



Research Policies Committee

Minutes of November 13th, 2020

Circulated: December 8th, 2020

Approved: December 10th, 2020

Present: Natalie Colabianchi, Jay Charles Vornhagen, Irene St. Charles, Nicholas Harris, Allen Liu, Jessica Durkin, Zenon Sommers, Teri Rosales, Mimi Dalaly

Absent: Marisa Conte, Vania Hinkovska-Galcheva, Hafiz Malik, Maddy Paxson, Robert Ploutz-Synder, Vitaliy Popov

11:44 AM: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda

A change was made to the attendance for the October 15 minutes to add Maddy Paxson as present. The minutes will be put to a vote at the next meeting.

Due to the loss of time due to the use of multiple meeting links, the charge review was moved up ahead of COVID-19 Inequities.

The committee discussed the current charge. Professor Liu confirmed that SACUA would be open to changes to the charge as needed.

Chair Colabianchi stated that Dr. Cunningham had suggested that the committee consider a change to the committee's name to reflect the work the committee is doing.

Chair Colabianchi also stated that there are many charges, but the group only meets 7-8 times per year. She identified some potential redundancy between charges 2 and 3, which could be streamlined. She also stated that given the attention that was given to the 4th charge last year, it may be advisable to remove this charge for this year. The 5th charge concerning community-based research could be repurposed to think about disparities more broadly. Dr. Rosales suggested in the notes in the charge document to revise this charge to indicate the following: "Provide and make recommendations for DEI-informed procedures/policies and practices in research to address disparities, particularly as exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic."

Chair Colabianchi solicited thoughts from the group about charge 4 and whether the charge could be revised to reflect a charge to monitor university structures that support research as needed.

Chair Colabianchi recommended tabling reconsidering the committee name for now, and she prioritized discussing the broad idea of the charges, combining charges 2 and 3, removing 4, and repurposing 5. If there is time, guests could be brought in, such as the Ginsberg Center.

Member Rosales was supportive of leaving charge 4 in and including qualifying language concerning addressing this charge as needed, but prioritizing charges 1, 2, and 5. Member Rosales mentioned that she is aware of efforts by the University Library to develop some



guidance for research in a number of ways which can contribute to making progress in charge 5. Member Vornhagen agreed with including charge 4 with qualifying language “as needed.” He inquired about inputs and outputs for the charges, as well as the process for bringing recommendations forward. He also expressed the desire to discuss charge 5 in more depth. He agreed that equity will be important in terms of research, but more clarity is needed about what research means in this context, including how research policies interact with disparities. Member Rosales agreed with the need for more clarity. Member Rosales explained that as written, it is unclear whether charge 5 is about the research enterprise more generally, or about the research infrastructure which is more closely related to charges 1 and 2. Member Rosales referred to a provided powerpoint presentation that had more emphasis on pipeline and support.

Chair Colabianchi stated that charges 2 and 5 are distinguishable. She inquired about whether it is too much to look at both, and where should efforts be focused. Member Vornhagen agreed that the committee should be looking at both charges. He suggested that the committee look at infrastructure and use partnerships for broader issues where information could be shared and distributed. Chair Colabianchi mentioned that charge 5 also concerns how research is valued. Member St. Charles also agreed that the two charges should be kept separate.

The committee discussed Member Rosales’s recommendation for charge 5. Member St. Charles asked if it would be helpful to have a guest attend a meeting from ODEI. Chair Colabianchi indicated that she had asked Jason Owen-Smith to attend at the next meeting, but if someone is available to attend this would be helpful, especially because the university is approaching the end of its five-year plan. Chair Colabianchi reflected on what the committee brings, and noted that the committee brings the constituency of Faculty Senate and partnership with VP Cunningham.

Member Rosales noted that she is the research analyst for evaluation and metrics for the five-year DEI plan, so she can help in this regard. She stated that she can make sure the efforts they are making align with current efforts that are being made and address the most effective levers for organizational change. A contribution could be to contextualize what DEI informed policies and practices mean for all kinds of research.

Member Rosales stated that procedures and practices is redundant. Member Vornhagen suggested that an asterisk be used to note that research policies are those coming from Faculty Senate, and outputs are directed to VP Cunningham and Faculty Senate. Specific language suggested was: “To our understanding, “research policies and practices” are those derived from the faculty senate and/or Dr. Cunningham’s recommendations. Correspondingly, this committee shall provide feedback on “research policies and practices” to the submitting bodies under the guise of the following charges”

Chair Colabianchi confirmed that Charge 3 was absorbed into Charge 2.

There was discussion about whether “disparities” should be included in charge 2.

Jessica Durkin suggested modifying charge 1 to account for continuing changes to the environment brought about by COVID. Charge 1 was modified as follows: “Consider continuing plans for research operations in the COVID-19 environment.”



Professor Liu gave a committee update to SACUA recently, and there was no opposition to modifying charges. Chair Colabianchi will follow up with Professor Liu and MaryJo Banasik in the Faculty Senate Office for the process for getting approval for revised charges.

Chair Colabianchi addressed the committee's title. She suggested that the title could be Research Practices and Policies Committee or just Research Practices. Professor Liu suggested that practices fits best based on VP Cunningham's previous feedback. Member Harris noted that changing the committee to Research Practices Committee would retain the same acronym.

Another suggestion was Research Operations Committee. A poll will be sent out to the full committee to determine whether the new title should be Research Practices Committee or Research Operations Committee.

12:16: Chair Colabianchi shared the slides she received from UMOR on COVID-19 Inequities and Research Disparities. She indicated that Jason Owen-Smith would be talking generally about research analytics. She asked what the committee would like him to address during his visit.

Chair Colabianchi touched on some of the broad issues covered in the slides, including challenges to post docs and doctoral students who are facing a constricted job market.

Chair Colabianchi asked how can the committee help with recommendations.

Jason Owen-Smith is the Executive Director of Research Analytics, and his visit relates to Charge number 2.

Chair Colabianchi highlighted the equality versus equity graphic in the slide deck. She indicated that UMOR is interested in getting the committee's feedback. She shared the report from Advance and highlighted things that she thought were most critical. She asked people to read the report. She wants people to think about their general perceptions, things that may have been overlooked, and what items are most pressing.

Committee members should consider where the follow ups are for the committee, and who should they be speaking with. Member Rosales gave the name of her unit, Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI).

For next steps, Chair Colabianchi will revise the Google doc and send it out for final edits. She will work with Professor Liu to see how to finalize the revised charge.

Chair Colabianchi requested to specific things people would like to see from Jason Owen-Smith. Jessica Durkin confirmed that the UMOR annual report is available on line.

Charge 2 and DEI informed research practices and policies in light of COVID may be helpful. Member Rosales mentioned that she would like to better understand the profile of the researchers beyond just tenure track but including researchers at institutes and centers with a demographic profile and level of appointment so they can think about how people are being impacted differently. Chair Colabianchi asked if data are requested about demographics only or also to include research expenditures. Member Rosales agreed it would be helpful to have both data sets. She reflected on who are constituents when



thinking about charges 1, 2, and 5. Post COVID-19 data are desired. Member Rosales noted that soft money positions are much different than tenure track positions. Member Vornhagen noted that staff also serve critical roles in research at the university.

Jessica Durkin noted that Jason Owen-Smith is new to his role, and UMOR and currently has many competing demands for data. Member Rosales stated that she has access to a dashboard that may provide additional data.

There was discussion about being able to share data and resources.

Member Harris suggested drafting a letter from the committee endorsing the slides from UMOR about COVID-19 Inequities and Research Disparities. He agreed to start the letter.

12:36 meeting adjourned.