

Research Council Minutes

September 9, 2015

3:40 - 5:00 pm

Blount Hall, Room A004

DRAFT

Attendees

Benjamin Auerbach
Chris Boake
Matthew Cooper
Bill Dunne
Gale Fulton
Mitch Goldman
Lyn Hardy
Qiang He
Sadie Hutson
Ramki Kalyanaraman
Rebecca Klenk
Bob Muenchen
Janet Nelson
Robert Nobles
Tina Shepardson
Dawnie Steadman
Kelly Steele
Michelle Van Riemsdijk
Shellen Wu
John Zomchick

Guest

Lela Young

Welcome by the Chair - Ramki Kalyanaraman

Ramki Kalyanaraman welcomed everyone, asked for self-introductions, and shared some information about the purpose of the Research Council to the new faculty senators.

Presentation on the role of the Research Council

Information on the purpose and goals of the council are available on the website, <http://web.utk.edu/~senate/rc/>.

The Research Council requires a quorum of 7 senators in order to conduct business, identifies guest speakers, and engages in discussions surrounding identified topics. The quorum is critical, everyone is urged to attend. Each senator is asked to sign-up for at least 2 committees. Committees include:

- a. The SARIF Equipment & Infrastructure Committee has been formed and includes Bill Dunne (chair), Chris Boake, Suzie Allard, Qiang He, Shellen Wu, and George Siopsis.
- b. Centers Review Committee - Two per year: Rebecca Klenk (fall) and Matthew Cooper (spring) have volunteered to chair.
- c. Chancellors Awards - Benjamin Auerbach will chair.
- d. SARIF Graduate Research Assistantships
- e. Ad-hoc committees as issues arise

Approval of minutes from April

Ramki Kalyanaraman presented the April 8, 2015 minutes for approval. Minutes unanimously approved as written

Introductions to/from Office of Research and Engagement - Janet Nelson

Janet Nelson presented a brief overview of ORE and introduced how the office is structured and the functions within the office including Research Funding, Science Alliance, Research Development, Faculty Development, Core Facilities, Community Engagement, Undergraduate Research, Responsible Conduct of Research, Research Integrity, and the Human Subjects Research Protection Program. She thanked the

Research Council for all they do for the University.

Announcements/Presentations

Revised misconduct policy - Lela Young

The General Counsel's Office works at the system level and can represent the system as a whole. The office is staffed with 15 lawyers with 10 of those residing in Knoxville. Involvement with the Research Misconduct Policy started around 7 years ago when it was noticed there was no federal reporting of research misconduct. It was identified that the policy as currently written was not user friendly. At the same time, the number of research misconduct allegations was increasing. Faculty are generally surprised at the number of cases reported - 20 over the past 5 years, with 2-3 general findings of research misconduct. Not all reported cases end in findings. The decision was made the board delegate responsible for the policy to the administration, directing the administration to develop a new policy that complies with all of the regulations. The administration is responsible for ensuring continued compliance to the regulations.

In the new policy, there are 4 distinct stages to processing allegations of research misconduct:

1. Assessment of Allegation
2. Inquiry
3. Investigation
4. Administrative Action; Disciplinary Action; and Closure

The biggest change was the definition of research misconduct being narrowed. Examples of the process identifying research misconduct were given by Lela Young and Robert Nobles. It was noted that there is a presumption of innocence in research misconduct investigations. Another change system-wide included the adaptation of the UTK policy on Sharing, Retention, and

Ownership of Research Records to all campuses within the system.

Ramki Kalyanaraman stated the Chancellor is looking for faculty feedback on the revised Research Misconduct Policy.

Feedback and questions regarding the revised policy have been requested to be sent to Lela Young by the end of September. The document may be shared with other faculty as well.

Questions on the new/revised research misconduct policy - Robert Nobles

The question was raised on the process for reporting. Robert and Lela both stated the process must start with the institution's Research Integrity Officer (RIO), Robert Nobles. All cases should be reported to him first and not within the departments and colleges. In the case where the RIO is named in the complaint, then the misconduct should be reported directly to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Taylor Eighmy.

A new Responsible Conduct of Research series has been started campus-wide and will begin this Friday at Hodges Library. Each session will be a lunch and learn with pizza provided and will take place in the Hodges Auditorium. Each session will be recorded and posted online for continued viewing.

Enhancements have been made to the IRB infrastructure over the summer and announcements have been disseminated across campus. 4 FTEs and 2 part-time FTEs have been dedicated to the Human Subjects Protection Program, an increase from 1.5 FTEs.

The Biosafety Teaching Labs policy is being updated through a working group led by Dr. Jun Lin. The draft policy should be available for review next month.

A question was raised on the Common Rule update (Human Subjects Oversight) and how it will affect UT. Robert Nobles stated they were in the 90-day period for public comment and until an official document is issued it is hard to determine what will be in the final document.

Another question was raised on how Robert Nobles group interacts with laboratory safety through EH&S reporting through Chris Cimino. Robert clarified the relationships between the offices.

Business

Inputs and revisions to revised misconduct policy - Ramki

Kalyanaraman

Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback on the policy directly to Lela Young by the end of September.

Overview of Committee tasks and assignment to committees - Ramki

Kalyanaraman

Ramki Kalyanaraman asked each person to think about their desired committees and stated he hoped to finalize assignments by the end of next week.

Seeking input on: RC meeting suggestions, Speaker suggestions, faculty research concerns

Ramki Kalyanaraman asked for suggestions from the floor for programs. Bill Dunne suggested George Farr to speak about the JIAMS building and Louise Nuttle regarding the Faculty Development Team.

Janet Nelson reminded the council regarding the Top 25 Milestone Refresh and Steve Smith was interested in presenting to the council. She also suggested Elizabeth Burman. It was suggested Elizabeth focus on how faculty measure their community

outreach especially when faculty pursue promotion and tenure.

Chris Boake suggested Matthew Theriot in the spring on the topic of the new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) on experiential learning and the tie-ins to undergraduate research.

Ben Auerbach suggested a presentation on an update of undergraduate research.

Tina Shepardson asked for an update on the progress of the proposal for the fee for undergraduate research.

Sadie Hutson asked where the conversation with Taylor Eighmy had gone with faculty reporting their research and creative activity. Ramki Kalyanaraman stated faculty in the College of Engineering were being asked to track their time spent on proposals and that was the number Taylor was interested in collecting. This is a number captured as research expenditures to be included in the base numbers. There was additional discussion on which colleges and departments collect this data. Janet Nelson stated Chris Cimino, John Zomchick, and Taylor Eighmy had worked to develop a rough order of magnitude. There was confusion on where the process was at on the reporting of proposal time. Ramki Kalyanaraman will inquire as to where this effort is at.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Minutes taken by Marisa Moazen.