

**University of Massachusetts Amherst  
Research Council of the Faculty Senate  
Paul Utgoff, Chair  
2005-2006  
Minutes  
December 2, 2005**

**PRESENT:** J. Adams, C. Clifton, D. Gilbert, P. Kostecki, M. Malone, A. Mangels, B. McCandless, D. Ostendorf, W. Patterson, S. Scarpati, C. Sprague, L. Sievert, J. Swinney, M. Taunton, P. Utgoff, H. Woodcock, J. Zamora

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

The Minutes of the November 4, 2005 meeting were unanimously approved.

Representing the Provost's Office, College of Engineering Dean Michael Malone announced that the Provost did not have any announcements at this time. Dean Malone wanted to bring to the Research Council's attention that the State Department's ITAR (International Traffic in Arms Regulations) policy which imposes export controls wants to tighten their guidelines. Currently scholarly institutions enjoy an exemption. Vice Provost Paul Kostecki has discussed the potential implications of these new guidelines with the Board of Trustee's Working Group for Science and Technology. The Research Council will explore how peer institutions handle ITAR and will further discuss guiding principles to manage research under stricter regulations.

Vice Provost for Research Paul Kostecki announced that the second round of Research Leadership in Action proposals (RLAP) had concluded. Three proposals were funded for a total of \$40,000 from the 6 submitted. The Faculty Research Grants (FRG) program received 60 proposals which was down slightly from previous submissions. Some colleges restricted their matching commitments which may have caused proposals to be down.

Several other updates were reported: The OGCA annual report is now on line. The international initiative with the President's Office will produce a data base of international interactions. The economic stimulus package is on hold. The fourth floor of the Integrated Science Building (ISB) will be used for generic research laboratories with a focus on interdisciplinary work and a working group comprised of Kostecki, Deans Langford and Willis will review proposals submitted by research clusters. The federal earmark process on campus will be coordinated by Jim Leheny with Deans' input. The memo from the Provost regarding the web-based showcase has resulted in responses from several departments.

Andy Mangels reported that the retroactive pay increases for FY03 have come through. Retros for FY02 are now proposed as well as retro funding for the current round of union contracts. If an employee was paid on a now expired grant or contract award, alternate sources of funding will be discussed.

Carol Sprague, Director of Office of Grant and Contract Administration, announced that NIH has notified them that non-competing awards have been hit with a 20% cut. Once the budget situation is resolved, the funds may be reinstated. OGCA is in discussion with John Dubach, the campus' Chief Information Officer, for a back-up system that will allow no down time.

The University's Research Compliance Coordinator, Hilary Woodcock, reported that NIH has created a new web site to provide guidance for research involving infectious agents and select agents, including submission, awards, monitoring and oversight. It includes a table that clarifies processes and responsibilities for investigations of lab accidents, research-related illnesses and potential biosafety violations. Also, the OLAW assurance has gone out for review. The campus must come out with a policy of dealing with animal complaints. The Radioisotope Use Committee is reviewing the Radiation Safety Manual. Chemical Safety Committee is still working on a laboratory safety manual.

Prof. Sievert, Chair of the Council's subcommittee on Research Policy. Minutes follow.

Prof. Swinney, Chair of the Council's subcommittee on Research Centers/Institutes, distributed the following minutes which reported on her committee's progress.

Prof. Clifton, Chair of the Council's subcommittee on Responsible Conduct of Research, submitted the following minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

**Research Policy Committee  
Minutes  
November 21, 2005**

Present: Lynnette Leidy Sievert (chair), Paul Utgoff, Andrea Foulkes, Martha Taunton, Bill Patterson, David Ostendorf, and Bruce McCandless.

1. Web-based showcase. Progress on submission of electronic AFR's discussed.
2. Government regulations re: export control and licensing. UMass is reviewing policies on classified research that other institutions have implemented.
3. FRGs. Packets have been distributed for evaluation.
4. Research mentoring of new faculty. Mary Deane Sorcinelli, Associate Provost for Faculty Development, was invited to attend the meeting to discuss faculty research mentoring. Key points that came out during the discussion included the observations that 1) new hires come to UMass with different advantages (e.g., postdocs or not) and different needs, 2) departments have very different cultures of mentoring, and 3) there are guidelines that could be recommended with respect to both the structural aspects of mentoring and the one-on-one advising of mentees.
5. At our next meeting, December 12/16, we will review a draft of policy guidelines.

Research Council: **Research Centers and Institutes**

A meeting was held November 18, 2005.

Discussion and Planned Activities:

1. We added, as suggested at the last Council meeting, the University of Wisconsin (Madison) and Indiana (Bloomington) to the Centers and Institutes being reviewed by our subcommittee.
2. We agreed that we are in the stage of discovery and should look at all the benchmark data and see how we stack up against them.
3. We want the UMass Centers and Institutes to be successful. In assessing where we are we need to see how we can make our Centers more successful and also accountable. Are there problems with what we are currently doing?
  - a. We need to identify what works and what does not work.
  - b. Possible barriers to research
  - c. What works and does not work, and
  - d. How do they evaluate success
  - e. After completing the discovery stage we might consider preparing a one page status report and send it out to the Centers and Institutes.
4. We must be mindful of the time to complete our task in an efficient and timely manner. Therefore we will plan working lunches with some of the Center and Institute directors/head administrators to get their feedback and lived experiences of developing and sustaining Centers/Institutes in the UMass campus e.g., Arthur Kinney from Renaissance Study.

Bruce  
Jean  
Jenny  
Paul

Notes on the November 14, 2005, meeting of the subcommittee of the **Research Council on Responsible Conduct of Research.**

Present at the meeting: Stanley Scarpati, Paul Utgoff, Bruce McCandless, Dorothy Gilbert, Margaret Bruggren, Phil Nasca, Charles Clifton

1. Paul Utgoff presented a synopsis of the Steneck book on Responsible Conduct of Research, stating that it provided good coverage of the relevant topics and should be "required reading" for faculty. The Subcommittee agreed to adopt its organization into nine topics as a structure for its own further discussions. Bruce McCandless noted that training in RCR will very likely be a prerequisite for receiving Federal funding in the near future.
2. Dorothy Gilbert summarized her review of UMass policies on RCR, noting that areas that fall under the purview of the ORA are in pretty good shape but the ORA websites do need some improvements. The Human Subjects Committee/IRB needs to be fit better into the University organizational structure and its website needs updating. Policies on Data Management and Ownership of Data need serious work. The Conflict of Interest policy is seriously incomplete. Its current coverage is largely limited to business issues, and UMass needs a COI policy for non-business research and needs a person designated as COI authority. In addition, policies in the RCR categories of authorship and peer review need updating. Further, the Memorandum of Understanding needs updating to include matters in addition to division of overhead funds. The subcommittee discussed just what else should be included, and generally agreed that the topics of responsibility, authorship credit, and recognition of contributions (in the form of appropriate remuneration and assignment of credits to collaborators' departments, centers, and colleges) should be included at some undetermined level of detail. There was some discussion of the need to coordinate with OSHA, but also some concern about overextending the purview of the Subcommittee beyond ethical issues in RCR. New areas where policy may be needed included publication in digital space (which raises interesting issues about data management and peer review). There was an extended discussion of the need to have policies whereby UMass could protect its researchers from "data attacks" (including politically motivated requests) that are permitted under current law, and general agreement that such protection should be part of a revised data management policy.
- . Stan Scarpatti and Jay Schafer described the results of their search for solutions that other universities have come to. They particularly recommended sites at the University of Montana (online research course available at [http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/products/montana\\_round1/research\\_ethics.html](http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/products/montana_round1/research_ethics.html)) and the University of New Hampshire (<http://www.unh.edu/rcr/>) for our examination. Stan noted that Montana in particular had well-integrated curriculum and evaluation components with on-line training modules, and that New Hampshire had a formal organization and an administrative entity to structure RCR issues.
4. There was a brief discussion of extending the Subcommittee's charge to go beyond scientific research and cover "Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship." Since

many RCR issues (e.g., authorship, plagiarism) apply outside the domain of scientific research, the Subcommittee accepted this extension.

5. There was some lively discussion of whether graduate training in RCR falls within the charge of this Subcommittee or is strictly a Graduate Council mission. The Subcommittee agreed that its domain and that of the Research Council do include development of policy about graduate training in research but generally agreed that digging into curricula would be encroaching on the Graduate Council's domain. Phil Nasca suggested that the Subcommittee could help specify what every researcher should know about RCR, but how to deliver training was more the responsibility of the Graduate Council.

6. Phil Nasca discussed the Graduate School's program of grants in ethics in research and scholarship. He also described a survey he conducted two years ago on what training offerings existed on campus (and off campus, via professional organizations). There was discussion of how to reach beyond the "true believers" to deliver instruction to other scholars. There was also discussion of the possibility of different ways of using the ethics grant program to achieve our goals in ethics and RCR and discussion of how to evaluate the outcome of what has been done so far.

7. The Subcommittee discussed how to evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and how to evaluate any changes that might be made in them, as well as how to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction in and dissemination of policy information. The need for "baselines" of problems and successes in each area of RCR was expressed, and Bruce McCandless indicated that he would try to develop such baselines for the different areas of RCR and present them to the Subcommittee.

8. The meeting concluded with some less-than-conclusive discussion of what our next specific goals should be. A preliminary list of goals, subject to revision, includes the following:

A. Build on Dorothy Gilbert's work and develop an explicit list of policies that need re-examination and policies that need to be developed.

B. Each of us examine the Montana and New Hampshire websites (and others we may discover) and make a list of things that those universities do that we think UMass might adopt (and include a list of things the UMass now does well).

C. Prepare proposals to the Research Council for topics involving development and implementation of policy (including training of faculty and students) that the Research Council could consider jointly with the Graduate Council.

D. Develop suggestions for possible alternatives to the ethics grants program that the Graduate School might use to encourage responsible conduct of research and scholarship on campus.

E. In the light of any baselines that Bruce McCandless can provide, develop recommendations for how to track problems and successes in fostering RCR at UMass.