

Research Policy Committee
Minutes
March 23, 2018

Present: Francine Dolins, Adam VanDeusen, Sandra Momper, Yi-Su Chen, Peter Lenk, Marisa Conte, Junghyun (Jessie) Lee

- 1) Marisa, Francine: IACUC eRAM training for animal protocols: Since the PEERRS module for animal use was replaced by a requirement for in-person training, it was suggested that a link to the ULAM training core with instructions should be included on the PEERRS site so that it can be accessed by those needing approval for animal use. Kate has requested information about making this addition.
- 2) Minutes approved
- 3) SPG, Procedures: (questions to send to Michael Imperiale):
 - Clarification on parameters of composition of investigation committee? Are these individuals coming from the Dean's recommendations or from the standing committee created by RIO or both? E.g., 4b (pg 4).
 - How is person/case evaluated? How to avoid conflict in discipline/field? Should have diverse representation of Junior and Senior faculty.
 - Is SACUA familiar with these new policies and procedures? Should it be brought to SACUA and Senate Assembly for discussion?
- 4) Kate emailed Mike with questions, and his responses are quoted below:

“Here are the major differences. Let me preface this by saying that these new documents came about as the result of discussions among my predecessor (James Ashton-Miller); Sana Shakour, who directs our Office of Research Compliance Review; Maya Kobersy and Tiana Korley from OGC; and myself. We also ran them by the Provost's office prior to sharing with the APG.

Currently, the SPG contains both the policy and procedures. We have now separated those two items. The new SPG covers the policy, whereas the procedures will be housed on the UMOR website and, more importantly, can now be changed as necessary without going through the arduous process of changing an SPG (i.e., taking it to the Deans, the Provost, SACUA, and the EO's [for final approval]).

Until I took over this position, both the assessment of whether the allegation met the definition of research misconduct and the inquiry were undertaken by the RIO. This was less-than-optimal for a couple of reasons. First, it resulted in these cases taking a long time to adjudicate. Second, it meant that subject matter expertise was often not enlisted unless a case made it to the investigation stage. Jack allowed me to hire an Assistant RIO, who is serving as a project manager and ensuring that cases are moving along. In addition, our new procedure will be to enlist faculty during the inquiry process. What we've done is to set up a standing pool of potential inquiry committee members, based on nominations from the Research Associate Deans of the schools and colleges. We will then draw from this pool whenever we need to initiate an inquiry. Thus, the new process will be fairer and more efficient.

The new SPG makes a clear distinction between research misconduct as defined by the federal government (plagiarism, fabrication, falsification) and other forms of misconduct/bad behavior, which will be handled differently.”

Mike will attend our April 25 meeting and we can ask for more clarification if necessary.

- 5) Daryl Weinert presented updates on Research Administration:
- a. The RAAC: (Research Administration Advisory Council) was instituted about 6 years ago.
 - b. There are 4 working sub-committees: 1 - communications, 2 - training, 3 - data and metrics, and 4 - process.
 - c. About 4 years ago faculty members were added to get faculty voice on changes and ideas – Faculty Council RAAC
 - d. Good track record of implementation
 - e. A few things that the RAAC has been working on in the past year:
 - i. Internal deadline policy for grant submissions
 - ii. Background to why we need a deadline policy:
 1. Technically proposals should be submitted to ORSP 4 days ahead of due date
 2. 7500 proposal submissions/year (proposals are only 20% of what ORSP does – rest contract negotiation, etc.)
 3. Fact: About 6500 of those proposal deadlines are set years in advance.
 4. 25% of proposals come in to ORSP the afternoon they are due; those have to be submitted with no institutional review or not submitted at all.
 5. From an institutional perspective, that means that either noncompliant proposals are submitted or proposals are not getting submitted: neither is acceptable.
 6. The further back from the deadline the proposal is submitted to OSRP the more successful/higher rate of success for those proposals.
 7. SM Commented: Research teams in colleges would not allow late proposals
 8. Some colleges have worse/late submissions: Dr. Weinert will send data.
 9. Currently there is a “soft” implantation of the new deadline policy. ORSP will be moving forward with enforced submission deadline.
 10. → Policy implemented: 4-2-1 Policy:
 - a. **if get proposal is submitted 4 days ahead**, gets full ORSP review and guarantees 42-point check for sponsors guidelines and checks everything matches;

- b. **if proposal is submitted 2 days ahead**, limited review, but not reviewing compliance with sponsor, but guarantees submission on time; but if faculty member gives notice only 30 days or less (or family death, etc) then exceptions okay;
 - c. **if get proposal is submitted 1 day ahead, will ensure proposal is submitted on time. But not reviewed and may not be compliant/accepted?**
 - 11. “Administrative shell” submission prior to final submission – means ORSP needs to review twice and is too time-consuming. So UM will not implement this.
 - 12. The academic program group (APG) was informed of these implementation changes; some pushback but overall, it seems to be accepted.
 - 13. Important for the institution and for workload implementation efficacy.
 - 14. Smaller colleges have smaller research staff or few staff who might be out unexpectedly for multiple reasons: proposed *Mutual Aid Society of Research Staff* to help out in these cases.
 - 15. More out of a research staff person who is already over-worked. Can there be a floating person who can assist?
- iii. MIDAR: Faculty dashboard to help faculty manage a project **Michigan Information Dashboard for the Administration of Research**. For this dashboard to relate diff components of research, IRB/IACUC, PEERRS, etc, related in one site with each section highlighting when needs actions to be completed for a proposal to be complete. Foundations for MIDAR to roll out in August, 2018. Will allow related PAFS and Awards to be mapped.
 - 1. Some vendors have these kind of integrated systems available. Decision at UM – do we go with commercial vendor product or do we continue to build our own integrated system?
- iv. Training: training protocol for research community, especially important for research administrators; faculty also stated they want training: NAVIGATE Program is for UM research administrators. Faculty training program is pending.
 - 1. Fundamentals – 7-day training for new research administrators. Done with other research admins. Budgeting basics and advanced trainings.
 - 2. For Faculty – for new faculty there may be training offered, but for existing faculty a new system: 3 layers of “onion”: simplified layer, etc.
 - 3. The faculty training program is In the process of being created. The new go-to structure to assist faculty will have everything

needed to create and administer a grant and will reduce time and effort. It will help to implement practical issues of (grant funded) research. It will also have information on who to contact to get assistance on issues.