

Faculty Senate Research Council Subcommittee Reports  
February 2021

**Research Council Compliance Subcommittee**

Minutes for Meeting Monday February 10, 2021 3:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Roll Call
  - Attendance: Shawn Burke (Chair), Darlin' Neal (Chair), Julie Brisset, Peter Delfyett
- 3) Approval of Minutes
  - No prior minutes as this is the first meeting
- 4) Announcements
  - Three primary goals for this initial meeting. First, affirm current or elect new chair. Second, discuss each assigned topic.
  - In discussing each topic, the following should be considered:
    - What do we think each topic means, are we clear on what we are being asked to do and if not what clarification is needed?
    - Given what we currently know, can we rank order the importance of items on our list? Which one (ones) will likely take the most time to complete or involve the most people or offices around campus?
    - Can we identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list
    - What items are not on our list and you think should be? What are they and why are they important?
- 5) Discussed if anyone wanted to assume the role of Chair. Committee unanimously decided on Shawn Burke serving as the Chair.
- 6) The committee has two topics on our current list: contract approval process and compliance items that had been moved out of OR (i.e., EH&S Environmental Health and Safety, undue foreign influence, and research non-compliance)
- 7) The committee began to discuss the first topic (contract approval process), but quickly realized that we needed clarification regarding what the issue was with respect to why it had been sent to Research Council. What are we trying to help resolve or what issue are we to work on with respect to the contract approval process? It is our hope that we can get further clarification on this at the next Research Council meeting.
- 8) With respect to the second item on our list (the compliance items that were moved out of OR), the committee felt that we were trying to ascertain why these items were moved out of OR as this seems to run counter to where they lay within many other universities. We felt that a first step might be to invite someone from OR as well as a representative from the Office of Compliance to come and talk to the committee regarding their thoughts about the movement of these items (e.g., why they were moved, benefits/drawbacks to them being where they currently are, and if they were wanted by OR and/or Office of Compliance). We

are not sure who to reach out to and are hoping that we can get some guidance from Liz and others. We also plan to look and see where these types of items are located at other universities. This will then determine our next steps.

It was mentioned by one committee member that compliance may be better served under OR. Compliance is there to help faculty in research, but often the perception is that compliance helps the university, but not the researchers. By being its own entity, it reinforces the non-jointness (potentially amplifying the view as an us versus them as compared to something that is there to help the researchers). It was mentioned that compliance issues sometimes feel like they are there to get in the way of research, but by having them under OR it would potentially suppress this feeling and amplify the notion of teaming. A second committee member agreed indicating that separating compliance seems to cause chaos and confusion.

The committee also discussed a little about the 'undue foreign influence' and promoting more understanding with respect to the second order effects the reporting process on this. While members acknowledged the university sensitivity in this regard with respect to Federal Funding, the second order effects become challenging, An example that was mentioned was that it becomes challenging when collaborating with a friendly foreign national, but that person may have a relationship with a person from a 'non-friendly' nation. Where does this leave us? How do we navigate that?

A member brought up the COI form and how that tied into reporting of undue foreign influence. For any of these non-compliance/compliance items there is a fine line between what the university needs and what becomes viewed as a hassle or headache to faculty. When viewed as too much of a headache it can have a negative effect on outreach, growth, and partnering. So the question becomes how to find a middle ground as well as promote understanding?

- There was a small discussion concerning whether this type of item fell within the bounds of the COI subcommittee or what the overlap was with respect to the 'undue foreign influence' within the Compliance subcommittee and items within the COI subcommittee. Ultimately, this was something the committee was going to ask for clarification on. It might be that the 'undue foreign influence' falls under COI subcommittee and what falls under Compliance subcommittee is more about the movement of these items from OR to the Office of Compliance and Risk.

- 9) At this time, we did not come up with any new action items to add to the current list.
- 10) Committee members also discussed regular meeting times for the committee. A committee member proposed that we meet once a month about halfway between the larger Research Council meeting. There was discussion regarding the day/time that would be best to meet. Mondays at 3:00 or later was discussed as a potential time on one of the 'off' weeks from the larger Research Council. This

seemed to work for a majority of the committee, but ultimately it was decided that a doodle poll would be sent to find the best time.

11)Adjournment

## **Research Council Facilities and Labs Subcommittee**

January 28th 10:00am EST Zoom

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

1) What do we think this topic means? Are we clear what we are being asked to do? If not, what clarifications do you need?

-No, this is not clear. We need further guidance and clarification about our topic and roles. New topics/discussions within OR are not clear to us. Organizational structure of the university is also unclear – Is Facilities part of UCF or are they contractors? Is our committee involved in EHS discussions?

2) Given what we know today, how would we rank in order of importance our list of topics? Which one (or ones) will likely take the most time to complete or involve the most people or offices around campus?

-New budget model – how will this impact Colleges and individual PIs?

3) Can you identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they, and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list.

-Idea: gather information from College/units about needs, what is working or not working. Unclear our role. Perhaps email to ADRs

4) What items are not on your list that you think should be? What are they and why are they important?

-We need guidance.

## Research Council Internal Research and Support Subcommittee

Feb 11, 2021

### Minutes

1. Assignment of Secretary for today's meeting
  - a. Sarah Norris volunteered to take minutes as Secretary for the meeting.
2. Microsoft Teams
  - a. Due to technical challenges, the group determined that Zoom will be used for future meetings. Chris Emrich, as chair, will send out a permanent Zoom link for future meetings.
3. Excellence in Research Awards
  - a. Discussion ensued about the current rubric and potential inequities for award distribution across disciplines.
    - i. Fevzi Okumus proposed that three awards for the following areas: Arts & Humanities, Social Sciences, and STEM be considered for the Excellence in Research award for next year's award cycle and beyond.
    - ii. The group noted that this was a topic of discussion for Research Council in 2019-2020 and that a review of previous minutes and recommendations would be an important task to undertake when considering future recommendations by the subcommittee.
    - iii. The group noted that the existing rubric needs modification and updating it should be a top priority ahead of the upcoming year's award cycle.
      1. Chris Emrich suggested one potential option for rubric modification that includes weighted factors based on disciplines; surveys with different disciplines to understand the importance/value of criteria and outputs could be utilized. David Luna also mentioned diversity as potential criteria for the award rubric.
  - b. Discussion of the 2020 Excellence in Research Award candidates/dossiers
    - i. Discussion ensued about the candidates and their dossiers and subcommittee member rankings.
    - ii. The subcommittee determined that the winner of the 2020 Excellence in Research Award would be Dr. Kathleen Richardson.
    - iii. Chris Emrich as subcommittee chair to communicate the subcommittee's decision to Kelli Marini.

#### 4. Who we are and what we do

This topic was tabled until the next scheduled meeting, due to the time constraints related to the Excellence in Research Awards.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Sarah Norris

## Research Council Policy Subcommittee

Minutes of a meeting of the Research Council Policy Subcommittee duly called and held on February 3, 2021 via Zoom.

### **Members present:**

- ✓ Debbie Hahs-Vaughn
- ✓ Victoria Loerzel
- ✓ Nazanin Rahnavard

### **Ex Officio present:**

- ✓ Liz Klonoff
- ✓ Debra Reinhart

---

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

**Updates to committee membership:** Yongho Sohn is stepping down from the Research Council after this semester. Humberto Lopez has stepped down from Research Council.

**Ex Officio.** As discussed at the meeting, ex-officio members were not assigned to subcommittees unless they requested to be on one. Discuss at your first sub-committee meeting which ex-officio members (refer to list on the Faculty Senate Website) you want/need to participate.

Liz Klonoff (VP for Research), Jennifer Kent-Walsh (Associate Dean for Research, College of Health Professions), and Debra Reinhart (Associate VP for Research) are serving as ex-officio for this subcommittee.

Suggestions from Dr. Klonoff: DARF representatives (process grants at college level to budget personnel in college, etc.) (they will be deciding who to serve).  
Doug Backman. Dorothy Yates.

**Chair.** Debbie Hahs-Vaughn will serve as Chair of this subcommittee.

**Next meeting: Monday, March 8, 9:00.** *Note and update: Both Doug Backman and Dorothy Yates have been invited to the meeting.*

## TOPICS ASSIGNED TO THE POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE

- supporting big initiatives with respect to policy, etc.;
- developing procedures for and evaluating research investment initiatives;
- policy pertaining to married faculty in advising and PI-ing;
- F&A redistribution (some money to PI for full-indirect projects)

### **1) *What items are not on this list that should be? What are they and why are they important?***

- a. Discussion: Suggestions from Dr. Klonoff included:
  - i. Fixed price contract policy.
  - ii. Follow-up questions on COI.
  - iii. Review PI handbook (Debra Reinhart created) and examine what additional policies are needed to support the PI handbook.
  - iv. 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.
  - v. What needs to be clarified as standard operating procedure versus policy.
  - vi. Effort reporting.
  - vii. Limited submissions. Procedures in place but no policy. Debra Reinhart has information from other institutions.
  - viii. Seed funding (internal review, decision process)

### **2) *Given what we know today, how would we rank in order of importance our list of topics? Which one (or ones) will likely take the most time to complete or involve the most people or offices around campus?***

- a. Discussion: Policies (e.g., credit split—there is not a policy for this, fixed price contracts—policy from Dorothy) are priority. COI sub-questions are also priority.
- b. Action item: Ask Dorothy what policies she's been working. DARF will be a great source for identifying policies that faculty should review. Ask Doug Backman the policies he's working. Jennifer Shambrook as well. They can provide drafts. <https://www.research.ucf.edu/Compliance/index.html>
  - i. *Update: email was sent Feb. 3 asking for policies in progress. Information has not been received as of Feb. 22.*

**3) For each topic assigned your group, answer the questions posed (see below).**

**TOPIC 1: Supporting big initiatives with respect to policy, etc.**

- What do we think this topic means? Are we clear what we are being asked to do? If not, what clarifications do you need?
  - Discussion: Dr. Klonoff was not sure of this topic. She shared information about Blue Ribbon panels that were established for energy and big data. Is this referring to what UCF should be focusing (i.e., where should UCF be investing and committing resources) and making this process transparent?
- Can you identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they, and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list.
  - Discussion: Additional clarification from the Research Council is needed to better understand this topic.

**TOPIC 2: Developing procedures for and evaluating research investment initiatives**

- What do we think this topic means? Are we clear what we are being asked to do? If not, what clarifications do you need?
  - Discussion: Debra Reinhart has developed procedures for this.
- Can you identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they, and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list.
  - Discussion: Additional clarification from the Research Council is needed to better understand this topic.

**TOPIC 3: Policy pertaining to married faculty in advising and PI-ing**

- What do we think this topic means? Are we clear what we are being asked to do? If not, what clarifications do you need?
  - Discussion: There is not currently a policy on this. The form has been changed to require disclosure. Relationships must be disclosed when advising on dissertation committees. Mitigation may be to make one member non-voting. In research, there are some policies, and these are HR policies. There is no policy for advising. The policy or disclosure needs to take into account other conflicts (e.g., financial, employment).
- Can you identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they, and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list.



- Discussion: Disclosure is sufficient. Policy is not needed. No action items are needed for this at this time (per Dr. Klonoff).

#### **TOPIC 4: F&A redistribution (some money to PI for full-indirect projects)**

- What do we think this topic means? Are we clear what we are being asked to do? If not, what clarifications do you need?
  - 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.
- Can you identify action items for this topic? If so, what are they, and can you draft a to-do list with timeline and deliverables? If not, refer to #1 and add questions to clarify the action items to your list.
  - 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.