RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2014 MEETING

I. Time, Location and Attendance
- 3:00PM, Plaza Room at Administrative Center
- RAC members present: Lawrence Dreyfus, Tony Caruso, Chris Winders, James Brazeal, Jenny Lundgren, Richard Arend, Robert Groene, Mark Johnson, Jacob Marszalek, Chris Homan, Patricia Kelly, Kathleen Kilway, Maureen Hannoun, Lorelei Sells, Bob Simmons, and Leslie Burgess.

II. 2014 Research Symposium and Open House
- Dr. Dreyfus reminded the council of the upcoming event on Dec. 12th, 2014. The deadline for participant registration was set for Wednesday December 3rd and he encouraged members to pass this information along to faculty.

III. RAC Terms of Service
- Members were asked to sign up for their chosen terms of service at the previous council meeting and Dr. Dreyfus noted that 2-year terms will end May of 2015 and 3-year terms will end May of 2016. The membership terms of service can be viewed on the RAC homepage under "Resources" at http://ors.umkc.edu/office-of-research-services/research-advisory-council

IV. Trustee Awards for Research and Creativity
- Dr. Dreyfus said he received the award nominee packets in October and has set up a review committee composed of members from the RAC and former award recipients. He said the decision will be made this week and the winners will be officially announced at an upcoming Trustee meeting in January or February.

V. eFCOI Software
- Maureen Hannoun explained that the Office of Research Services has been working on obtaining a program from Osprey Software for an electronic Financial Conflict of Interest form. Once a year, the form will be updated and reminders will be sent to P.I.'s via email. Any financial conflict of interests should be mentioned and can be updated per proposal as needed. Dr. Dreyfus noted that once a disclosure form is complete, it is good for a year and open for updates at any time. Lorelei Sells and Keron Hopkins of Pre Award services will be reviewing the forms at the proposal stage for each project to ensure there aren't conflicts of interest.

VI. OMB Uniform Guidance
- Maureen explained that as of December 26th, 2014 new regulations will go into effect from the UM System and the Office of Research Services will hold two training

sessions on December 5th to inform and review the changes. The morning session will be held from 10am-12pm on the Volker Campus in the Administrative Center Plaza Room and the afternoon session will be from 1-3pm at the School of Medicine in Theatre C.

- Key changes include the charging of administrative and clerical salary costs as well as the charging of computing devices. A PI Quick Guide summary of these new regulations was distributed to RAC members and is available on the ORS website at https://uminfopoint.umsystem.edu/media/fa/Controller/OSP_PI_QUICK_GUIDE.pdf

VII. **Electronic Effort Verification Reports**
- Maureen announced that starting in February of 2015, paper EVR's will no longer be sent to P.I.'s. The system will be online and will prompt reviewers by email to log in to fill out and sign the EVR electronically.

VIII. **IRB Report**
- Chris Winders, director of UMKC Research Compliance, provided a presentation regarding the Institutional Review Board. He explained various aspects of the board, from its purpose and structure to its review criteria for approvals. He also discussed the types of IRB reviews along with their average turn around times. Mark Johnson noted that this information would be beneficial to share with faculty. The presentation is posted for members to access on the RAC homepage under "Resources" at http://ors.umkc.edu/office-of-research-services/research-advisory-council

IX. **New Initiative: Application Review Proposal**
- Tony Caruso explained that in an effort to reduce burden on faculty, to increase the number of proposal submissions, and to raise the success rate of those submitted, the Office of Research Services is considering offering new services from the Pre Award department.
- He first discussed the preparation of non-technical documents or full proposals, saying that while some units and divisions provide this assistance, the much of the college does not have this service available. It would require that investigators submit their proposal at least one month prior to the ORS submission deadline. He asked members for feedback regarding the turnover time, particularly if one month would be enough. He noted that it is uncertain what level of demand these services would bring and that if the requests are high, a first-come-first-serve work flow may be an option.
- He then discussed the non-technical review of white papers. Dr. Caruso explained that these are pre-proposal, project summary, specific gains, short documents that give the main concept of the investigator's goal in research. The technical review of white papers would then be performed by a sub-committee of 3 people from an overall group of 20. Reviews with comments would be returned within 1-calendar-week, giving the applicant both non-technical and technical feedback.
- Dr. Caruso encouraged members to consider these options and provide feedback via email. A summary of this information can be found on the RAC website under

"Resources" at http://ors.umkc.edu/office-of-research-services/research-advisory-council

X. Discussion Items: Supporting Faculty Research and Protection Research Integrity

- Richard Arend led a discussion regarding research support and protection of research integrity. He explained that it is important to first define the type of research that UMKC should and not support and then to design a corruption-proof system to reward such research. He shared examples of good and bad research, noting that good research helps students, faculty, and the university overall. Some examples of poor research, he explained, are exploitive, center on administration projects, or mine data. Members noted the positive and negative levels of data mining, with Mark Johnson agreeing that it is a method that needs careful consideration in some cases.
- Jenny Lundgren pointed out that many of the topics being discussed were broad, complex, ethical issues to science and scientific method. She asked if the goal was to discuss these issues as a group or to come up with explicit policies and procedures. Dr. Arend said it is for both, and that he believes this council's charge is to provide more defined guidelines to support the development of good research. Dr. Lundgren noted that in research there are clearly ethical and unethical practices with a gray area that is very discipline specific. What is normative or considered right in one unit may differ in another, she explained. Dr. Arend said he doesn't think it necessary to get down to a level where there are conflicts among schools or departments and that guidelines can come from a general level for research with each school deciding for themselves what is acceptable.
- Dr. Dreyfus noted that policies regarding issues specific to certain schools are best developed within the unit as opposed to being imposed by the council. He said that promotion and tenure committees and structures within units and departments should ideally provide that guidance. Jenny Lundgren said that disciplines and fields, such as Psychology, often regulate themselves.
- Dr. Arend said he's hoping discussion such as this begins at a higher level where the council can agree on what defines good research and then designs a system that will support and encourage this within academic units. Dr. Johnson concluded it is imperative for the council to support the best scientifically meritorious research that can be identified on campus, those that maintain ethically high standards, and can be a basis for forming an overall defining umbrella.