Meeting began at 3:08 PM

I. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of November 10, 1998 meeting were approved without corrections.

II. Discussion with Provost Ron Henry

The Provost joined the Committee at its invitation for a discussion about the Committee's concerns over exclusion from a series of research-related university issues during the 1997-98 academic year. The discussion covered a broad range of issues and topics summarized below:

- Dr. Reitzes now attends the Provost's Staff meetings and Deans Group meetings which provides a direct link from Research to these meetings that the Committee did not have in the past. The Provost stressed good communication and articulation of concerns between all groups in the university.
- The Master Plan is a conceptual plan for the next 10 plus years. The Provost is in the process of putting together teams to look at what is realistic and what isn't including research buildings. In the interim, two cooling loops have been installed in Kell Hall to improve ventilation conditions.
- With respect to the co-location of Grants & Contracts and the Office of Research & Sponsored Programs, nothing has been instituted to date. This is still a major priority but no specific plans are in place. Space is still a problem.
- We reached the Carnegie Research II threshold of obtaining $15.5 million in federal research support for each of 3 three and awarding 50 or more doctorates per year. The Carnegie Foundation will not reclassify universities and have stated that they are not sure whether they will update their existing classification scheme or create another one. The Provost felt that the limited focus on federal dollars as opposed to all sponsored programs awards (federal, state, and private foundation) was a draw back to using the Carnegie Research I as our next research goal. Research I requires receiving annually $40 million or more in federal support. He proposed that our goal of 15% growth in annual total support would translate into a five year goal of $100 million in total external support.
- A re-evaluation of indirect costs is something that needs to be revisited. The university had incentive modules.
- With the enrollment figures for the Spring Semester, QIF funds will be looked at again and possibly the funds will be released.
- In Dr. Arrington's absence, Albertha Barrett, Dr. Reitzes and the Provost will work as a committee of three to make decisions. His FAC-P membership will probably be assumed by another vice president.
- Re-direction is presently at 1%; under Gov. Miller it was 5%. GSU is still preparing a budget outlining our needs for the next year.

III. Old Business

A. Report from GSU Research Foundation Representatives
Drs. Boykin, Lederberg, and Morris discussed four options for how monies are distributed in the Research Foundation. Currently only 21.74% of the indirect cost recovery funds can be carried over fiscal years. The remaining 78.26% must be spent in the fiscal year in which the funds were recovered. The Research Foundation is considering a plan that would divide both the 21.74% that can be carried over fiscal years evenly between the Foundation (50%) and the principal investigator's department (50%) as well as the 78.26% of the indirect recovery that cannot be carried over between the Foundation (50%) and the department (50%).

B. Report from Strategic Planning Subcommittee - Will be discussed at next meeting.

C. Report from Ad Hoc Task Force on Research Facilities

Drs. Boykin and Morris reported that a consultant has been hired to assess the feasibility of putting a building on or near G-deck. Questions to be answered: Can this new building handle vibrations? What would be the costs? How will indirect costs be applied toward the bond?

D. Standing Subcommittee Reports - Will be discussed at next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM.

**The next meeting of the Research Committee will be on Monday, February 22 at 3:00 PM in 718-GCB.**