in the best interests of their research objectives. The remaining \$500K, however, appears to be coming from sources that basically are not really there. This means that executive decisions have been made, largely without faculty input, that may have committed funds to this enterprise at the expense of other research activities that the faculty have in the past judged worthwhile, such as EPPE, SARIF, and other programs.

A possible, and equitable, solution to the \$500K dilemma would be to charge research projects that utilize ORNL computing resources fees in order to recover at least a large percentage of the UT funding commitment. For a number of years several fairly well-funded research projects have been indirectly supported by free access to and use of the UT IBM SP/2. Most other users of moderate to large computing resources have had to pay for their resource utilization, in many cases including the cost of purchase and operation of the equipment. While this is a very attractive system for the small number of faculty who benefit, it does not appear to be sustainable, nor does it appear equitable to those who do not use these facilities.

It is clear that UT is continuing to bear the costs of JICS personnel. According to the web page http://www-jics.cs.utk.edu/home-htmls/ornl_loc.html, seven individuals are employed within JICS. These individuals are located at ORNL in ORNL facilities and appear to be performing, at least to a very great extent, ORNL work. For example, I did not see the usual JICS-operated short courses this summer on UT's campus. This deprives our students of opportunities to become involved in research projects using high performance computing, and deprives our research projects and PIs of an opportunity to train their students and staff. I first became aware of these issues when I approached Christian Halloy about the possibility of his involvement on one of my funded research projects. It has become clear, however, that this is difficult because neither Christian nor

the rest of the JICS staff are on campus, and their involvement requires additional travel and other impediments such as campus parking.

Jesse raised valid points in our conversation. He said that UT can either be a player in computational science action, or ignore it, in which case someone else will do it -- at least, at ORNL. In this instance, the "someone else" will most likely be one of the other universities that is affiliated with ORNL through the UT-Battelle contract. He stated that it was his decision to roll the "old JICS" into a "new JICS" at ORNL, and that his assessment is this has to be a "slam dunk win" or there is no point in continuing it. He said he had recently talked to A. J. Baker and Peter Cummings in UT/Engineering, and to Ward Plummer in Physics, and that they are very supportive -- but who wouldn't be when they're offered unlimited computer time at no cost? Jesse Poore also said that if UT doesn't fund his concept of computational science, he doesn't want anything to do with it. This is unfortunate, as his contributions are potentially valuable; however, the directions pursued by the University need to be chosen using the principles of shared governance, and not be executive fiat, as has occurred to date in this matter.

There is not a clear solution to the current situation. I believe the dialogue that began last year at the meeting on February 28th should continue, and that all of the affected faculty who care to participate should have an opportunity to do so. Only through this process can a position be reached that is satisfactory to a majority of the stakeholders within our University community.

Attachment F



University of Tennessee (Knoxville Campus) Research Council

UTK Research Council Committees, 2001-2002

- [Standing Committees](#)
 - [Special Panels](#)
 - [Ad Hoc Committees](#)
-

Standing Committees

Policies and Procedures

Charge: To explore the realm of policies and procedures at the University with special attention to policies and procedures which have not evolved consistent with the University's development as a Research I University. To make recommendations to the VC/Research regarding desirable policy and procedure changes that would enhance the productivity of the research enterprise.

Chair: Thomas Handler

Members: Doug Birdwell, Bill Blass,
Elizabeth Aversa, Ham Bozdogan,
Narendra Dahotre, Jens Gregor, C. A.
Speer, Dwight Teeter, Michael Wyatt
Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso, Arlene
Garrison, Dwayne McCay

Research Promotion and Education

Charge: To work with the Research Office to educate the community -- University as well as Statewide -- regarding the research activities of the University. To promote awareness of the activities and achievements of the research enterprise.

May work jointly with the Special Projects Committee.

Chair: William Blass

Members: Doug Birdwell, Basil Antar, David Bassett, Michael Gant, John Hancock, Marion Hansen, Bonnie Ownley, Michael Wyatt

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso, Lee Magid, Lillian Mashburn

Research Infrastructure

Charge: To determine and prioritize research infrastructure needs in consultation with the research faculty. To engage the University administration in a substantive dialog regarding Research Infrastructure funding models such as the Library Model versus a Cost Recovery Model. To provide an assessment of the likely impact of funding model choices on Faculty productivity, graduate education, and our Research I status. To integrate into an annual research infrastructure needs document all committee assessments.

Chair: Doug Birdwell

Members: Bill Blass, Gayle Baker, David Buehler, Anthony Condo, Narendra Dahotre, Pat Fisher, Joanne Hall, Mark Hedrick, Majid Keyhani, Ian Rockett, Pamela Small, Marlys Staudt, Gretchen Whitney

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso, Barbara Dewey, Arlene Garrison, Dwayne McCay, Faye Muly

Special Panels

Provost's Research Awards

Charge: To solicit nominations, receive nominations, evaluate nominations materials and make recommendations to the Provost for the awards.

Chair: Michael Gant

Members: Doug Birdwell, Basil Antar, David Bassett, Jens Gregor, Joanne Hall, Marion Hansen, Jon Levin, Susan Smith,

**Elizabeth Sutherland, Dwight Teeter,
Bruce Tonn**

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso

SARIF: Summer Special Research Assistants

Charge: To solicit nominations, receive nominations, evaluate nominations materials and make recommendations to the Associate Vice President for Research for the awarding of the funding.

Chair: Pat Fisher

Members: Doug Birdwell, Elizabeth Aversa, Mark Hedrick, William Nugent, C. A. Speer

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso

EPPE (Exhibit, Publication and Performance Expense)

Charge: To solicit and evaluate applications for EPPE grants on a timely basis and make recommendations to Associate Vice President for Research for funding.

Chair: Elizabeth Sutherland

Members: Doug Birdwell, Bill Blass, Gayle Baker, Mark Dadmun, Thomas Handler, William Nugent, Susan Smith, Dixie Thompson, Gretchen Whitney

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso

Centers Evaluation

Charge: To evaluate Research Centers on an ongoing periodic basis and recommend to the Associate Vice President for Research the disposition of renewal requests; to perform the same evaluation for new applications for Research Center status.

Chair: Ham Bozdogan

Members: Doug Birdwell, David Buehler, Anthony Condo, Majid Keyhani, Jon Levin, Bonnie Ownley, Ian Rockett, Pamela Small, Bruce Tonn

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso, Barbara Dewey

Ad Hoc Committees

Special Projects

Charge: To engage in activities which will raise Community awareness of UTK research activities and results. To promote the participation of all faculty in scholarly and research activities. Specific projects shall include the RC web page, a public lecture series, and the promotion of small grant applications.

Chair: Gayle Baker

Members: Doug Birdwell, Mark

Dadmum, John Hancock, Marlys Staudt

Ex-officio: Peter Alfonso

Comments to: gsbaker@utk.edu

Last updated September 5, 2001.

Attachment G

Research Council Committee Assignments, 2001-2002

NAME	Date returned	Pol. & Proc.	Res. Promo. & Educ.	Res. Infra.	Provost Res. Awd.	SARIF	EPPE	Centers Eval.	Spec. Proj.	Notes
Doug Birdwell/Chair				chair						
Bill Blass/Past Chair			chair							
Gayle Baker/Webmaster	8/20/2001			1			1		chair	
Peter Alfonso		ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO	ExO
Basil N. Antar	8/15/2001	2	1		1	2				UTSI
Elizabeth Aversa										SIS
David Bassett	8/17/2001	2	1		1	2				ExSci
Hampersun Bozdogan								chair		Stat
David Buehler	8/23/2001			1				1		Forest
Anthony Condo				GSA				GSA		GSA
Mark Dadmun	8/31/2001						1			Chem
Narendra Dahotre	8/22/2001	1		2	1	2				UTSI
Barbara Dewey				ExO				ExO		ExO
Pat Fisher	8/15/2001		2	1		chair				SIS
Michael Gant	8/17/2001		1		chair					PolSci
Arlene Garrison		ExO		ExO						ExO
Jens Gregor	8/20/2001	1			2					CS
Joanne Hall	8/15/2001			1	1					Nurs
John Hancock			GSA						GSA	GSA
Thomas Handler		chair								Phys
Marion Glenn Hansen	8/22/2001		1	2	1			2		MatSci
Mark Hedrick	8/20/2001			1		1		2	2	Audio
Majid Keyhani										MAES
Jon Levin										Phys
Lee Magid			ExO							ExO

NAME	Date returned	Pol. & Proc.	Res. Promo. & Educ.	Res. Infra.	Provost Res. Awd.	SARIF	EPPE	Centers Eval.	Spec. Proj.	Notes
Lillian Mashburn			ExO							ExO
T. Dwayne McCay		ExO		ExO						ExO
Faye Muly				ExO						ExO
William Nugent										SocWk
Bonnie Ownley	8/15/2001		1	2	2			1		Plant
Ian Rockett			1	2	2			1		ExSci
Pamela Small	8/20/2001		1	2			2	1		MicoBio
Susan Smith	8/31/2001									HeSafety
C. A. Speer										AgSci
Marlys Staudt										SocWk
Elizabeth Sutherland	8/20/2001		3		2		chair		4	Classics
Dwight Teeter										Comm
Dixie Thompson	8/22/2001	2	1				1	2		ExSpt
Bruce Tonn	8/17/2001				2			1		Planning
Gretchen Whitney	8/15/2002		2	1		2	1			SIS
Michael Wyatt		GSA	GSA							GSA

Attachment H

Research Council Members, 2001-2002

NAME	DEPARTMENT	PHONE	E-MAIL	MBR-TYPE
Doug Birdwell/Chair	Electrical & Computer Engineering	4-5468	birdwell@utk.edu	FacSen
Bill Blass/Co-Vice-Chair	Physics	4-7846	wblass@utk.edu	App
Gayle Baker/Co-Vice-Chair	Library	4-3519	gsbaker@utk.edu	App
Peter Alfonso	Office of Research	4-3466	Office of Research	ExO
Basil N. Antar	UTSI		bantar@tennessee.edu	FacSen
Elizabeth Aversa	School of Information Science	4-2148	aversa@utk.edu	FacSen
David Bassett	Exercise Science & Sport Management	4-8766	dbassett@utk.edu	FacSen
Hampersun Bozdogan	Statistics	4-1635	bozdogan@utk.edu	FacSen
David Buehler	Forestry	4-7126	dbuehler@utk.edu	FacSen
Anthony Condo	Chemistry		acondo@utk.edu	GSA
Narendra Dahotre	UTSI		ndahotre@tennessee.edu	FacSen
Barbara Dewey	Library	4-4127	bdewey@utk.edu	ExO
Pat Fisher	School of Information Science	4-1405	pfisher@utk.edu	App
Michael Gant	Social Science Research Institute/Political Science	4-2730	mgant1@utk.edu	App
Arlene Garrison	Office of Research	4-6410	agarrison@utk.edu	ExO
Jens Gregor	Computer Science	4-5067	jgregor@utk.edu	FacSen
Joanne Hall	Nursing	4-5769	jhall7@utk.edu	FacSen
John Hancock	Biosystems Engineering & Environmental Science		hancockj@utk.edu	GSA
Thomas Handler	Physics	4-7820	thandler@utk.edu	App
Marion Glenn Hansen	Materials Science & Engineering	4-5319	mghansen@utk.edu	FacSen

Mark Hedrick	Audiology & Speech Pathology	4-8105	mhedric1@utk.edu	FacSen
Majid Keyhani	Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	4-4795	keyhani@utk.edu	FacSen
Jon Levin	Physics	4-8705	jlevin@utk.edu	FacSen
Lee Magid	Office of Research	4-3466	lmagid@utk.edu	ExO
Lillian Mashburn	Office of Res. & Info. Tech.	4-2206	lmashburn@utk.edu	ExO
T. Dwayne McCay	Office of Res. & Info. Tech.	4-3211	tdmccay@utk.edu	ExO
Faye Muly	Information Infrastructure	4-6582	muly@utk.edu	ExO
William Nugent	Social Work	4-3802	wnugent@utk.edu	FacSen
Bonnie Ownley	Entomology & Plant Pathology	4-7135	bornley@utk.edu	FacSen
Ian Rockett	Exercise Science & Sport Management	4-2272	irockett@utk.edu	FacSen
Pamela Small	Microbiology	4-4042	psmall@utk.edu	FacSen
Susan Smith	Health & Safety Science	4-1108	smsmith@utk.edu	FacSen
C. A. Speer	College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources	4-6756	caspeer@utk.edu	FacSen
Marlys Staudt	Social Work	4-7502	mstaudt@utk.edu	FacSen
Elizabeth Sutherland	Classics	4-7174	ehsuther@utk.edu	FacSen
Dwight Teeter	College of Communications	4-3031	teeter@utk.edu	FacSen
Dixie Thompson	Exercise Science & Sport Management	4-8883	dixielee@utk.edu	FacSen
Bruce Tonn	Graduate School Of Planning	4-5227	btonn@utk.edu	FacSen
Gretchen Whitney	School of Information Science	4-7919	gwhitney@utk.edu	FacSen
Michael Wyatt	Geological Sciences		mwyatt@utkux.utk.edu	GSA
Representative	Academic Affairs			ExO
College level research officials	Various colleges			ExO

App - Chair's appointees
ExO - Ex-officio
FacSen - Faculty Senate
GSA - GSA representative
UTSI - UT Space Institute

*Comments to: gsbaker@utk.edu
Last updated August 16, 2001.*

Attachment I

Faculty Senate Charge to Research Council, 2001-2002

The Research Council shall engage the Administration including but not limited to the President, the Vice President for Research and Information Technology, the Associate Vice-President for Research, and the Provost regarding all aspects of the University's research mission, including but not limited to:

1. Recommendations for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers
2. Allocation of research incentive funds, startup funds for new faculty, faculty accounts, incentives to work with centers
3. Follow-up on faculty leave policy
4. Leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants; contract and grant management
5. University supercomputer initiatives, the Joint Institute for Computational Science, and DII's support infrastructure
6. Impact of restructuring on the Research Council
7. Public exposure of research and outreach
8. Benchmarks and measurement of University progress
9. Stipends and benefits for graduate students
10. Overview of IRB/Human Subjects, Federal requirements, and compliance at UT
11. Faculty titles

The Research Council shall, in addition, explore the possibility of collaboration with comparable bodies at Memphis and Tullahoma.

The Research Council shall, further, remain engaged in:

1. The functioning of the faculty workstation refresh program
2. Its historically close collaboration and supportive activities with the Office of Research.

*Comments to: birdwell@hickory.engr.utk.edu
Last updated August 14, 2001.*

Attachment J

DRAFT

Faculty Senate Retreat Planning Document Focus Area on Graduate/Research Issues Topics

- The need for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers
- Efforts to restructure Facilities & Administrative charges and revenue utilization. Allocation of research incentive funds, startup funds for new faculty, faculty accounts, incentives to work with centers
- Leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants; contract and grant management.
- Contingent faculty and research staff. Rights and responsibilities of research faculty and research staff.
- University supercomputer initiatives, the Joint Institute for Computational Science, and DII support infrastructure
- Public exposure of research and outreach, including the impact of research upon teaching, the state, and the nation.
- Recruiting and admissions, making UT more attractive to top quality graduate and undergraduate students. Keeping our top undergraduate students as graduate students in MS/MA/MBA programs.
- Stipends and benefits for graduate students.
- Student performance standards.
- Research support for faculty without external funding sources. Support infrastructure for proposal development.
- External funding and the research agenda.