Research Council Meeting Minutes
20 December 2013

Present:
Lesley Berhan       Mike Dowd       Barbara Floyd
Ruth Hottell       Jerzy Kamburowski       Susan Pocotte
Patty Relue       Barry Scheuermann       Pamela Stover
Eileen Walsh       Bill Messer       Elsa Nadler

Guest: Keith Crist

Absent (excused):
Zeljko Cuckovic       Ivana de la Serna       Llew Gibbons
Hans Gottgens       Marthe Howard       Richard Johnson
Joan Kaderavek       Marcia McInerney       Guillermo Vazquez

Members introduced themselves to Bill Messer.

Bill said he met with many members of the council as part of the interview process.

Elsa distributed the November minutes, which will be reviewed and voted on at the January meeting.

Center annual reports
Asian Studies: Mike reported the report is fine. The only question is no details were provided under section 1. But he is not concerned that that information on faculty and individuals served was not provided.

Mike said we are just reviewing an annual report to help create review in five years. The office of Research will contact the director.

Bill said he is trying to get good handle on what council is doing across all campuses to promote research.

Precision Micro-Machining Center: Mike said it is in sharp contrast to the review of the Asian Studies Institute. Mike said the original report was harsh. It is not really a research center. It runs tests for local industry. The annual report was a simple paste job. No one from UT is on the advisory board, and there is no evidence of advisory board meetings. No dates, funding agencies or funding are reported. The center is
housed in Nitschke Hall but no stated university support other than a large amount of space. Patty said there are several centers in engineering but this is not a research center.

Elsa reported that the center was given provisional approval until September, but further review has not occurred.

Bill suggested discussing with Nagi about whether this is a resource or a research center. Council members agreed that this is an appropriate course of action.

Eileen suggested reviewing what is a research center and discussing the possibility of a multi-tiered process and definition. Bill talked about looking at different models.

New Online Journal
Keith Crist presented the new journal. He said it is a new effort that started in the College of Medicine but will not be restricted to OCM faculty. The goal is for rapid review of short articles that may not currently be acceptable to mainline journals. Medical students have papers presented at meetings, some of which will go on to be submitted to standard journals. All medical students have some requirements for scholarship that will help them get a residency position. Keith said they are exploring ways to put these articles on PubMed Central and Google Scholar. They are working with Berkeley Press to provide an online archive. It is not clear what is required to credential journals for inclusion in PubMed, etc.

B Press will manage a blinded review process. Promedica will help with reviewing. Keith said there are no page charges for this journal. Barbara said B Press is a software package purchased by the library that provides a number of functions, including the opportunity for housing datasets. A concern is that there are 500 journals with B Press with 100 added in last year. The library has discussed the Research Council having oversight of any e-journal coming out of the University of Toledo. There is an issue of quality and control and making sure the institution is well represented in the publishing world. She said she was also concerned about the two-week review process and 90% acceptance rate. Keith said it does not take longer than two weeks to do a review, that reviewers tend to take longer than that. It is up to the editorial board to maintain quality. We are trying to fit the journal into a niche. Dr. Takashima and chairs wanted this type of effort. This kind of activity is essential for medical students to be competitive for residency slots. Bill said there is also an interest to have outlets for papers that have results that are rigorous but do not have findings that would warrant publication in major journals.
Mike said the council should also follow Barbara’s suggestion of council oversight. Jerzy asked if other medical colleges in country have such journals. Keith said it was difficult to find other institutional e-journals outside of Baylor, and one or two others. The assumption is that these journals are more prevalent than he has been able to document.

Proliferation of journals is an international issue. There have been issues of people publishing in multiple journals. Bill said it makes sense to establish journal as a well monitored and quality publication. Eileen said journal reviewers have access to other online journals through Elsevier.

This is only the second journal published under the university’s name. Bill suggested formalizing the process:

Scope of the journal
Process for submission
Process for reviews
Process to assure quality
Eligibility for submission to journal

Bill will draft a template for quality-assurance review and forward to Keith, Akira and the council. Bill said he would use what is online already. Neither Keith nor B Press could find specific requirements of National Library of Medicine as stated by PubMed for adding a journal.

Barbara said she is concerned to establish a process before people start creating e-journals with the institution’s name on them. Bill suggested setting up a policy for approving and monitoring online journals. Barbara and Bill will look at developing a policy to bring to council. Susan asked if this journal will accept evidence-based articles rather than only hypothesis-based research. Keith said he envisioned sections of journal that might incorporate different efforts. The Website does not appear to limit the scope of articles.

Jerzy asked Keith to clarify who can submit to the journal. Keith said he did not see someone from another institution wanting to publish in this journal.

**New Business**

Mike said he was putting together a document to present to finance and strategy concerning indirect costs. David Morlock wants to propose a change to the 70-30 formula, especially on MC. Bill said he has already initiated a discussion about the
budget process and who various units report to. Bill said F&A return now goes into the
general fund. Bill said department chairs should be able to accrue some of those funds
and should be able to save across fiscal years. This would allow for better planning for
the future and also cost savings if funds do not have to be spent by the end of the fiscal
year or be swept. Mike said that Morlock is in favor of providing incentives for
research, both funded and unfunded. Mike asked if 1% could be re-assigned to support
URAF funding. Bill indicated that F&A discussions would continue as part of the
annual budget process and as changes in F&A policies develop.

Respectfully submitted,

Elsa G. Nadler
Director, Grants Development