

Research Policy Committee
April 26, 2019
2:30-4:00 pm
Fleming Regents Room
Chaired by Dr. Francine Dolins

Topic: Office of Research: administrative functions supporting research

Members present: Francine Dolins ...

Absent: ...

- I. Invited Speaker: Dr. Craig Reynolds, ORSP
Please also see the slides provided by Dr. Reynolds (pdf available on RPC MBox folder).

- II. **First topic: Formalizing UM's Approach to Risk Management: Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)**
 - a. The objective of ERM is to develop a holistic, portfolio view of the most significant risks to the achievement of the University's mission of research, education and service.
 - b. Benefits of ERM: Provides a framework and context for strategies, allocating resources and policy and process.
 - c. Define roles & responsibilities; common risk language; Develop risk framework (identification, prioritization, evaluation, treatment); Communicate strategic vision and risk information.
 - d. Risk owners adjudicate risk requests within areas of responsibility
 - e. Coordinate efforts with other Risk Owners
 - f. Provost Philbert has asked for faculty input on philosophy and guiding principles from RPC (as well as others).
 - g. Risk terminology: **Risk philosophy** - a set of shared beliefs and attitudes characterizing how an entity considers risk in all that it does. ○ For example, "Risk is unavoidable.";
 - i. **Guiding principles** - a more granular set of foundational values that inform how an entity considers and manages enterprise risks ○ For example, "The cost of mitigating a risk should not be ignored when deciding how or whether to mitigate the risk."

- h. **Risk Philosophy:** The set of shared beliefs and attitudes characterizing how U-M considers risk in everything it does, from strategy development and implementation to its day-to-day activities)
 - 1. Risk is inherent in the work of the university, therefore some risk taking is necessary carry out the mission.
 - 2. The university seeks to establish a risk-aware culture where consideration of risk is integrated into decision making at all levels.
 - 3. Risk averse behavior and risk taking behavior each have their place in university decision making.
 - 4. Risk management is a shared responsibility at all levels of the university.
 - 5. Risks will vary by unit and will change over time.
 - 6. Informed decision making regarding risks can only occur after the risks are understood within the context of the work being done.
 - 7. Appropriately mitigated risk unleashes potential for innovation, efficiency, and cost savings across the university, and can facilitate positive changes in the higher education, research, and service ecosystems.
 - 8. The effective allocation of resources requires an appropriate assessment of risk.
- i. **Guiding principles:**
 - 1. to maintain the highest standards, we recognize the need for an approach to risk that is appropriate for the work of the institution.
 - 2. risks to be managed in a responsible and accountable manner.
 - 3. level of oversight and controls associated with managing risks should be proportional to the magnitude of the risk. Cost/benefit and opportunity costs should be taken into account when deciding how to manage or mitigate a risk.
 - 4. a tool for improved, risk-informed decision making and not a separate, one-time administrative process.
 - 5. Prior related risk decisions and assumptions should be regularly re-examined.
 - 6. Before intentionally accepting a risk, unit leaders should assess the risk, understand the implications of accepting the risk, and know when they have the authority to assume the risk. Unit leaders should also have a designated path forward to appropriately escalate risks when a given risk is greater/higher than the unit leader's authority.
 - 7. Collaboration among units
 - 8. All individuals, regardless of their role at the university, are empowered and expected to report to senior leaders any perceived significant risks or failures of existing control measures, without fear of retaliation.
 - 9. When adverse outcomes result from risks taken in accordance with these guiding principles:

10. Reviews should be conducted so as to identify lessons learned and implement appropriately calibrated corrective measures.
11. The university will support employees and students who act in good faith, consistent with its guiding principles and applicable risk management decision tolerances.

III. **Second topic:** There was an indepth discussion of the investigation by the federal government into “Undue Foreign Influence: NIH Concerns and Actions.”

- a. Letters sent to 70 institutions asking about information found in publications but not disclosed in proposal submissions or award progress reports.
- b. Three U-M investigators asked about:
 - c. Foreign components
 - d. Foreign collaboration
 - o Conflicts of Interest/Conflicts of Commitment
 - e. 12 institutions referred to NIH’s OIG
 - f. Foreign Component defined: NIH defines a foreign component as, “The performance of any significant scientific element or segment of a project outside of the United States either by the recipient or by a researcher employed by a foreign organization, whether or not grant funds are expended.”
 - g. NIH must approve foreign components in advance.
 - h. Activities performed outside the U.S. that meet this definition include:
 - The involvement of human subjects or animals
 - Extensive foreign travel for the purpose of data collection, surveying, sampling, and similar activities (but not for consultation purposes)
 - Any activity that may impact U.S. foreign policy through involvement in affairs or environment of foreign country
 - Collaborations with investigators at a foreign site anticipated to result in co-authorship
 - Use of facilities or instrumentation at a foreign site
 - Receipt of financial support or resources from a foreign entity
 - i. **Research Community Concerns:**
 - NIH is suggesting that any foreign collaboration is a foreign component.
 - What does “significant” mean in the definition of a foreign component (i.e., performance of any significant scientific element or segment of a project outside the U.S.)?
 - How much discretion do grantees have?
 - j. **NIH has suggested foreign scientists working in U.S. labs constitutes a “foreign component.”**
 - Work done in the U.S. is, by definition, not a foreign component
 - Generally, a foreign-funded student, postdoc, researcher or visiting scholar working in a U.S. lab is not considered a foreign component.
 - k. NIH sees foreign support cited by collaborating authors on publications that also cite NIH as a possible foreign component.

- PIs often report supplemental results in their NIH progress reports and publications, including results that build on the NIH grants, arise from informal collaborations, or are co-funded by other sponsors.
- Grantees should not be deemed non-compliant because they could not predict a collaboration would be “significant” or result in a co-authored publication.

l. What UM is doing:

- Thoughtfully responding to NIH
- Working with COGR, AAU, FDP, and others to
- discuss this with federal agencies
- Studying our current processes
- Establishing a new committee to address International Research Security
- Not advising changes in practice (yet)

m. See remaining slides in pdf.

IV. **Third Topic:** Policy Evolution for Submitting Proposals to ORSP for internal review and submit.

- ≥ 4 days, full review; 4-2days-15 hours, limited review; if miss deadline: at risk.

V. **Fourth Topic:** PAF Changes for late June, 2019.

VI. Discussion of Letter to Dr. Hu, regarding increased funding support for IRBMED and Library support of research.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 4pm.