

RESEARCH ADVISORY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF DEC 2, 2013 MEETING DRAFT 12/3/13

I. Time, Location and Attendance:

- 3:00PM, Plaza Room at Administrative Center
- RAC members present: Vice Chancellor Lawrence Dreyfus, Dean Denis Medeiros, Chris Winders, Anthony Caruso, Jenny Lundgren, Virginia Blanton, Marilyn Yoder, Richard Arend, Robert Groene, Mark Johnson, Jacob Marszalek, Brenda Dingley, Patricia Kelly, John Wang, Anil Kumar, Kathleen Kilway, Lorelei Sells, Maureen Hannoun, Chris Winders, Bob Simmons, and Leslie Burgess. Absent: Provost Gail Hackett, Reza Derakhshani, and Chris Holman.

II. Welcome and Introduction

- Dr. Dreyfus welcomed the council and introduced himself. Members introduced themselves, providing information about their department and role at UMKC.

III. Research Integrity (CRR Rule)

- The previous meeting had brought about the discussion of how the university addresses issues involving research integrity and misconduct. Dr. Dreyfus explained to the group that the CRR 420.010 “Research Misconduct” Rule provides the guidelines for handling this issue and that the RAC should serve as the standing committee as described in CRR 420.010. There are a few areas where the RAC does not exactly fit the description of the standing committee, such as the rank of the faculty membership and the selection process; however, Dr. Dreyfus stated that he would request approval from Provost Hackett for the Council to serve in this capacity. In the case of a misconduct allegation coming up from one of the academic units, a subcommittee of members would be created to prosecute the case in accordance with the CRR. Dr. Dreyfus commented that the proposed subcommittee would be comprised of full professors, as dictated by the CRR and *ad hoc* members, if necessary, with attention to adherence to the CRR guidelines. Dean Medeiros acknowledged that other campuses have used these guidelines and Mark Johnson noted that many institutions have plaintiffs reviewed by their department specifically.

IV. Revised Advisory Council Charge

- Dr. Dreyfus addressed the revision of the advisory council charge and noted he had streamlined several redundancies in the stated functions as suggested by various members since the last meeting. He said the document is still

open for discussion and that members are welcomed to provide feedback toward any proposed edits or additions.

- The second function, “Develop and implement strategies aimed at increasing research opportunities and funding at UMKC” shows a connection to the overall strategic plan, but also encourages exploration of new research prospects.
- Regarding the stated charge that the RAC would be the standing committee as stated in the CRR 420.010, Dr. Arend asked if changes could be made to the CRR 420.010 in order to give more “teeth” to the policy. Dr. Dreyfus said the document doesn’t appear to be lacking in this way. Dean Medeiros commented that the document was changed in 2007 and such modifications often take years to become finalized. Patricia Kelley asked what the procedures would have been last year if allegations of research misconduct had arisen. Dr. Dreyfus noted that there had been a case in which its corresponding academic unit didn’t pursue. Had it been pursued, a committee would have been formed *ad hoc* to prosecute the misconduct allegation. The procedures at the time had been that the issue was sent to Dean Medeiros as a grievance and then forwarded to Dr. Dreyfus and the Office of Research Services. RAC would now be the standing committee to review and address issues of misconduct or dishonesty and in accordance with CRR 420.010.
- Mark Johnson proposed inviting an additional *ex officio* member for RAC to represent either Tech Transfer or IT, as they have great impact on research. Dr. Dreyfus agreed, and said he had considered this when constructing the council and that he would invite James Brazeal, Director of Technology Transfer to join the Council.
- In addressing function 4 of the charge, “Support undergraduate and graduate student research activities,” the council further discussed the membership of a graduate student representative. Dean Medeiros was asked to provide guidance with this and Mark Johnson suggested having a student council officer in the role, particularly the president. The question of membership assignment arose and Kathleen Kilway encouraged a yearly rotation. Dean Medeiros noted that not all graduate students are involved in research. Dr. Dreyfus concluded that those engaged in research activities would best fit this membership role and would provide a valuable perspective. This membership would also provide the student with beneficial learning opportunities. A rotating membership between Masters and I.Ph.D. students was also suggested. Jake Marszalek asked if the student member would have a vote in counsel, and Dr. Dreyfus noted that they would and that it would be a good learning opportunity. Virginia Blanton stated that this vote would not extend to any research misconduct case decisions, and Dr. Dreyfus noted that this was the case according to CRR 420.010. It was decided that Dean Medeiros would invite the Student a member of the I-PhD governing body to participate.

V. **Research Administration Overview and Budget Presentation**

- Dr. Dreyfus presented the Office of Research Services' website, along with the updates that have been recently made, such as the addition of the RAC web page. He explained that research integrity will be more predominantly featured on the page, such as links to the CRR Rule as well as the federal guidelines from the PHS and the NSF.
- He displayed the Office of Research Services' organizational chart page, portraying the breadth of operations and functions of research services on campus.
- A presentation of the Office of Research Services' budget was given to the council to provide transparency of the financial status of the office. Revenue streams were pointed out, including F&A, royalties received by Tech Transfer, IRB filing fees received from outside entities using IRBs, and LARC billings. Patricia Kelly asked if the university supports animal research and it was confirmed that its subsidization has been historically how the budget has operated. She emphasized the possible subsidization of other types of research, such as Humanities and Behavioral Health. Anthony Caruso noted that this review of operations is a focal part the Council's charge, to see how things are run and if determine if they make sense from the standpoint of our strategic mission. Anil Kumar pointed out the importance of looking at the percentage of subsidies the departments operate on. Kathleen Kilway commented that this transparency is a good start to having the information the council needs to see what things cost. Patricia Kelly pointed out that it is beneficial to observe how those not doing heavy technical research realize returns without assistance and the possible returns they could receive with subsidization. She urged the inclusion of support for nontechnical community research.
- Dr. Dreyfus said in reviewing the budget one can observe how research services operates on fairly fine margin. The launching of a faculty research grant program or any other internal investment strategy would be difficult to pursue given the existing budget.
- Anil Kumar asked how the Office of Research Services evaluates the need for new staff and whether it is a decision based on grant numbers. Dr. Dreyfus said the recent hiring of a new Pre-Award Services Grants & Contracts Administrator stemmed from the elimination of a separate position and the need to invest in generating new grant activity. He said the office operates with three individuals currently and would like to provide more proactive Pre-Award assistance on campus. Between two Grants and Contracts Administrators, three to four hundred proposals were processed last year, with the needs of units and individuals seeking assistance varying. Maureen Hannoun proposed that presentations from research administrators could be given to departments to create greater awareness of the services. Mark Johnson noted that the greater the quality of proposals, the more likely they are to be funded. It was agreed that it is important to examine how successful units construct proposals and for there to be a commitment by

faculty toward research opportunities as opposed to centralized administration. Anil Kumar and Mark Johnson noted that their departmental grant reviews are key factors in more successful proposal processes.

- Dr. Dreyfus concluded the budget discussion by pointing out that \$2.52 million noted in the budget portion of revenue is the expected F&A for FY2014 and that the true revenue is net of that amount resulting in available revenue totally \$3,106,880 and that expenditures should be net of the “bad debt write off” (\$1,193,310), resulting in true expenditures of \$3,179,916. The resulting balance is therefore (\$-73,036).
- Virginia Blanton Asked if there was a way of tracking awards that aren’t administered through the office, such as the Guggenheim, many of which go toward art and humanities projects. Dr. Dreyfus said that research services does not record this since they do not come across the office books as sponsored research or contracts, however, he noted that this would definitely be beneficial to record. Maureen Hannoun noted the limitations of PeopleSoft in searching out these type of funds. Virginia explained that finding ways to provide more Pre-Award support for grants such as these would be valuable for her unit. Dr. Dreyfus concluded that the faculty grants program could also focus on these types of scholarships and multi-tiered grants.

V. F&A Redistribution Investment Questionnaire Data

- The results of the questionnaire indicated that a pilot grant program was definitely high on the “wish list” for each respondent. Dr. Dreyfus noted that he hears this all across campus that faculty desperately want an internal funding program for research and scholarship. Dr. Dreyfus said that it is clear that the previously proposed formula for generating an internal pool of money for investment would have to be reconsidered due to the overwhelming resistance to such an approach, especially given the academic unit budget realities. Dr. Dreyfus indicated that the proposal as discussed in our previous meeting would be to first pinpoint the investment strategies deemed most beneficial by the Council, assign a cost to the priorities, then find a shared revenue formula or strategy to reach those financial goals. It was noted by a few members that the University does not provide general operating budget support for research and that doing so would create a baseline of funding while promoting the institution’s mission of providing research in Health and Life Sciences and research in general (Goals 2 and 6 of the University Strategic Plan). Current research is reliant on grants and F&A funds to keep going. Dr. Dreyfus concluded that the ideal would be where both university and grant funding were pooled toward investment goals in research.

Information Items

- The council had voted that monthly meetings will be held on the first Monday at 3:00 p.m.. There will be no meeting in January due to the holidays.
- Dr. Dreyfus will lead a subcommittee made up of Council volunteers to further study and draft a proposal for a pilot Faculty Grants Program. He asked that members who want to participate email him and a meeting date will be decided.