

Meeting Notes

Thursday, October 13, 2022

11:00pm-12:30pm – Zoom Meeting

Members Present	Members Unable to Attend	Others Present
Sandra Acosta, EPSY Bugrahan Yalvac, TLAC Marc Goodrich, TLAC Ben Herman, TLAC David Wright, KNSM Daniel Bowen, EAHR Rick Kreider, KNSM Zohreh Eslami, EPSY Luis Ponjuan, EAHR Karen Rambo-Hernandez, TLAC	Hector Rivera, EPSY	Michael De Miranda, Dean Beverly Irby, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Jim Fluckey, Associate Dean for Research Paul Hernandez, University CPI Representative Ann Savell, SERD Pre Award Jason Foley, SERD Pre Award Amy Jurica, SERD Pre Award
Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/Actions/Follo w-up
I. Introduction of Members		
II. Review of Meeting Minutes	Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of April 14, 2022 were approved. Minutes will be posted at this link: https://mycehd.tamu.edu/faculty/research-office/council-of-principal- investigators/	The minutes, bylaws, and current list of members are available on the SEHD CPI website.
III. Dean Michael de Miranda	Dean Michael de Miranda congratulated SEHD – last month we broke the \$40,000,000 mark. The research office is here to serve you. Let us know how we can support you in being successful.	
IV. Graduate Student Stipends	Dr. Beverly Irby spoke on an upcoming increase in the salaries for SEHD PhD Graduate Research Assistants and Teaching Assistants. It is currently below	

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/Actions/Follow-up
	<p>what a living wage would be. This increase has already received approval from GIC, FAC, and SAC. She asked if there is support from CPI to move forward on this increase.</p> <p>Dr. De Miranda said we want to bring the stipend to at least \$2000/month (from \$1,750). We will need to determine which grants will allow for increases and which grants will require bridge funding.</p> <p>Preaward budgeting should reflect the new minimum starting immediately.</p> <p>Dr. Irby added that we should ensure postdocs are also seeing an increase.</p> <p>Dr. Kreider asked if there will be increases for the staff, as well, since many will not make as much as the new full-time equivalent for GRAs also receiving tuition and fees.</p> <p>Dr. De Miranda responded that they will run some models to determine what that looks like. The goal is for the 23-24 year plan, but analysis needs to be complete first.</p> <p>No objections were raised.</p>	
<p>V. Updates from Interim Associate Dean for Research</p>	<p>Dr. Jim Fluckey was introduced as the new Interim Associate Dean for Research, and he discussed several initiatives from the preaward office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal Templates: The preaward office is getting ready to develop templates for various funding mechanisms. This will involve learning from our researchers in SEHD what has been successful with those funders and incorporating those commonalities into templates that we can share. This could lead to the development of a “brand” so that when funding agents review our work, it is recognizable as being from our school. Reviewers would know we have a brand that we live up to with every grant proposal that we submit. - MINT Initiative: The preaward office is preparing to pilot a project called Maximizing Ivthat will help faculty build their research portfolios and align them to software and tools offered by the university libraries and division of research. This will enhance their research profiles, build collaborations, and bring them real-time funding opportunities unique to their research interests. - New Name: the preaward office is no longer the College of Education Research Development office. The new name is SEHD Research Enterprise 	

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/Actions/Follow-up
	<p>& Outreach (REO). This encompasses more of the roles performed by this team rather than just proposal development. We want to maximize our service to you in every way, shape, and form. There will be marketing and branding and a new website with improved resources. Dr. Fluckey may be reaching out to you to see what made your applications successful. The question was asked: How does our faculty distinguish your office and the TAMU SRS office?</p> <p>Answer: SRS performs a different job than REO. We do not want duplication of effort. SRS handles budgets, internal routing requirements, skimming your proposal for compliance, and then submitting the application form. REO can help you with the development of your proposal documents to make sure by the time you are ready to hand your grant to SRS, it's the best it can be – to make it attractive to funders. We give you the opportunity for your proposal to be proofread and reviewed. We have brilliant people in this school, we have brilliant ideas, and if we can package that in a way that the reviewers get the message immediately, we are going to up our ability to attract more grants.</p> <p>Metrics: we intend to capture certain metrics over the next few years to show objectively what progress has been made and/or what needs to be modified.</p>	
VI. Updates from SERD Pre Award	Proposals to the Catapult program are due this week. Dr. Izat has been working with several people, and Ann can help with budgets and budget justifications. The Research Office has also hired a student worker to help with the MINT Initiative.	
VII. Updates from SERD Post Award	Clayton Holle was not present. No updates from SERD Post Award.	
VIII. SEHD-CPI: Roles and Bylaws	<p>Dr. Marc Goodrich presented slides summarizing the key points of the SEHD CPI Bylaws.</p> <p>A question was posed as to whether a broader announcement should be sent to all SEHD faculty inviting them to join the meeting. The benefits of this were discussed. No objections were raised. Ann Savell will send out the next meeting invitations to all SEHD faculty.</p>	Ann Savell will send out the next meeting invitations to all SEHD faculty.

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/Actions/Follow-up
<p>IX. SEHD Junior Faculty Initiative – Podcasts</p>	<p>In FY2022, Dr. Lei-Shih Chen began the Junior Faculty Initiative presentations on zoom discussing research impacts to provide support to junior faculty. Dr. Acosta has been approved to continue this as a podcast with the objective of junior faculty hearing successful researchers across our fields discuss commonalities, collaboration, or guidance. We will aim for four podcasts for this year at fifteen to twenty minutes each. The CPI chair or other host will interview a researcher from each one of our departments. The Huffines Institute has agreed to collaborate with us on this as they have a very successful podcast with a similar goal and already have all the resources. Dr. Acosta is currently arranging guests and the interview guide. If anyone is interested in being on the committee for this podcast or has suggestions on questions to add to the guide, email Dr. Acosta.</p> <p>Dr. Ponjuan agreed that these podcasts will lead to greater transparency in how these successful faculty get funding. We need to create a collaborative community rather than all fighting for the same piece of the pie, and these podcasts will help to make the process more transparent. It should help demystify the process in getting external funding grants, exposing the blind spots. Perhaps we can consider asking the junior faculty where they need help and identification of blind spots.</p> <p>Dr. Kreider suggested we have the senior, distinguished professors, local and from across the country, succinctly discuss how they became successful; pick their brains on what their habits are, how they got involved, how they were mentored, and what the secret to their success is. It should be informative and not take too much time away from researchers.</p> <p>Dr. Acosta will be converting these ideas into questions.</p>	<p>Dr. Acosta asked the faculty to consider which senior, successful faculty from their departments they would like to see on a podcast, and that they please consider serving on the committee. Please also send suggestions on questions for the interview guide to Dr. Acosta. She will send the questions/guide out to everyone ahead of time for their input.</p>
<p>X. SEHD Fall Reception for Incoming and Outgoing CPI Members</p>	<p>Ann Savell announced that, with the CPI meetings occurring over zoom since the pandemic, the Dean has approved an in-person reception to be held for all incoming/outgoing CPI members and affiliated personnel. Look for the details coming out soon.</p>	
<p>XI. Updates from University CPI</p>	<p>The University CPI met yesterday for a closed-door meeting consisting of five breakout groups focusing on the areas the CPI should set their agenda and should with the university administration. The five working groups</p>	

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations/Actions/Follow-up
	discussed issues with limited submissions and making them more equitable and transparent; strategic initiatives and emerging opportunities across funding; retention and midcareer issues (salaries, inflation, flexibility); DEI and related issues for student/faculty/staff. There was an open forum group focusing on broader issues. No specific proposals were put forward but it much brain storming occurred.	
XII. Establish CPI Priorities and Issues to be Addressed 2022-2023	<p>This agenda item will be retained for the next CPI meeting. Continue to consider what is important for the SEHD CPI to focus on, make a statement on, or create as an action this year.</p> <p>Items discussed at the end of FY22 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issues related to iRIS (readability and intuitiveness vs intent of the policy) - Mentoring junior faculty - Research Interest Groups (RIGs) <p>Dr. Kreider suggested a potential topic for consideration: discussing issues with the path forward, particularly following the townhall the president held for SEHD and its lack of inclusion for KNSM research foci.</p>	Send suggestions on priorities to Dr. Acosta or through the Suggestion Box on the SEHD CPI webpage . Discuss with your colleagues and other PI's to see what they would like addressed at the school level.
XIII. Meetings in person or online (Zoom)	<p>The council discussed the merits and demerits of continuing the CPI meetings virtually rather than returning to in-person meetings as they were pre-pandemic. Most members prefer zoom now for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time taken to get to and from a meeting place is saved. - historically, it is hard enough to get people together, but zoom is easier. - the idea of a reception or meeting in-person once a year or semester sounded appealing to new council members. <p>Meetings will continue on zoom for this year with the upcoming reception being the sole in-person event for now.</p>	
XIV. Election of Vice Chair	Dr. Marc Goodrich continued his interest in the position for this year. His nomination was seconded and approved by al.	
XV. Other Topics	No other business was presented.	