University of Memphis Research Council (UMRC)
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, Oct 3, 2019
UC 261 Senate Chamber

Members in Attendance: R. Debes, K. Saunders, H. Zhang, T. Sutter, C. Preza, A. Hall, G. Beck, B. Pence, K. Lambert-Pennington, S. Ivey, C. Pierce, W. Karmaus, G. Emmert, S. Zanskas, A. Fatemi, E. Lindner, J. Dhaliwal, S. Kumar, J. Murphy, C. Pierce, J. Wheelan, M. Gill, D. Dasgupta

L. Williams, V. Hazlett, T. Franklin, B. Jacobik, K. Watson, M. Dawson, L. Wright, S. Thompson, C. Behles, L. Wright, H. Trieu

Members Absent: G. Bowlin, B. Waldron, S. Potter

Meeting Called to Order 2:01 p.m.

Consideration of Minutes – May 6, 2019
Motion to approve minutes by C. Chappell and seconded by C. Havard. Council unanimously approved minutes.

Opening Remarks from Dr. Dhaliwal, Carnegie R1 Goals
Dr. Dhaliwal welcomed the Council members and gave opening remarks regarding our R1 goals. He asks that no one share this information with other schools. He demonstrated on the projector the model of where the U of M is ranked based on past and current data using Carnegie's measurements/criteria, e.g. S&E Expenditures, PostDocs/Research Staff. Refer to "Carnegie R1 Measurements" slide included in folder packet. UofM is in strong standing to become R01. We can ask for 5 million dollars of base budget from the state.

Important ways we can increase our ranking this fiscal year now until May 2020: Ensure we maximize, track and spend research expenditures correctly; account for research faculty accurately; work to graduate PhDs this academic year; modernize tenure requirements to match R01 school's standards; and work with R&I to increase the number of post docs.

Questions from Council members included whether research staff must have PhDs—they do. But research expenditures for undergraduate programs or MA students can be counted if considered "research" agendas. Another question was about what the Graduate School planned to do in order to help graduate more PhD students this year. A list of graduate students planning to graduate is being given to R&I so that advisors can be contacted.

Dr. Dhaliwal introduced changes to the Council and Research & Sponsored Programs, such as the new AVP search Dr. Abby-Parrill is Chairing, Cody is the Director of Development, Teresa is included in Development, Stephanie is OSP Manager, etc.

Division News and Upcoming Initiatives

- Editing service (Cody Behles):
Cody announced several initiatives by referring to contents of folders given to council members. Research Statistical Consulting Exchange—see postcard in folder; Faculty Research Development Workshop Series—see flyer in folder. See flyer for Research Editing services—three levels.
- Academic Analytics (Cody Behles): Research Insights (flyer in folder). Gives access to Chairs, Deans, Pre-Award Coordinators, for metrics to give examples of opportunities, etc.
- P2P (Hai Trieu): No update given.
- Compliance (Beverly Jacobik): Beverly announced that the Compliance office are witnessing consistent recurring issues regarding PIs adhering to IRB Compliance. Feedback or ideas are welcomed for how to improve that process. Stats from newsletter: FY 2018 compared to 2019—19% in compliance reviews; 26% number of unique protocols; average turn-around time for determinations is ~8 days. They welcome feedback.
- OSP (Stephanie Thompson): Stephanie referred Council members to see Quick Guide in folder for who we are and what we do.
- Contracts (Ty Flores): Stephanie reported that MOU, Non-Monetary agreements do not have to be routed—notes can be made in Cayuse SP record for Ty.

Task Forces Updates/Reports

- Research Centers, Institutes and Labs (Chuck Langston): See slides as a reference. Charge is to create guidelines for a three-year comprehensive review of the mission and performance for University-designated research centers. Background: As part of the SACS accreditation process, the University requires a comprehensive review of the University Centers to be held every three years to evaluate Center effectiveness in fulfilling the research and educational missions of the University of Memphis.
List of University Designated Research Centers was shown. A draft of guidelines for three-year comprehensive review of university designated research centers included: 1) Each center is encouraged to form a permanent Eternal Advisory Committee (EACom) of 3-5 people; 2) Annual meetings with EACom; 3) EACom will provide third-year review to the Office of the Vice Present for Research & Innovation through answers to rubrics and a written report. Motivation/Rationale: Comprehensive review of research centers is just as important as review of academic departments and degree programs for a Tier 1 research university. However, third-year review is too often because of 1) Uncertain of the origin of the three-year time scale; 2) not comparable to other University review cycles; 3) costs of EACom visit; 4) other concerns raised by Directors of University-designated Centers. They will have an October meeting between Task Force and Center

Directors to have an informal third-year review and a more formal external review every 6 years.

Comments from Council Members: S. Kumar said some centers receive review reports from state funding or other sponsor review reports. Perhaps these reviews can count toward SACS accreditation. Dhaliwal says leave it to the task force to make recommendations.

- Research Policies, Intellectual Property (Gary Bowlin): No report given.
- Research Policies, Research Misconduct (Steve Zanskas): See draft handouts—one packet is clean draft of changes implemented; second draft is track changes inverse (crossed-out content is actually what are positive changes). Changes made to policy included updated language and adding transparency to the basic process for faculty or students. Task force is making recommendation for motion to approve. No motion made and will be tabled for motion next meeting. Please review, and we'll get the faculty senate involved. 40-page procedure documents was/will be emailed.
- Research Policies, Faculty Incentive Pay (Santosh Kumar/Satish Kedia): See handout for questions asked and research conducted. 3 major changes. Dept is given flexibility of salary recovery. Course releases by Instructors given to Dept to make decisions.
- **Motion to consider the revisions regarding updating Policy RE7001- Research Misconduct made by R. Debes; Motion seconded by J. Murphy. Motion to update policy unanimously approved.**

  Discussion: G. Beck asks why is Department more involved vs. College in the process/buy-outs. It is where it is, no change. R&I will take to Policy and Review Board and we'll consult with Deans and Office of the Provost; then it will be presented to President and Board.
- Research Policies: Sponsored Programs, Grants, Contracts & Agreements (Leader, Alfred Hall): We agreed not to change policy but to draft recommended guidelines. Will provide a draft at the next meeting.
- Strategic Research Plan (Brian Waldron): No report given.

Call for new Task Forces

Dr. Dhaliwal initiated a charge to possibly create a Bibliometrics Task Force to review (beyond Google Scholar) other R01 schools to research other issues to consider as to what improvements can be made for Rewards. He said he'd appeal to John Evans with the library or write to the Deans to nominate people from the colleges.

- Research Technology Advisory Committee on campus currently thinks we need an exchange. H. Zhang was hesitant at first and was under the impression that this could be done in the current task force. Kumar: Cloud computing devices and machine doubling; Dhaliwal: Do we want to create another committee to consider technology infrastructure? Needs for technology campus-wide for research technology? A task

force to build a bridge to other university groups/people. Zhang says yes for more support and more visibility and more voices beyond part of Council (broader base). **Motion to set up a Research Technology task force whose first task is to work with the CIO council was made by Jim Murphy and seconded by Steve Zanskas. Zhang will lead task force and propose structure/membership/representation across campus.** They should come to this Council.

- Jim Wheelan as Chair of IRB: Please see slides. Jim gives reasons he likes to Chair the committee: importance, respect for other faculty members, commitment by R&I. Quick overview of what we do and how we operate: IRB is federally required if we engage in Human Subjects Research. People are protected. Membership is intentionally diverse so that areas that are engaged in Human Subjects Research. Non scientist and community member is required by feds. Shout out to Kelli and Beverly in R&I. Decisions made by members or designees or experts. Our challenge is to follow the moving target. See Culture of Compliance for the IRB's Efforts and their Requests of us.

  Kumar: Thankful for IRB. Examples of protocols for various areas of study that could be helpful. Perhaps a repository can be created for specific protocol / methodology required to be followed. Please follow the approved protocol—Dhaliwal.

- Brandt Pence is making Council aware of School of Public Health: T-HEC eternal feasibility resources and new requirements. Important because PhD graduates make multiple requests for independent feasibility study from external source and this could potentially be expensive and time consuming.

Closing Remarks (Dhaliwal)

Meeting adjourned at 3:30p.m.