

Faculty Senate Research Council  
Compliance Subcommittee Minutes  
April 12, 2021, 4:00 pm  
Virtual Meeting

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
  - Attendance: Shawn Burke (Chair), Julie Brisset, Peter Delfyett
3. Approval of Minutes 3/8/21
  - Minutes approved with no changes
4. Recognition of Guests
  - Doug Backman (Office of Research, Director Office of Compliance)
5. Announcements
  - No new announcements
6. Old Business

Compliance Items

- Doug Backman provided an update on COI disclosures; most faculty have completed COI. Biggest questions out there revolve around foreign influence and its associated questions. Mentioned that faculty are not entirely happy with what they have to now do as it is burdensome. Hope is that the developed matrix can assist faculty in deciding what they need/don't need to disclose.

Research Misconduct Policy

- We continued the discussions started at our last meeting regarding concerns voiced from Office of Research regarding a desire/need to either expand the current research misconduct policy or create separate academic/publication misconduct policy. The committee received input from Doug Backman in terms of the types of situations that were being seen and the rationale for why didn't fit nicely within research misconduct as it is currently stated. There was some initial discussion regarding how this was handled at other universities. Initial discussions indicated a tendency for many universities to either intertwine the two or not really explicitly address publication misconduct.
- We also began to discuss the types of activities that might fall under a publication misconduct policy. In initial research that had been conducted prior to the issue being brought forth to Research Council, Doug mentioned the following categories: plagiarizing and/or, fabricating information in publications, *duplicate submissions* (submitting same manuscript or several manuscript with minor differences in title, author order, keyword, abstract, order affiliation to two or more journals at same time or submitting to another journal within an agreed or stipulated period), *multiple submissions*, *overlapping publications* (publishing a paper that overlaps substantially with existing publication), *salami publications* (slicing data from a large study which could have been reported in a single paper into different pieces and publishing them in two or more articles all which cover the same population, methods, and questions) *inappropriate authorship* (authorship inappropriately assigned based on author

contributions). Are there other areas that should be included? Another related issue was potential H-factor padding and the mechanisms that may cause/allow that to occur. Some ideas were surfaced regarding how to mitigate this latter issue (e.g., putting some onus on the researcher, faculty scrubbing promotion materials). There was also a recognition of the idea that what constitutes a 'publication' differs across discipline and a need to be clear, but inclusive in defining these things. It was also noted while each discipline and/or department may have a localized way of dealing with some of these issues there is a lack of a centralized plan or procedure at the university level. Despite our differences across disciplines there are probably some general criteria that could be agreed upon.

- For our subcommittee the question is whether this is an area that we feel needs to be addressed, and if so – how. Does it make sense to have the existing research misconduct policy and then begin to iteratively draft language for an action that would lead to the creation of a publication misconduct policy? Should the academic side have the authority to handle these things instead of putting it into a research misconduct box even though it may be intermingled? How does UCF want to vet these things? It was felt that this was not something that the committee could do on their own, but would require Faculty and Administrator input. First, to see to the degree others felt it was an issue and the types of things that may be still brewing that have not yet bubbled up to Compliance. And, of course, working with Faculty to draft the language in a resolution if that is the direction the committee decides to go after further research.

- The committee generally felt this was an issue that was important and needed further investigation. This meeting is the last official meeting of the subcommittee before the start of the academic year. Despite this being the last meeting, it was agreed that Doug will have his staff begin to gather some data from a handful of other universities so the committee has a starting point to see existing guidelines, policies, and procedures around publications. The committee was also interested in any information that could be obtained regarding the scope of the issue at other universities. Once this documentation is gathered Doug will contact the committee chair who will upload the documents into 'Teams'. The committee chair will then let the members know the documents are there so they can be examined prior to the committee's first meeting in August. It is expected that all committee members will be returning for next year. Later steps would be to possibly create some type of survey that could be sent out to Faculty and Administrators.

#### 7. New Business

- No new business

#### 8. Other Business

- No other business

#### 9. Adjournment

## **UCF Faculty Senate Facilities/Labs Subcommittee Report – April 29, 2021**

Members: Matt Stock (Chair), Andres Campiglia, Shengli Zou, Carmen Giurgescu (ADR; ex-officio)

Summary: Following our UCF ADR survey and previous discussions, our group has been in discussion concerning sending a similar survey to SUS institutions to garner feedback about how communication is managed among Facilities and faculty/staff. We will meet again in early May to finalize this survey.

The Internal Research Support Sub-committee met on April 12<sup>th</sup> and attempted to wrangle the questions/topics provided to us to build our mission and start talking about how we can achieve success. Here is what we came up with. Note that we keep our notes in Google Drive here ([https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Q7Z36AdHhU\\_W7nOjmuF4wY01T-4xhekawsQd6N2FLyA/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Q7Z36AdHhU_W7nOjmuF4wY01T-4xhekawsQd6N2FLyA/edit)) in case you ever need to see what is happening.

Our Mission: Be the people that represent the faculty voice in where resources can be prioritized when they are made available.

How can we do this?

1. Help the faculty think and position themselves for future funds
2. Turn priorities into action items
3. Reorganize funding structures to be more inclusive of faculty population.  
Consider different faculty units and provide different opportunities for different subsets, and ENCOURAGE research from these units.

In what ways can we achieve these goals/what needs attention: We need to spend more time on these to flesh them out more, but there are several areas we think need attention.

- 1) Ad hoc/ as needed funding? Deadlines for University grants do not align with sometimes urgent needs - rolling deadline possibilities?
  - a. Calendar of dates for future funding
    - i. What is known
    - ii. What is expected - based on reading the tea leaves
    - iii. Can faculty be given more time in this way
  - b. Set of specific document needs for every grant
    - i. Based on size of award
- 2) Teaching loads at different colleges have a diverse set of teaching loads.
  - a. How can we equalize or reward people for excellence?
  - b. What is excellence?
  - c. Can each department come up with options to have people chose the path that makes them the best scholar. Flexible work option
    - i. Less teaching - more publishing
    - ii. More teaching - less research
- 3) Many awards are college/university level. Can we consider department level awards?
  - a. Would we build the process for this to take place
  - b. Simple recognition at departmental level
    - i. Paper recognition makes a difference in P&T
    - ii. So many faculty but not enough opportunities
    - iii. Perhaps look at Nicholson School for how they distribute awards.....
  - c. Faculty do want more proportional opportunities
    - i. How can we equalize opportunities
    - ii. Based on faculty size (eg 70 people going for 1 award make it difficult)
- 4) Support for Editors of top-tier journals do not receive support although UCF/colleges/departments benefit from these journals. Can UCF provide some support for journal editors?
  - i. Course release
    1. No standard on what constitutes a course release.

2. Colleges should have course release policy on how course releases take place
      3. Such policies will increase research productivity
    - ii. Assistance for conference coordination?
    - iii. How do we mitigate these sorts of roadblocks to faculty doing their best work
      1. Benchmarks from other Universities
        - a. Course releases
        - b. Other support
- 5) Open access publishing funding
  - a. We have post-doc/junior-faculty support for this, but what about others?
- 6) Supporting mid-career
  - a. Awards - We must suggest opportunities - no real ownership in the award itself - perhaps Faculty Excellence continues
  - b. Mentorship
  - c. Support for Mentors.... Course release?
  - d. Transition into associate professor needs mentorship/support

# **Minutes**

## **University Research Council Policy Subcommittee**

### **April 20, 2021**

Minutes of a meeting of the University Research Council Policy Subcommittee duly called and held on April 20, 2021 via Zoom.

#### **Members present:**

- ✓ Debbie Hahs-Vaughn
- ✓ Nazanin Rahnavard
- ✓ Yongho Sohn

#### **Members absent:**

- ✓ Victoria Loerzel

#### **Ex officio and others present:**

- ✓ Erin Blackwell
- ✓ Elise Dantuma
- ✓ Tamara Gabrus
- ✓ Jennifer Kent-Walsh
- ✓ Liz Klonoff
- ✓ Venessa Nieves
- ✓ Ginny Pellam
- ✓ Debra Reinhart
- ✓ Dorothy Yates

---

With the approval of the members present, Debbie Hahs-Vaughn acted as Chair of the meeting and also recorded the minutes.

---

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

None

---

## OLD BUSINESS

1. One of the original topics for the subcommittee was ‘supporting big initiatives with respect to policy, etc.’ No additional clarifying information has been received from Research Council to better understand what the policy subcommittee needs to be reviewing. The subcommittee will close this item.
2. Another original topic for the subcommittee was ‘developing procedures for and evaluating research investment initiatives.’ No additional clarifying information has been received from Research Council to better understand what the policy subcommittee needs to be reviewing. Deb Reinhart has already developed procedures for this. The subcommittee will close this item.
3. The subcommittee recommends that the 2021-2022 subcommittee have Rhonda Bishop attend the first meeting of the year, or early in the year, to share information on the University Policy Committee and if/how this subcommittee can coordinate with that committee.
4. **Credit split.** The subcommittee spent the meeting discussing and finalizing a statement to share with Research Council. This will be shared prior to the end of the semester with Research Council.
5. **All other items on the agenda have been tabled.**
6. **TABLED.** Determine way of work for reviewing the university policies that the committee is being asked to review such as:
  - The subcommittee develops a response, sends it to the larger research council for review and feedback, and that response is sent on.
  - The Research Council distributed to respective constituencies, gathers feedback, then share it with the subcommittee. The policy subcommittee takes that input and create a collective response based on it.
3. **TABLED.** Policies from DARF that the committee should be reviewing.
  - a. Fixed price contract. Is there a policy in draft for this that the committee should be reviewing?
4. **TABLED.** F&A redistribution (some money to PI for full-indirect projects)

- a. Discussion: F&A reinvestment in research is one way to incentivize faculty to write proposals and reward faculty who are successful. State statute is that F&A must be used to support research. Reinvesting at individual faculty, reinvest with caveat that it must be used for research.
  - b. Discussion: This subcommittee needs to examine ways to do this. UCF benchmarks to 40 different institutions and reviewing UCF's policy relative to benchmark institutions may be helpful.
  - c. Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: F&A is what goes back to the college. If using credit split, the college would get based on credit split. Now, give back 45% of total F&A generated to college. Every college handles F&A differently. Others give back certain %. Question for committee: Do colleges need to standardize?
5. **TABLED.** Recommendation from the subcommittee on potentially removing the requirement that faculty have to subscribe to receive policy notifications.
6. **TABLED.** Prioritize the following list to be addressed during 2021-2022.
  - a. Fixed price contract policy.
  - b. Follow-up questions on COI. [Question 10 may be problematic. Feedback on questions and their clarity is important. There is no formal feedback process in place.]
  - c. Review PI handbook (Debra Reinhart created) and examine what additional policies are needed to support the PI handbook.
  - d. Generally, examine what policies are needed, what OR can do without policies, vet policies, what can be passed through this committee versus higher review, ensure faculty input, etc.
  - e. What needs to be clarified as standard operating procedure versus policy.
  - f. Effort reporting.
  - g. Limited submissions. Procedures in place but no policy. Debra Reinhart has information from other institutions.
  - h. Seed funding (internal review, decision process)
7. Adjournment. There being no further business to transact at the time, the meeting was adjourned.

Dated: April 20, 2021