

## **2019-2020 FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COUNCIL**

### **AGENDA**

**Meeting Date:** January 13, 2020

**Meeting Time:** 4:00 – 5:00 pm

**Meeting Location:** Millican Hall, room 395E

- **Call to Order**
- **Roll Call**
- **Approval of Minutes of December 9, 2019**
- **Announcements and Recognition of Guests**
- **New Business**
  - Discussion on new EHS policy.
  - Moving Research related operation of EHS to OOR?
  - Update on OOR internal award
- **Other Business**
- **Adjournment**

# **Faculty Senate Research Council Meeting**

Minutes of

**December 9, 2019**

**In attendance:** Martha Brenckle, Julie Brisset, Andres Campiglia, Debopam Chakrabarti, Peter Delfyett, Chris Emrich, Debbie Hahs-Vaughn, Bari Hoffman Ruddy, Qun “Treen” Huo, Kangsang Lee, David Luma, Sarah Norris, Fevzi Okumus, Nina Orlovskaya, Yongho Sohn, Keri Watson, Paul Wiegand, Shengli Zou, Liz Klonoff, Debra Reinhart.

Debopam Chakrabarti, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM. The roll was circulated for signatures.

Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

## **Discussion to Proposed Changes to “Campus Safety and Health Policy”, Policy Number 3-122 (4:07p)**

There was a discussion about potential revisions the policy with respect to who pays for reinspection after violations are found. Some members noted that the revisions would have the PI pay even if the violations are minor.

Several faculty present noted serious concerns, noting that they frequently have changes and go through reinspection regularly—this will create the wrong kinds of disincentives, limiting how quickly UCF responds to problems.

Dr. Lee pointed out that his lab goes through reinspect regularly for things such as: clarifying language and required equipment to purchase. Who pays the cost? Does he pass it on to students who are in violation? Does he pass it on to the sponsor of the grant to which to work belongs? He expressed concern about how he tells his program manager he has to change the costs.

There was general agreement that the change should be resisted. Dr. Chakrabarti suggested we create a resolution for the faculty senate.

Dr. Huo expressed concern that such policies should go through the units for review.

Dr Reinhart noted that it is supposed to go through review but that the policy change was posted for discussion at the last meeting but was withdrawn. So it is not technically even a proposed change yet.

Dr. Klonoff reviewed the reporting structure and recent changes to EHS—EHS doesn’t report to the Office of Research.

There was some general discussion about the nature of a resolution we might draft. Dr. Reinhart suggested a response should be more than opposition, it should be constructive.

Dr. Emrich asked how much overhead could be used to pay for these re-inspections. Dr. Klonoff indicated that there is no mechanism now for paying operational costs like these. She went on to discussion the plan to put in 10 kiosks for purchasing lab coats on campus.

There was general discussion between Dr. Reinhart and Dr. Lee about the fact that the proposed change allows 30 days for minor infraction—Dr. Lee pointed out that sometimes UCF purchasing cannot process new equipment purchases in under 30 days. Dr. Reinhart suggested that maybe the language should allow for some kind of “plan” to be put in place rather to allow for such variance. There was some general discussion about what kind of form that might take.

Dr. Klonoff suggested that the council invite Renee Michel (Director of EHS) to the next meeting to discuss these issues.

Dr. Chakrabarti agreed this was a good idea, but also wished to pursue a resolution concurrently.

Dr. Orlovskaya asked for clarification about the process: to steering committee for approval first?

Dr. Ruddy suggested that we wait until something from EHS has been officially submitted to the steering committee, noting that it has not yet (because it was pulled).

Dr. Chakrabarti pointed out that a draft had been available to faculty before it was pulled from the agenda. We can respond to that draft.

Dr. Orlovskaya asked whether such a policy *could* be approved without faculty input, and Dr. Chakrabarti indicated that a draft research council resolution to the senate was a means of expressing our opinion.

Several faculty agreed with Dr. Klonoff that we should invite Dr. Michel to discuss further. Dr. Orlovskaya moved that we do so, Dr. Lee seconded. The action was approved unanimously by the council.

### **EHS Responsibilities Under OR? (4:35p)**

There was a general discussion about whether or not EHS (or parts of EHS) should fall under the Office of Research. There was general agreement that there were a lot of changes UCF was undertaking, and that these must be done in concert with compliance (which is typically under OR).

Dr. Klonoff pointed out that EHS had been moved to its own unit last July, but that the budget has not yet been moved. Dr. Reinhart pointed out that IRB and export control are under OR at UCF. Office of Research representatives pointed out that the faculty should take a more active role in clarifying how they believe these organizations and policies should be structured.

Dr. Lee asked whether we could survey other schools to find out how EHS is typically structured at other universities. Dr. Klonoff indicated that that had already been done. Of 30 schools, only 2 had EHS under OR—typically they are under facilities, with an “arm that reaches out to OR”. In 28 schools, export control reports to OR, except where EHS is under OR (UF and USF). At UF, EHS reports to facilities.

Dr. Orlovskaya asked how faculty should express their position on such matters. There was general discussion about surveying UCF faculty, etc. Dr. Orlovskaya suggested we form an ad hoc subcommittee to develop a proposal as to whether the lab responsibilities portion of EHS should report to the Office of Research.

Dr. Reinhart examined the EHS website and asked whether *most* of the responsibilities listed should fall under OR.

Dr. Chakrabarti asked Dr. Ruddy to draft some language we could use for a resolution. Dr. Watson suggested language be broadened beyond “labs” to include “studios”, as well. Dr. Ruddy agreed to draft a resolution.

### **Discussion about Creating Subcommittees/Taskforce (4:52p)**

Dr. Orlovskaya suggested we have three “subcommittees”: 1) research compliance in general; 2) evaluation procedures (task force created last meeting); 3) IT policy as it pertains to research.

General discussion about whether these are “subcommittees” or “task forces”. Agreed that these are probably task forces, but that they should report back to the research council regularly.

Dr. Chakrabarti suggested that we also consider how space is allocated. There was general discussions about the idea that the research council could draft a document proposing the process and procedures for assigning lab space on campus.

It was agreed that task forces should be formed to address each of these, but the task forces were not yet formed.

**The meeting was adjourned at 5:12p.**