Research Council Subcommittee Reports
March 2021
Compliance Subcommittee

1) Old Business
   a) The old business that we have deals with beginning to discuss the topic that was sent to Compliance regarding the 'compliance items moved out of OR'. We had invited Doug Backman to attend this meeting to provide insight from the Office of Research perspective.
   b) Doug Backman provided his insight onto our questions regarding compliance items that were moved out of OR (e.g., EHS, foreign influence, research non-compliance)
   c) With respect to EHS. There had been a significant event that happened about 1 ½ ago in EHS and the previous provost asked Liz to manage the EHS group. With Rhonda Bishop coming back to the university and working with the new president the understanding was that EHS would fall under her. In both cases he is not sure if it was never really formalized. Doug's understanding is that EHS reports to Rhonda, but he will confirm.
      i) There is still a lot of synergy between OR and Rhonda Bishop's office as it applies to sponsored activity. Doug will find out more information and if there is anything else that needs to be added he will bring it back to the committee. There was also a short discussion revolving around where EHS might best fit. Doug felt that there is quite a bit of other activity in EHS that may not directly relate to research. Doug felt that OR should be able to work with anyone that is managing that outcome as OR has been doing this for such a long time. OR works with Rhonda's office to manage the outcomes related to sponsored research (mostly federal).
   d) With respect to the item on undue foreign influence. There was some background given on recent events with respect to the addition of Q12 to the AA21 form. Two primary reasons for the addition. First, Senate Bill 72 created a new disclosure process (required that anyone engaged in research at a higher education institution was responsible for disclosing outside interest in the 'foreign arena'). This is significant because the questions in the past have been based on faculty or people working with them responsible for the design, conduct, and reporting the state law changed it to 'engaged in the design, conduct, and reporting'. This is a lot broader. There is now a matrix on what to be disclosed to help.
   e) Related, the ownership of COI process was discussed. Ownership resides within compliance and ethics, but is also still the responsibility of OR. Faculty that are engaged in research will be routed through OR. If answer yes to Questions 1, 2, 3, 9, 10 in a certain way it gets routed to OR Compliance Office. OR is interested in what faculty need, why they need it, how it relates to their research, federal regulations, and Florida statues, etc. Rhonda's office will oversee COI from a compliance component, providing oversight. When OR gets done with helping faculty complete the AA21 it gets routed to Rhonda's office. Doug felt that OR was not being taken out of the process, but that the move was more of an affirmation of the policy to affirm that Rhonda's office was responsible for the COI process at the university. Doug doesn't really see a change per se in terms of the foreign influence/COI (e.g., where responsibility resides) – it being 'moved'.
   f) Doug also mentioned another aspect - Entitlement agencies (e.g., DOD, NIH, NSF) in how interested in getting outside activity in current and pending. In many cases they were concerned about the Thousand Talent Program. Helping faculty

to understand what needs to be disclosed and why when the whole culture is now changing will be a key role of OR moving forward.

    g) Committee decided to let the dust settle a bit before moving forward due to all of the changes that are ongoing in the culture surrounding much of the above. Otherwise, we may have a problem finding others to benchmark against as everyone is trying to scramble to deal with the new changes.

2) New Business

    a) Research misconduct policy on unethical behavior. At the last Research Council meeting Liz had brought up the need for a research misconduct policy on unethical behavior. The current research misconduct policy only covers issues such as plagiarism, fabrication, or falsification – yet there are other issues that are being seen that don't fall under these areas. Doug provided some insight into what Liz was talking about. The current research misconduct policy does not address when people in the academic arena are conducting misconduct as it may apply to things such as: authorship [e.g., including people who shouldn't be on the authorship line and vice versa, graduate students/authorship], inappropriately adding to their citations.

    b) Many universities have their own version of 'academic' misconduct separate from research misconduct. Often revolves a lot around authorship issues. Research misconduct at many institutions in US is heavily based on Federal Government Office of Research Integrity with Department Health and Human Services. There are a number of academic misconduct areas that have nothing to do with 'research'. Could envision two separate policies [academic versus research]. Doug offered to provide us with verbiage from other universities and other guidelines that are dealing with 'academic' misconduct.   Doug also mentioned some sentiment from faculty members working in administrative fields whereby they feel hindered by only having the 'research' misconduct (so focused on only 3 research misconduct areas). Doug mentioned that there currently not much centralized when it comes to how to handle academic misconduct at UCF - each college has its own approach and may use their predominant associations as their benchmark (most focused on authorship related misconduct). Academic side of this is not only based on research misconduct and not only based on Department of Health and Human Services standard. Some of examples that were highlighted include: people that should have been included as authors and are not as well as those that should not be included and are. Other examples may include people listing things that are not actual research papers to boost their H-index. People are actually going out on google scholar and framing papers that are nominal changes to something that is already out there and claiming their name to it.

    c) One of the committee members asked who enforces supervision of this? Doug explained that once someone identifies it they often make allegations through either the integrity line or a dean/department chair. When it is seen as misconduct there is a tendency for it to

    d) gravitate to OR as that technically is the only office that manages that type of conduct separate from what Liz and undergrads have done for those items that outlie in the academic misconduct guidelines only. It is so limited and intertwined that we need to come up with an alternate solution. Some universities tie the academic misconduct with the research misconduct. Doug will provide some information that he has received in doing some initial research on it. He will also come back and talk more about this at our next meeting.

Facilities and Labs Subcommittee

1) Summary: During the UCF Research Council meeting on Monday, February 22nd, 2021, Dr. Klonoff and other members of the Council provided feedback on current issues related to UCF Facilities and the management of laboratories. Much of the conversation centered around problems with communication among PIs, Chairs/Directors, and UCF Facilities. Dr. Klonoff shared examples of emergency situations in laboratories in which proper personnel were not notified in a timely manner. These errors in communication have led to the loss of research productivity and have had financial implications at the university. Dr. Klonoff suggested that our subcommittee spend some time investigating the issue of communication and ponder potential solutions to prevent costly emergencies.

   a) In response, our subcommittee has continued to gather feedback concerning not only problems related to facilities and labs, but how PIs, departments, and colleges communicate with UCF Facilities. We created a **Qualtrics survey** that was distributed to all UCF ADRs. Five ADRs responded (see attached). Based on the findings, it appears that there is variability with respect to how ADRs perceive communication between PIs, Chairs/Directors, and UCF Facilities. The results of the survey also highlight the fact that **there is not a consistent manner in which communication is fostered** across campus. Our own internal discussion (representation across four different UCF colleges) shows that **communication is highly individualized**, with some PIs discussing issues with facilities representatives directly and others communicating with Chairs/Directors. We also have reason to believe that **some PIs may have no idea who to communicate with** in the event of problems or needs in their lab/studio. This may be even further complicated for academic units that have labs or facilities spread across campus and Research Park.

   b) To facilitate our conversation, these topics were broken down in two areas: 1) **Normal communication** and 2) **Emergencies**.

2) **Normal communication –** Based on the feedback we've received, it appears that there is a need for better communication between PIs and UCF Facilities. As every College is unique, it may not be possible or wise to standardize across the university, but a system should be established to ensure that every PI knows the proper communication channels. More importantly, there is a need for better communication from UCF Facilities should work need to be done in a lab or studio. UCF Facilities personnel need to ensure that the proper channels are notified and a potential date and time of work to be done is **approved before arriving** unexpectedly. We offer two solutions that may help in this regard. First, an annual or fall/spring meeting with PIs, Chairs/Directors, and/or ADRs with appropriate UCF Facilities representatives would strengthen communication by allowing discussion about specific topics. These meetings would also likely **prevent problems** by giving PIs a forum to discuss concerns or issues that UCF Facilities may not be aware of. A variety of approaches for managing communication may be effective, but it is important that everyone knows the proper communication channels should minor problems arise.

3) **Emergencies–** In the event of a non-medical emergency in a UCF lab or studio, there **is no universal communication system** in place to allow for a rapid response. This is

troubling given that some PIs may have no idea who to communicate with in the first place, and many investigators work on research during nights and weekends. In these cases, an email to a Chair or Director may not be helpful. As such, we suggest that a "UCF Research Amber Alert" type of communication system be implemented to allow immediate contact between all of those that need to be notified should an emergency arise in a specific lab or studio (UCF Facilities, the PI, Chairs/Director, and/or ADR). We have not investigated how this could be implemented. Given the familiarity with the **UCF Mobile app** due to the need to perform the daily COVID Self-Checker, many faculty and staff are now accustomed to using their mobile device to communicate and provide data for various purposes. Use of the UCF Mobile app could be an innovative means of fostering communication between PIs and UCF Facilities in the event of an emergency that requires immediate attention.

Internal Research Support Subcommittee
The subcommittee reached out to the faculty union to discuss our suggestion to allow UCF to offer multiple research awards to enable people other than multimillion-dollar grant-generating scientists to ever get one.

Policy Subcommittee
   1) **NEW BUSINESS**
      a) Request to review university policy 2-001.4 University Policy Development
          i) The policy subcommittee has been asked to *"make any comments on the Website by the two-week deadline [email distributed March 4; if that date begins the 2 week deadline, the deadline to comment would be March 18], and then let the Faculty Senate office know of the outcome so the Topics Tracker can be updated"*: Comment to review: *https://policies.ucf.edu/rfc.asp*
      b) **The policy subcommittee needs to determine a way of work for the committee.** Natalie has offered two options for this process (but we may suggest others). See email thread (saved as PDF) but here as well:
          i) My understanding of this process is that we're giving you this issue as the "point person" subcommittee who deals with policy. What we'd want to do next, then, is have your subcommittee gather any feedback on this issue so it can be collated and sent along.
          ii) There are a couple ways to do this: one is to first, among yourselves, get a response going, and then send it to the larger research council for review and feedback. Then that can be sent on.
          iii) Another way to handle it would be to first direct us, as the larger research council, to fan out to our respective constituencies, gather feedback, then share it with you and you, as the policy subcommittee, take that input and create a collective response based on it.
          iv) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: See to-do list below.
      c) From Natalie: I had the chance to sit down with Liz Klonoff to talk about research council issues, and she had a few comments and suggestions for things for the subcommittee to be thinking of I said I would pass along to you.
          i) Something to start thinking about is the policy we currently have for credit splits when writing grants. Why do we do it the way we do? Can we just deal with credit issues in a financial sense within the OOR system, and leave the issue of credit for how much effort credit individual faculty get for promotion and tenure etc. purposes to the individual departments? It's

causing real problems with OOR when they try to run all these grants through Huron. They really don't need to know about and it's complicated to try to account for the question of "how much is your contribution toward this grant supposed to count for end-of-year judgements about your work and effort on the project" versus just "how do we divvy up the money"? She suggests bringing in the staff from the different programs into these discussions to get good, actionable feedback and buy-in on this question. They know how these things are actually done within particular units, and they need to be brought into the discussions to help OOR understand how this works.

d) *To discuss: We (policy subcommittee) need to determine how to tackle this topic.*

   i) Credit split vs. financial split. F&A typically follows where $ is and there is no credit split. Dr. Klonoff requested feedback and has suggested colleges maintain this as it is not something that can be maintained in OOR. Should we continue to do credit split? Distributing F&A? Originally, the credit split was based on distributing overhead to college, department. Parameters need to be determined on how this is done so it's standardized across the colleges. If it's for overhead distribution, that needs to be done separately. Each academic unit has their own perception of credit splits, and it's an internal decision (not OOR). Institutions that do this do not separate it from indirect costs. The new Huron system doesn't allow this to be tracked.

e) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: To do [DHV is drafting a document to be shared with policy subcommittee]: Draft recommendation based on reviewing other institutions (e.g., https://www.umass.edu/research/kuali-research-faq) and write as policy. DARF will review and perhaps share with ADRs. Then review as a subcommittee after that feedback. Doug will share how this originally worked in ARGIS.

f) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: To do (DHV; email sent 3/8): Get clarification from Rhonda Bishop on what policies are reviewed and the process, what has to go through the committee, etc.

g) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: To do (DHV; email sent 3/8): Ask Rhonda re: remove the requirement that faculty have to subscribe to receive policy notifications.

h) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: To do (DHV; email sent 3/8): 2-001.4 University Policy Development is not available on the website, https://policies.ucf.edu/rfc.asp.

i) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: To do (DHV; email sent 3/8): How many faculty are on the policy committee and how they are selected.

2) **OLD BUSINESS**

   a) Updates on committee membership
   b) DARF representative? Debra will see who needs to be invited.
   c) Additional suggestions
   d) *From our first meeting we were provided several topics to cover in the committee. Updates for those that had outstanding business are provided here.*
      i) *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?

    ii) 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.

    iii) 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

    iv) Update: email was sent Feb. 3 asking for policies in progress. Information has not been received as of March 4.

e) Discussion 3/8 from subcommittee: **To do: Fixed price contract. Ask Dorothy about this if there is a draft.**

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

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

        (1) Discussion 3/8: 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?

    ii) 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.

        (1) Discussion 3/8: Additional clarification from the Research Council is needed to better understand this topic.

    iii) UPDATE: No additional information has been shared.

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

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

    ii) Discussion: Debra Reinhart has developed procedures for this.

        (1) 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.

    iii) Discussion: Additional clarification from the Research Council is needed to better understand this topic.

    iv) UPDATE: No additional information has been shared.

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

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

    ii) 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.

        (1) 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.

      iii) 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.

i) ***To discuss 3/8: We (policy subcommittee) need to determine how to tackle this topic.***

      i) 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?

      ii) To do: Topic for the next meeting.

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

      i) Discussion: Suggestions from Dr. Klonoff included:

      ii) Fixed price contract policy.

      iii) 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.]

      iv) Review PI handbook (Debra Reinhart created) and examine what additional policies are needed to support the PI handbook.

      v) 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.

      vi) What needs to be clarified as standard operating procedure versus policy.

      vii) Effort reporting.

      viii) Limited submissions. Procedures in place but no policy. Debra Reinhart has information from other institutions.

      ix) Seed funding (internal review, decision process)

k) ***To discuss 3/8: feedback is needed on which of these takes priority and materials/resources to get the subcommittee started in addressing the issue.***

      i) Status: Tabled until the next meeting.