Meeting Minutes  
Research Board  

Date: 24 April 2014  
Time: 1500 - 1630  
Location: MAE Conference Room  

Present:  

Jeffrey Paduan, Dean of Research  
Kevin Wood, Associate Dean of Research  
Imre Balogh, MOVES  
Robert Harney, SE  
Claudia Luhrs, MAE  
George Dinolt, Cebrowski Institute  
Qing Wang, MR  
James Newman, SSAG  
Duane Davis, CAG  
Phil Pace, ECE  
Johannes Royset, OR  
Clay Moltz, NSA  
Chris Twomey, NSA  
Mike Malley, NSA  
Wieslaw Maslowski, OC  
Geoffrey Xie, CS  
Pante Stanica, MA  

Not Present:  
Frank Barrett, GPPAG  
Thomas Herbers, OC/UW  
Mark Nissen, IS  
Mark Aparicio, Meyer Institute  
David Tucker, DA  
Kevin Smith, PH  
Uday Apte, GSBPP  

COMMUNICATIONS  

Dr. Paduan opened the board meeting with an update on the Board of Advisors meeting. The board meets bi-annually and serves as the academic advisors to NPS. The board is comprised of people from either an academic or retired military background who have a clear understanding of the school mission. The board put some pressure on the office of the Secretary of the Navy to close out the remaining IG items. The SECNAV found that there was no supporting evidence to the IG report that claimed research was undermining the teaching portion of the school mission. The board also learned of the faculty losses the school has recently undergone. These departures are due to the current climate and hiring issues NPS is experiencing.
NPS Studies Program Update

The studies program sent out a solicitation for proposals. The process has evolved since last year. The idea is to have decisions made against a more complete proposal. A five page template has been created in order to facilitate that. The people interested in proposing should send them in against the proposed topics list. 30 May is the deadline for a response for the proposals. Dr. Paduan noted that more information can be gleaned from a NPS POC. It should also be noted that even if you have a two year proposal, they must be planned one year at a time. It would be nice to have more flexibility, but that is not possible at this time. Approximately 150 proposals are expected to be submitted of which one third will be accepted.

In June, the NPS POCs will be asked to form a technical team to do a peer review. The OPNAV PAM will then rate the questions on the wikisite and rate operational relevance. That information and the proposals will go to the executive Research Board who will reorder them. It has not yet been decided who will participate in the board. It will most likely include Scott Lutterloh, N1, President Route and some representatives from N3 and N5. Ideally, it would have a representative from each code. A charter for the Naval Studies Program is in the process of being created. This will help provide a more clear definition of the program and processes involved.

Dr. Paduan will be going to DC to discuss the program and should have an update by the next board meeting. Col. McCarthy informed the board that of the 63 Marine Corps proposal submitted, 38 were approved. The Marine Corps receives $750,000 in funding so there will be a cut line.

DISCUSSION

Research Board Charter

Recently, a board member requested a copy of the charter. This action started an examination of the existing charter and recommendations for edits. The Research Board Charter was approved in 2011 and is located on the Research Board website. Dr. Paduan disseminated a version with track changes for review at this board meeting. The reason for this update is related to the membership rules. At the previous board meeting, Jeff Haferman put in a bid to represent ITAC on the Research Board. The charter does not list ITAC in the current version of the charter and would need to be updated. Dr. Paduan proposed the notion of a non-voting group. Dean Paduan recommended the primary membership, wherein there is a representative from each department, are the voting members. If ITAC and other groups are interested in attending regularly, they can be beneficial to the board, but will serve as non-voting members.

Under the “Roles & Responsibilities” section, some changes regarding governance were suggested. For example, monthly meetings do not always occur due to holiday seasons and summer breaks. The language in the charter could be modified to “typically
monthly.” Dr. Paduan requested that the board review the document and send their recommendations or suggestions to him. The primary role of the board is to advise the Dean of Research. There was some discussion of striking the section regarding “misconduct of research”. Typically, those cases are handled by other entities (i.e. IRB).

Research Faculty & Step Awards

A formal pay step instruction will be disseminated shortly by Academic Planning. This year, the campus has 350 steps to give out to faculty. This is a dramatic increase from the past few years. There has been some concern expressed regarding the non-tenure track vs. tenure track faculty receiving pay steps. The third category of Research Associates must also be taken into consideration.

Kevin Wood voiced the importance of ensuring Deans and Chairs are aware of past trends in the step system. In terms of rewarding faculty employees for their productivity, how will their productivity be measured? It can be measured in terms of research dollars and publications. The committee would like to send a memo to Deans and Chairs that shows there is evidence of unfair treatment of non-tenure track faculty. In the past, chairs were more apt to give steps to tenure track faculty. This shows some obvious bias.

Some Chairs would also award steps to those who had already hit the pay cap –thereby making them null. A memo will be written by the committee asking for corrective action going forward when awarding pay steps. A board member noted that the process can vary by department. It is also a complex issue because some Chairs may want to give more incentive for the tenure track faculty to stay at NPS. A board member pointed out that a tenure track may start out higher on the scale which could skew results. Equalizing the non-tenure track and tenure track might then be preferential to the non-tenure track faculty.

Dr. Paduan motioned to adjourn, the motion was seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:27PM.