**University Research Subcommittee**

**Minutes of the November, 16, 2011 meeting**

**Present: Jeff Cummins (Chair), Anil Shrestha, Peter Vandewater, Chris Lucey, Ted Bergman, Lubo Liu**

**Not Present: Helda Pinzo-Perez (excused), Tom McClanahan**

1. The minutes of the last meeting were passed without any amendment.
2. Discussion on the release time awarded by the Provost was added to the agenda.
3. The annual research report was discussed. The major points made were:
	1. The annual report showed an overall downward trend in funding levels.
	2. The report received this year was more comprehensive than those of previous years.
	3. The committee decided that there was not much that we could comment on the funding model as it was variable between schools.
	4. The research expectations in Arts and Humanities are higher than they used to be in previous years while funding levels are down.
	5. Concern was expressed that the proposed move of the Math and Science college to another college may cause a decline in research funds and decline in research projects.
4. Sabbatical leaves were discussed and the following points were made:
	1. The university has a mandate to make available a minimum number of slots to be awarded each year.
	2. According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the University must award sabbaticals equal to 12 percent of the eligible faculty university-wide. These sabbatical slots are then allocated to schools/colleges based on their proportion of eligible faculty. Some colleges did not meet their quotas.
	3. Some colleges, such as the College of Social Sciences, have excess applicants so a second round of allocations would help meet demand in these colleges. The Committee agreed that unused sabbatical slots from colleges/schools should be reallocated in a second round similar to the distribution in the first round, but excluding those colleges/schools that did not fill their slots. This method was preferred over centralizing the allocation of the remaining slots in the Provost Office. The question was raised if slots could be reallocated from other Colleges that have unused slots.

Recommendation: Propose a second round of allocation of sabbaticals in the Annual Report.

1. Release time:
	1. The issue was raised that the 3 WTU release time from the Provost was not sufficient to conduct meaningful research.
	2. The release time should be defined better.
	3. Awards should be based on quality of the proposal and applicants should be able to apply for up to 6 WTUs based on the nature of the proposal.
	4. The question was also raised if the two-tiered research/teaching faculty should be temporary or permanent.

Recommendation: Research release time awarded by the Provost should be more flexible and allow requests for 6 WTUs of release time. Include in Annual Report.

1. Committee adjourned at 440pm.