**Meeting Minutes**  
**Research Board**

**Date:** 24 January 2013  
**Time:** 1500 - 1630  
**Location:** MAE Conference Room

**Present:**  
Jeffrey Paduan, Dean of Research  
Jim Newman, SSAG  
Amela Sadagic, MOVES/ Faculty Council Rep.  
Steve Hall, MOVES  
Paul Shebalin, Meyer Institute  
Joel Young, CS  
Uday Apte, GSBPP  
Ira Lewis, RSPO  
Pante Stanica, MA  
Clay Moltz, NSA  
Phil Pace, ECE  
George Dinolt, Cebrowski Institute  
Robert Harney, SE  
Marcello Romano, MAE  
Kevin Smith, PH  
David Tucker, DA  
Wieslaw Maslowski, OC

**Not Present:**  
Frank Barrett, GPPAG  
John Colosi, OC/UW  
Kevin Wood, Associate Dean of Research/OR  
Mark Nissen, IS  
Qing Wang, MR

**Guests:**  
CDR Marc Aparicio, SE

**COMMUNICATIONS**

*Dean of Research Update*

Dr. Paduan opened the board meeting with information on the Research and Research programs budget. Budget updates were distributed to the board members that included information on the various research office accounts. The Research office requested $2 million in program funds and was only allocated $750k. Those funds are intended to cover such things as NRC postdocs and publications. Currently, $500k of the $750k was
pulled back which is a grave concern to the office. This places the future of certain programs, such as the NRC postdocs, in jeopardy.

There are approximately five potential candidates currently in the pool and enough money can be pulled together to cover the $14,000 per candidate fee. There is a subsidy that goes on for each NRC on campus. Those with “A” grades are offered a higher package.

Even if funds are reinstated, the Research office will still be working on a limited budget, and some cuts will have to be made. It is important to ascertain whether or not this is still a top spending priority to the board. It should be noted that the program has grown over the years and has been a success at NPS. How much money should go into publications? How much into research recap? Dr. Paduan would like some sense about where the board prioritizes these expenditures.

The spreadsheet that creates the indirect model is being held by the office of the VP for F&A. Colleen Nickles has not released it due to a belief that it will create additional confusion. Dr. Paduan volunteered to send the spreadsheet to the board. That spreadsheet determines what comes back to the Research office in indirect.

The model and spreadsheet are determined by a process that is not widely understood on campus. It is particularly concerning that there is nothing in the methodology being used that scales with the research. No additional money is given, even if your research doubles during the year, with the exception of individual PI bid and proposal money. The department will not gain any additional funds to administer the activities. Chairs should ensure that their employee listing, on the spreadsheet, is properly categorized. This will affect the amount of indirect that is received.

Amela Sadagic suggested that there be some justification of the VP for F&A processing of calculating indirect. It has to be assumed that there are inaccuracies and the chairs should closely examine the spreadsheet. Previously, the board discussed having the board review the indirect process and then have Colleen Nickles come to a board meeting to field questions. It should be noted that the indirect model is an action item on the IG list.

A board member questioned the Dean’s ability to defend PI indirect for the next fiscal year. Dr. Paduan recently met with the Provost and Colleen Nickles on that topic. There seems to be an issue with checking on whether the money was appropriately spent.

Dr. Newman countered that there is a process in place to review how indirect funds are allocated. The funds reviewer will receive the requisition and can raise any potential questions to the PI. It would be helpful if the Dean of Research was present with ADM Tighe when defending the process to the Secretary. Getting approval to travel has been particularly problematic due to additional scrutiny placed on DTS authorizations.
The larger question is the method used to decide how to break up an individual’s time between direct and indirect. How can accuracy be gained? Dr. Paduan believes that having a number of reviewers of the spreadsheet will help weed out inaccuracies.

What if there are more people on the list than are supported by the amount of indirect collected? This would indicate a problem somewhere in their process.

A board member questioned the function of technology transfer. There is an employee who works half time, with Lisa Norris, on patents. A board member asked about the payback on those patents. Is it possible to sell that technology to others? It would seem to be a standard practice, for someone in that function, to market the patents. There should be a legal and allowable method for sharing that intellectual property. It would be helpful to have Lisa Norris speak on this topic. It would be beneficial to have an employee on board who would make the attempt to sell that technology. That money could assist in funding the function in the future.

**Introductions**

Dr. Shebalin introduced CDR Mark Aparicio who is sitting in Meyer Institute as the Deputy Director. He is currently teaching courses within SE and hopes to bring in some projects from DHS.

Amela Sadagic introduced Steve Hall a new representative for Faculty Council.

**CCB**

The Configuration Control Board for KFS has a need for more faculty representatives. If a board member is willing, or interested in participating, they should notify Amela. The board is really the most direct way to influence the financial office. Having more faculty members would be greatly beneficial. A board member requested additional information, via email, on what a role on the board would entail.

**CISP**

There is a small group that handles Counter Intelligence for NPS. The group examines public release of documents and shipment of sensitive equipment. CAPT Abbott and CAPT Hoyt form the core of the group. They want to establish a committee, with faculty members, for Counter Intelligence at NPS. Suggestions were requested from the Research Board. Clay Moltz offered assistance and added that Chris Twomey, of NSA, would be a good option as well.

**Contracts Review Board**

There is a Contract Review Board (CRB) that has been established at NPS. The CNO requested that there be a review conducted to ensure that contracts are being done properly. A team, from San Diego, was brought to NPS. That team pulled every existing
contract, with a value of over $250k, and reviewed them. The outcome and conclusions of the review are pending. The team will return to review outgoing grants in approximately a month.

RSPO Update

Dr. Paduan previously sent out the Research Office organizational chart which shows the recent re-alignment. The reorganization was set in place to continue operations and supervision of certain functions of RSPO upon Danielle’s retirement. Debbie Buettner was detailed to the role of Director of RSPO. There is a need to place someone in the position but it will need to be advertised. Debbie Buettner has a number of the necessary qualifications. Another individual, from ONR London, has also expressed interest in the position. The position is a GS-13/14. Some of the duties previously assigned to Danielle have been re-distributed to other supervisors within the office. Ira Lewis and Sandi Leavitt have taken on supervising a number of the functions ranging from Thesis Processing, IRB and the Writing Center.

DISCUSSION

Review of the February USMC Workshop re: Thesis Research

COL Mitch McCarthy, senior Marine representative at NPS, joined the Research Board to present on the topic of creating a Marine Corps Thesis Research Working Group (TRWG). Discussion started on this process due to the fact that in his previous experience as a Marine Corps student, at NPS, there was some difficulty finding a thesis topic related to the USMC. There seemed to be some redundancy and duplication of efforts. The solution to this would be the creation of a Marine Corps Thesis Research Working Group (TRWG)

The TRWG would convene semi-annually, in both February and August, at NPS. The hope is to have sponsors come to NPS and sit with the faculty in breakout sessions to discuss topics. COL McCarthy stated, “The TRWG purpose is to provide an oversight body made up of research stakeholders, or sponsors, from across the Marine Corps to communicate, review, validate and recommend approval of specific research, theses, projects or broad area studies that will be executed by NPS students and faculty on behalf of Marine Corps’ sponsors and/or stakeholders.”

It is of the utmost importance that the Research Board communicates this opportunity to their faculty. The USMC is present and willing to put in the time and effort required to ensure the success of this group. The Marine Corps continues to increase their student presence on the NPS campus.
**Additional information can be found on the Research Board website at:**

http://www.nps.edu/Research/Documents/BoardMeetingPresentation_MCTRWG_Marine_Corps_Presentation_1_24_13.pdf

*NTT Faculty Committee Report*

Agenda item deferred until Kevin Wood returns to campus.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35