



Council of Principal
Investigators

Texas A&M University
1112 TAMU
College Station, Texas 77843-1112
(979) 845-8585 Fax (979) 845-1855

CPI Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, 20 June 2007
11:30-1:00

(11:50-12:00) Call to Order/Opening Remarks: (Moderated by D. Russell)

- Welcome
- Announcements
 - Reminder: July 11, 2007 CPI meeting
- Introduction:
 - Michael D. McKinney, M.D., chancellor of The Texas A&M University System

(12:00-12:20) *Special Guest Presentation:*

Michael D. McKinney, M.D., chancellor of The Texas A&M University System

(12:20-1:00) Facilitated Discussion: (Moderated by D. Russell)

- Open forum discussion with Dr. McKinney

(1:00) Adjournment:

Attachments: (Materials are available for download at <http://cpi.tamu.edu/>)

— Agenda, 20 June 2007

cc: (distributed meeting resources)

- Dr. Eddie J. Davis, Interim President (Texas A&M University)
- Dr. Jerry Strawser, Interim Executive Vice-President and Provost (Texas A&M University)
- College Deans, Administrative Heads, and Department Heads (Texas A&M University, TAES, TEES, HSC, TTI)
- Dr. H. Joseph Newton, Chair of the Research Environment Council (Texas A&M University)
- Dr. Doug Slack, Speaker of the Faculty Senate (Texas A&M University)
- Dr. Howard Kaplan, Chair of the Distinguished Professors (Texas A&M University)

Chair — David Russell, *Science* • *Chair Elect* — Alan Love, *COALS* • *Past-Chair* — Tom Blasingame, *Engineering* • *Architecture* — Donald House • *Business* — Joobin Choobineh • *COALS* — Paul Fitzpatrick, Rosana Moreira, Suresh Pillai, Herman Scholthof, Dorothy Shippen, David Stelly • *Education* — Susan Bloomfield • *Engineering* — Dave Burnett, Don Russell • *Geosciences* — Sarah Bednarz, Lisa Campbell, Mahlon Kennicutt • *Health Science Center* — Geoffrey Kapler, Marty Scholtz • *Liberal Arts* — Howard Kaplan, James Grau • *Science* — Deb Bell-Pedersen, Keith Maggert, Michael Weimer • *TEES* — David Boyle • *TTI* — William Eisele, Katherine Turnbull • *Veterinary Medicine* — Bhanu Chowdhary, James Derr

Council of Principal Investigators
April 11, 2007
Minutes

Members present	Members not present	Guests present	Guests not present
Campbell, Lisa; Choobineh, Joobin; Chowdhary, Bhanu; Derr, James; Eisele, William; Fitzpatrick, Paul; Grau, Jim; House, Donald; Kaplan, Howard; Love, Alan (Chair Elect); Maggert, Keith; Pillai, Suresh; Russell, David (Chair); Scholtz, Marty; Scholthof, Herman	Bednarz, Sarah; Bell-Pedersen, Deb; Bloomfield, Susan; Blasingame, Tom (Past-Chair); Boyle, David; Burnett, Dave; Kapler, Geoffrey; Kennicutt, Mahlon; Moreira, Rosana; Russell, Don; Shippen, Dorothy; Stelly, Dave; Turnbull, Katherine; Weimer, Michael	Bednarz, Robert; Calvin, Jim; Cantrell, Carol Hilding-Kronforst, Shari Kettleborough, C.F.; Maldonado, Theresa; Newton, H. Joseph; Pollock, Jill; Rojo del Busto, Katherine; Rojo del Busto, Mario; Sippial, Sr., Charles A.; Smock, Mark; Summers, Max;	Gilliland, Diane Droleskey, Suzanne; Ewing, Richard; Foxworth, Greg Giardino, Rick; Hussey, Mark; Miller, Charlene; O'Quinn, Mike; Raines, Angie; Riddle, David; Watson, Karan; Webb, Bob

(11:45-12:00) Call to Order/Opening Remarks:

- Welcome
- Announcements
 - May 9, 2007 CPI Special guest: Mike McKinney, Chancellor
 - June 13, 2007 & July 16, 2007: CPI Committee Presentations
- CPI Coordinator – Report scheduling & content outlines out by April 30, 2007
- Guest Introductions
 - Charles A. Sippial, Sr., vice president for facilities
 - H. Joseph Newton, dean, College of Science

(12:00-12:30) Charles A. Sippial, Sr., vice president for facilities
Presentation – Texas A&M University's Council on the Built Environment: Construction Update

(Questions labeled “Q”, followed by speaker name and query; answers labeled “A” with speaker and response in italics; general comments listed and noted with speaker name.)

- Discussed Council on the Built Environment (CBE) membership and purpose; CBE exists to aide in controlling & coordinating all of the construction that is occurring on campus.
- When Dr. Robert Gates arrived, the Campus Master Plan was being completed.
- Noted that the design of a concept for any project goes through Facilities Planning and Construction (FP&C); which asserts an additional measure of quality control.
- (Slide presentation) Current projects were discussed; specifically the 4th floor renovation of the Reed McDonald building for two incoming chemists.
- One of Dr. Gates initiatives was the renovation of the Military Walk; approval has not yet been received.
- There has been discussion about adding another floor to the Cyclotron building.
- Slide 9 detailed three proposed plans to build the Emerging Technologies and Economic Development Buildings (ETED); the first concept had the ETED buildings flanking either side of the Williams Administration building (in current parking lots 54 and 55); a second concept had them positioned in 90 degree positions in front of either side of the corner of the administration building; the last was a distribution of the ETED buildings along Texas A&M's University Drive entrance at Bizzell, with additional space to the east of Bizzell and at the corner of Bizzell and Ross St.
- The ETED buildings would house 2/3 engineering/architecture & research; a proposal is due to go before a committee in May 2007 for approval.
- Referred to the ILSB building as the University's “signature” building; cited some current issues with utilities for the

Mitchell Building and the Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts, Arts and Humanities building.

- The main factor behind all of this construction is faculty reinvestment.

Q: L. Campbell – Asked how parking is being addressed around all of this construction.

A: C. Sippial – Acknowledged that all of the construction is taking away parking and there are no current plans to add parking spaces. The reason given for no current parking additions is due to the projections that there will still be enough parking spaces after construction is completed, but given some of the locations of these available lots will require bus travel or walking those occupants.

- Mr. Sippial referenced the NMR building, Vet Med Research Tower, Agriculture Program State headquarters, TTI buildings and the new athletic facilities.
- In recent years, former Senator Phil Gramm had secured approximately \$25 million to relocate the train tracks that run parallel to Wellborn Road, but the committee that reviewed this plan could not reach consensus on a plan. As a result, the topic of grade separations was discussed as an alternative, with matching grant money available for the project.
- Noted that a grade separation plan would allow for the tracks to be bypassed by all traffic, alleviate potential accidents and pull the campuses (West and Main) together.

Q: A. Love – With all of the new buildings under construction, what thought has been given about academic scholarship and the role it will play in the implementation of the current campus master plan?

A: C. Sippial – A steering committee was formed, including deans and faculty, to consider shortening the time between classes and looking at this issue further. Cited Charles Johnson and Kem Bennett as being involved with this committee as well as department heads.

Comment: M. Summers – Recommended Tom Regan to address CPI with a virtual presentation that maps out the traffic flow on campus.

Comment: T. Hall – Wanted to revisit parking concerns.

A: C. Sippial – When the master plan was developed, it was recognized that northeast parking spaces were needed; the prospect of parking garages were discussed, but fees would also go up. The bottom line is, as the master plan was developed, there simply weren't funds available to consider a parking plan. The CBE has been assured that there will be enough parking spaces after construction is complete, there will just be a template in place for allotting out those spaces in order of importance. (i.e., administration and faculty; staff; students)

Comment: J. Newton – With the Mitchell buildings, there is the elimination of lots 5 and 42. Is there a plan for those who have been displaced? Does the end result mean fewer freshman or overall students in parking garages?

Comment: A. Love – Understand the need for a transportation plan, but the issue seems to be more of transportation for the faculty who are a less mobile population than students.

A: C. Sippial – The plan at the present time is to treat parking on the peripheral.

Q: A. Love – Will everyone have to ride buses?

A: C. Sippial – There were no in depth discussions about parking because there was no money available for any implementation of such a plan. There were parking consultants hired and the parking and transportation issue are considered to be the responsibility of the pedestrian.

Q: H. Kaplan – Have there been any discussions about a monorail system?

A: C. Sippial – Before arriving at Texas A&M, it was better to walk where you needed to go, which also presented a 20-minute issue between classes. At this time a system of transportation, such as a monorail, is not in consideration.

Q: T. Hall – It would be beneficial if buses could stop at intermediate locations. Cited a personal example of traveling from Biology department to Biochemistry and the long walk involved. Transportation provided would be beneficial.

Comment: J. Newton – The idea of a tram-type system that constantly traveled around ILSB and Science departments would seem beneficial.

A: C. Sippial – Acknowledged that the current bus routes go through all areas of campus and surrounding community and are free to all students, faculty and staff. Bus routes and schedules are also available on line.

Recommendations/Actions/Follow-Up:

- CPI Coordinator will invite Tom Regan for presentation in Fall 2007 and follow up in Spring 2008

(12:30-1:07) H. Joseph Newton, dean, College of Science

Presentation – Current and future Research Environment Council Initiatives

(Questions labeled “Q”, followed by speaker name and query; answers labeled “A” with speaker and response in italics; general comments listed and noted with speaker name.)

- In slide presentation, noted the make up of the REC membership and their current issues.
- One of the current issues is surrounding the Life Sciences Building (ILSB) and who will be its occupants.
- The REC has been asked to study how grants are administered; additionally requests have been made in the development of policies and procedures in the coordination between the University and the Office of Technology Commercialization (OTC).
- Currently, the REC is suggesting items to be including in the quarterly report, regarding the intellectual property (IP) policy and who is responsible for payment.
- Another issue being addressed, regarding the IP Policy, is its complexity. REC is working with OTC to make the document easier to read and comprehend.
- Regarding current REC and CPI initiatives, cited that they can and will overlap; as such, the REC utilizes minutes from CPI meetings to ensure that communication takes place between the two councils on parallel issues.
- At the request of the President and Provost, a memo was developed with the recommendation that, similar to how the CBE studies space initiatives and the DSG studies development initiatives, that the REC is the appropriate group to study major research initiatives, such as TIPS, TIGM, and TXAN to advise administration on the implications of such initiatives.
- An example of this advisement role would be in the case of outside monies donated for an activity or structure that may not be in the best interest of the University. The REC would be a beneficial mechanism to turn down such gifts and alleviate this task from the administration.
- Future issues revolve around the beginning of the reinvestment program, specifically addressing start up and retention funds.
- There are also efforts to develop research metrics for faculty.
- Discussed Interdisciplinary Programs & some of the issues in retaining faculty. One issue that was cited in exit interviews with faculty was the University’s lack of research infrastructure.
- Lastly, reported efforts to address the status of postdocs and the benefits of having a common research database.

Q: D. House – Would the research metric you mentioned be utilized for faculty, administration or department heads?

A: J. Newton – *The intent would be to address the teaching capabilities of new faculty, but at the present time there is no proposal for research metrics.*

Q: A. Love – Does there appear to be a gap in our research infrastructure and faculty retention?

A: J. Newton – *The current issue is that we have people that want to work here, but other institutions have new lasers or NMR; in order to be a world class research institution, then you need to acquire world class equipment. At the present time, unfortunately, our University is not there at the present time.*

Q: A. Love – Do the departments, who facilitate utilities planning, work with the REC to consider how the research infrastructure will be affected?

Comment: C. Sippial – Recognized ILSB as an example where research infrastructure is being taken into consideration when planning for utilities.

Comment: J. Newton – There is a formula used in determining the utilities planning for buildings on campus

Comment: C. Sippial – Cited the ILSB and several other structures, as being custom-designed facilities.

Comment: J. Newton – Additional questions exist, regarding where these funds will come from.

Comment: C. Sippial – Dr. Gates designated \$54 million to support the infrastructure of the University. However, greater cost has been incurred because some of the older facilities have been renovated or are undergoing renovation, so there’s still a need for more resources to support infrastructure growth.

Comment: J. Newton – A concern that exists is how equipment will be acquired that is supposed to go into the buildings being built to house them. E.g., the NMR and ILSB buildings. Where is the money going to come from to purchase the NMR, once the NMR building is built?

Q: S. Pillai – Is there currently any data on faculty that have been lost from reinvestment positions?

A: J. Newton – *One example cited was the loss of one chemist and two statisticians in the College of Science. In conversations with TEES administrators, research infrastructure appears to be problematic for them as well.*

Comment: D. Russell – The main reason the chemistry faculty member left was due to equipment and infrastructure. The intellectual environment was stimulating, but it always goes back to an infrastructure issue.

Q: S. Pillai – Is the REC looking at taking any exploratory steps to address the issue of research infrastructure?

A: J. Newton – *There have not been any steps taken to date by the REC, but these discussions are a good start.*

Q: T. Hall – Regarding Interdisciplinary Programs (IDP's), what is the administration's attitude of departments vs. IDP's?

A: J. Newton – *There is no evident issue between the two. Personally, it might be an issue of IDP's not being as creative as other departments.*

Comment: T. Maldonado – {inaudible}

Comment: J. Newton – Believes that attitudes are changing towards the importance of implementing a solid research infrastructure.

Comment: D. Russell – At the last REC meeting, Joe Newton was reviewing the CPI minutes from the previous meeting. What had stimulated discussion was a summary we received from our last CPI meeting by Keith Maggert, that was sent to the REC. This is an example of the type of exchange that should take place between the two councils.

Comment: J. Newton – CPI has a member on the REC, which also has direct access to the Provost. Recently, the CPI Executive Committee met with President Davis, and has regular meetings with the Provost. This is a good start in building the type of communication among administration and faculty that Dr. Gates intended when he developed the councils.

Comment: C. Cantrell – May 9, 2007 meeting with the Chancellor would be a good opportunity to let him know about how all of these councils/agencies are working together so he doesn't feel the need to duplicate these efforts.

Q: T. Hall – Brought up the issue of tuition for graduate students, which has the appearance of a tax on successful researchers who have to pay this tuition out of grant funds.

A: J. Newton – *The University has come up with funds to assist with those costs. Most universities require tuition built into research budgets. Both the CPI and REC could study this issue by looking at peer institutions and how they handle tuition for grad students participating on research/grant projects.*

Comment: D. Russell – After speaking with representatives from Northwestern, the mandatory inclusion of tuition in research budgets, decreases the competitive edge of those institutions.

Comment: J. Newton – There may be a lowering of this requirement in the fall of 2008. There also may be some legislative actions that could allow for tuition waivers. Suggested that this was an issue for Chancellor McKinney to hear about as well.

Comment: J. Pollack – Unfortunately, the only tuition waivers being considered during this legislative session is for dependent children of faculty.

Comment: J. Newton – If this is the case, this issue can still be addressed in the future.

Comment: J. Pollack – Our institution's issue is a competitive one. Where most institutions do have this policy, ours is an issue in regards to attraction and retention.

Comment: A. Love – Both councils (e.g. REC & CPI) have some homework to do.

Comment: C. Sippial – Noted that the CBE meetings are always open to the public as well.

Recommendations/Actions/Follow-Up:

- CPI/REC collaborate on white paper, detailing peer institution's handling of tuition on research grants.
- CPI EC to consider adding the issue of tuition waivers to the agenda for the CPI meeting with the Chancellor.
- CPI Coordinator will send copies of minutes to REC members.

(1:07) Adjournment