

**University of Massachusetts Amherst
Research Council of the Faculty Senate
Paul Utgoff, Chair
2005-2006
Minutes
March 3, 2006**

PRESENT: C. Clifton, K. Danai, D. Ostendorf, W. Patterson, S. Scarpati, J. Schafer, L. Sievert, J. Swinney, M. Taunton, P. Utgoff, A. Mangels, T. Butterfield, P. Kosteck, E. May, B. McCandless, C. Sprague, M. Malone, H. Woodcock, N. Khan

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

The minutes of the previous meeting, February 10, 2006, were unanimously approved.

Paul Kosteck, Vice Provost for Research, announced that the Research Annual Report is available. He has received many very positive responses to the publication which has been sent to legislators and alumni. He also reported that a "Time to Submission" memo had been sent to all Deans listing PIs and number of days before deadline their proposals are received by OGCA. Proposals are requested to be at OGCA a full working five days before submission deadline. Seventy percent of all proposals are late. Research Affairs has sent a survey regarding the pre-award process to all faculty who have submitted proposals in the last 90 days. The VPR has asked OGCA to remind/educate PIs at the time of proposal submission that adequate time must be given to process the application. Also, the VPRs office is in discussions with Mary Deane Sorcinelli regarding a major mentoring program in which the Research area will participate.

Mike Malone, representing the Provost, stated that the UMass system is creating a Research Council. Paul Kosteck, Lee Edwards, and Paul Utgoff will represent UMA. The Provost is interested in the hiring of Research Assistants vs. Post-Docs. Bruce McCandless passed out data indicating that post-docs are on the increase and RAs are on the decrease. Nigar Khan suggested that a discussion on the importance of post-docs and RAs should be a combined effort of the Graduate and Research Councils.

Andy Mangels, representing Administration and Finance, reported bringing in a consultant to review the additional compensation process. He will ask faculty and administration to meet with the consultant.

Carol Sprague, Director of OGCA, announced that for FY06 proposals are up but dollars down.

Hilary Woodcock, Compliance Officer, reported that discussions are proceeding on why we don't have a health and safety policy on campus for animal users. Also, the Radiation Use Committee (RUC) will take up a discussion on whether the University should change from the present Class A radiation license to a Class B license. A Class B license puts control of radiation use on campus in the hands of the radiation officer in EH&S while the Class A leaves control in the hands of the RUC.

Tony Butterfield, representing the Graduate Council, stated that they are actively discussing significant changes to the Graduate School Fellowships. The Council is also discussing differential weighting of graduate vs. undergraduate courses to more properly reflect the effort of faculty.

Lynnette Leidy Sievert, Chair of the Research Policy Committee, submitted the attached minutes (Attachment A). Her committee will be bringing a report to the Council at its April meeting.

Jean Swinney, Chair of the Research Centers/Institutes Committee, submitted the attached minutes (Attachment B) and Update/Progress Report (Attachment C).

Jay Shafer, representing the University Libraries, submitted the attached memo which explains in detail our BioMed Central membership (Attachment D). After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Shafer would get back to BioMed Central and say that discussions with the research community find that their increased membership fees are not an acceptable business model. The Research Library Council E-Scholarship Repository Investigatory Task Force is conducting a preliminary investigation into campus interest and feasibility of a University electronic repository service which could serve as an alternative to BioMed Central. The Task Force will conduct a needs and interest assessment throughout the University by undertaking a survey to define the services and elements essential in the provision of such a service. Will determine types of content for the repository and prioritize based on survey results and provide recommendations for an E-Scholarship Repository service. Shafer suggested asking Marilyn Billings attend the next meeting to give a presentation about the Repository.

Charles Clifton, Chair of the Committee on Responsible Conduct of Research, submitted the attached minutes (Attachment E). After of run-through of an audit of UMass policies that relating to aspects of RCR, primary discussion centered on data access and management and intellectual property rights. It was determined that an ad hoc committee made up of RCR committee members, the MTA, perhaps legal representation, will be formed to draft a memo developing a policy dealing with data management.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

ATTACHMENT A

Research Policy Committee Minutes of meeting February 24, 2006

Present: Lynnette Leidy Sievert (chair), Paul Utgoff, Martha Taunton, and David Ostendorf

We devoted the entire meeting to a review of a drafted Guidelines/Recommendations for Faculty Research Mentoring

We considered University-level Recommendations (Data gathering, Seminars, Lunches), College-level Recommendations (Grant-writing assistance, Faculty pairing, Intra-college communication facilitated by the deans, Lunches), and Departmental Recommendations (Spelling out research as a priority at the time of hire, Checklists for faculty progress toward tenure, Rotating course release(s) within departments, Travel money for junior faculty).

Revisions are being made for our next Research Policy committee meeting

The final Recommendations will be presented to the University Research Council on April 7, 2006.

ATTACHMENT B

Minutes Research Centers Committee Meeting February 24, 2006

Present: Paul Utgoff (recorder, sub for Jean Swinney), Nigar Khan, David Ostendorf

Paul Utgoff related a conversation that he and Jean Swinney had with Ernie May regarding the evaluation of research centers. In that conversation, Ernie gave them Board of Trustees document T96-096, as amended 10/9/1996, entitled 'University of Massachusetts Policy on Centers and Institutes,' and Faculty Senate Document 97-027, dated 2/20/1997, entitled 'Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The UMass/Amherst Policy on Centers and Institutes.' For brevity, I shall refer to the former as BOT and the latter as SEN. Copies of these documents were distributed to the committee.

The essence of the issue is that the BOT document calls for review of each center or institute at least every five years, and that we (as a campus) have not been doing this. Though the trustees have not yet noticed, they could at any time, in which case we could be found not to have complied. No one wishes to create work, but some kind of review process should be put in place, both to serve its intended purpose, and to have complied with the BOT policy. This is the crux of our task, and our scope can be guided and limited by the BOT document.

The SEN document echoes much of the BOT document, but specifies certain particulars, including that the review of centers and institutes is to be conducted by the Provost on a schedule set by the Provost that conforms to a review of each center or institute at least every five years.

So, while the impetus to get this review process in place has come from Faculty Senate, it could have come as well from Administration. Research Council represents Senate, and works with Administration to advance the campus research mission. It is in our interest to maintain centers and institutes that facilitate the campus mission. Centers or institutes that have outlived their usefulness should be closed. This is the somewhat simple outcome of the review process: a recommendation for whether to continue or close a given center or institute. Such a recommendation is to be given to the Provost, from which it will be passed to the Chancellor and then the President.

Both the BOT and SEN documents are brief, about two pages each. The language of the SEN document is: 'Centers and institutes shall be evaluated on their success in meeting their own goals and objectives as well as their substantive contribution to the mission of the campus. Once a center or institute has been reviewed, a recommendation to continue said center or institute must be approved by the President upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and Provost. Academic administrators may request the termination of a center or institute to the campus administration for specific reasons such as a prolonged period of

inactivity, insufficient level of funding, inconsistency with campus mission and stated purposes of the center or institute, misconduct of employees, and disappearance of the clientele served. The campus administration shall review the proposed termination and forward it to the Faculty Senate for review and recommendation. The termination of a center or institute must receive approval of the Chancellor, upon recommendation of the Provost.'

So, a continuation requires approval of the President and a closure requires approval of the Chancellor. Only a recommendation for closure requires review by the Faculty Senate.

Our task is to create a simple evaluation procedure for centers. It should be brief, and ideally it should not ask for information that a director has not already produced or can access easily. The SEN document gives strong hints about what to measure, e.g. activity level, funding level, conformity to mission, satisfied clientele. The plan for this committee is to bring to our next committee meeting a draft of a one page evaluation form for centers or institutes, and a short statement that outlines a specific process for carrying out the review process. Jean will draft these. The committee will work in consultation with the Provost's office.

ATTACHMENT C

Research Centers Committee

Update – Progress Report

Several meetings have been held as the committee worked to gather information and to more clearly define the assignment given to us by the Research Council. After our meeting with Ernie May we found we have been overly ambitious in our approach to addressing our assignment.

Following our meeting (Paul Utgoff and Jean Swinney) with Ernie May regarding the evaluation of research centers, we received copies of the Board of Trustees document T96-096, as amended 10/9/1996, entitled 'University of Massachusetts Policy on Centers and Institutes,' and Faculty Senate Document 97-027, dated 2/20/1997, entitled 'Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The UMass/Amherst Policy on Centers and Institutes.

The Board of Trustees document calls for review of each center or institute at least every five years, and that we (as a campus) have not been doing this. Though the trustees have not yet noticed, they could at any time, in which case we could be found not to have complied. Ernie May stated that no one wishes to create work, but some kind of review process should be put in place, both to serve its intended purpose, and to have complied with the Board of Trustees policy.

Therefore our task, and the scope of our work should be guided and limited by the Board of Trustees document.

The SEN document echoes much of the Board of Trustees document, but specifies certain particulars, including that the review of centers and institutes should be conducted by the Provost on a schedule set by the Provost that conforms to a review of each center or institute at least every five years.

So, while the impetus for the review process has come from the Faculty Senate, it could have come as well from Administration. The Research Council represents the Senate, and works with Administration to advance the campus research mission. It is in our interest to maintain the centers and institutes that facilitate the campus mission. Centers or institutes that have outlived their usefulness should be closed. This is the somewhat simple outcome of the review process: a recommendation for whether to continue or close a given center or institute. Such a recommendation is to be given to the Provost, from which it will be passed to the Chancellor and then the President.

The language of the SEN document is: ``Centers and institutes shall be evaluated on their success in meeting their own goals and objectives as well as their substantive contribution to the mission of the campus. Once a center or institute has been reviewed, a recommendation to continue said center or institute must be approved by the President upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and Provost. Academic administrators may request the termination of a center or institute to the campus

administration for specific reasons such as a prolonged period of inactivity, insufficient level of funding, inconsistency with campus mission and stated purposes of the center or institute, misconduct of employees, and disappearance of the clientele served. The campus administration shall review the proposed termination and forward it to the Faculty Senate for review and recommendation. The termination of a center or institute must receive approval of the Chancellor, upon recommendation of the Provost.'

So, a continuation requires approval of the President and a closure requires approval of the Chancellor. Only a recommendation for closure requires review by the Faculty Senate.

Our task is to create a simple evaluation procedure for centers. It should be brief, and ideally it should not ask for information that a director has not already produced or can access easily. The SEN document gives strong hints about what to measure, e.g. activity level, funding level, conformity to mission, satisfied clientele. The plan for this committee is to bring to our next committee meeting a draft of a one page evaluation form for centers or institutes, and a short statement that outlines a specific process for carrying out the review process. Jean will draft these. The committee will work in consultation with the Provost's office.

ATTACHMENT D

University of Massachusetts Amherst
University Libraries
February 27, 2006

To: Research Council
From: Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries
Subject: BioMed Central Membership

For more than a decade, the University Libraries have faced increased costs more than twice the CPI to provide access to print and electronic information resources. A new publishing model, known as open-access, emerged in 2001 the goal of providing more cost effective alternatives to the traditional publishing model. BioMed Central, an open-access initiative, was launched as an independent publishing house committed to providing immediate access to peer-reviewed biomedical. The Library decided to join BioMed Central as an institutional membership in 2005.

The 2005 membership benefits included:

- Membership fee at modest cost (\$1,350 per year).
- Article processing fee for UMass/Amherst faculty was covered 100% by membership fee, regardless of the number of articles our faculty published.
- Support economically open-access model as an alternative to traditional publishing.
- As a result of our membership UMass/Amherst faculty members published four articles in BioMed Central during 2005 and did not have to pay an article processing fee.

In late 2005, BioMed Central announced they were changing their membership model pricing. Their rationale was their original economic model was no longer sustainable.

For 2006, they suggested the best model for the UMass/Amherst Libraries is:

- Deposit \$8,100 into a prepay account. They base the \$8,100 on the number of articles our faculty published in 2005 (4) times \$1,350 per article, plus potential growth of 2 additional articles during 2006.
- Any monies in the prepay account not used this calendar year would carry forward to next year.

The Library has not renewed our membership to BioMed Central for 2006. The dilemma for us is:

- BioMed Central's new pricing model represents a 600% increase in direct costs of the Library from 2005 to 2006.

- Many grant-funding agencies (the NIH, for example) include funds to publish in open-access entities, but those funds go directly to the principal investigator, not the Library.
- The \$6,750 cost difference from the 2005 membership to the proposed 2006 model represents what it costs the Library to provide access to a medium-priced electronic database that benefits the research community.

My question to the Research Council is:

- Since publication and research is an issue that affects the research output of the campus, should this be funded through a campus entity other than the Library (since the Library receives no direct funds from grant-funding agencies to offset this cost)?
- Should the Research Council fund this membership?

ATTACHMENT E

Draft Minutes Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship Subcommittee February 17, 2006

Present: Paul Utgoff, Bruce McCandless, Margaret Burggren, Stanley Scarpati, Philip Nasca, Charles Clifton.

1. We agreed to develop an audit of UMass policies that relate to the nine aspects of RCR as presented in Steneck's 2004 book *Introduction to the responsible conduct of research*. The audit would include our identification of policies that may require development or revision together with preliminary suggestions for topics that should be considered in any such development or revision. The audit is attached, and will be presented to the Research Council for its further action.
2. We agreed that it would be wise for UMass to be proactive in preventing violations of RCR rather than simply trying to respond to them as they occur. UMass has taken an appropriately proactive position in the areas of animal care and protection of human subjects (albeit in reaction to external requirements) but may fall short in other areas.
3. We had an extended discussion of the possible need for a data access and management policy, attempting to identify costs and benefits of having such a policy. We considered it desirable for the University to have a policy mandating that it respond when external agencies place unreasonable demands on its members to produce data, and we considered it desirable to be clear about what rights University members have to take data when they leave. We recognize the difficulty of identifying what counts as research data and of clarifying the relation of principles of academic freedom, confidentiality, and intellectual property rights to any policy about data access, management, and ownership.
4. We discussed the existence of policies (e.g., annual reporting of potential conflict of interest) which may not be universally enforced at the present time.
5. We agreed that at our next meeting we will consider questions of making information about the principles of responsible conduct of research and the UMass policies on that topic available to University members. We agreed to coordinate with other bodies on campus (e.g., the Graduate School and the Graduate Council) in developing a program of on-line and in-class courses and other training vehicles that would permit all members of the University (faculty, students, postdocs, assistants, etc.) to become appropriately knowledgeable about the principles of responsible conduct of research. We hope to develop recommendations to the Research Council on these matters.

Audit of UMass Policies on Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarship

February 17, 2006

1. Research misconduct

UMass has a policy, available at: <http://www.umass.edu/research/ora/misconduct.html> that was recently updated (May, 2005).

Recommendation: no policy action needed.

However, it would be desirable to add computerized links to key contacts (who are now identified by title only) and to relevant parts of the Federal code.

2. Protection of human subjects

UMass has a policy, available at <http://www.umass.edu/research/humsub.html>

It is generally satisfactory, and the relevant officials are keeping it updated.

Recommendation: no additional policy action is needed. However, it would be desirable to add computerized links to key contacts (who are now identified by title only) and to appropriate state and Federal policies.

3. Welfare of laboratory animals

UMass has a policy, available at

<http://www.umass.edu/research/aco/institutionalpolicy.html> and a code of procedures, available at <http://www.umass.edu/research/aco/iacucprocedures.html> dated 2004.

Recommendation: No policy action is needed.

4. Conflict of interest

Various policy statements exist:

http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/news/AD%20Comp%20Policy%2012_05.pdf

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/policies/t68060.htm>

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/policies/conflict.htm>

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ora/confi.html>

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ora/faccon.html>

Some of these policies date back some 15 years. They need to be examined for any inconsistencies and need to be integrated. They may need to be extended beyond their current focus on financial conflict of interest to matters of conflict of interest in matters pertaining to research and scholarship. Further, it would be desirable to have a single Conflict of Interest authority on campus.

Recommendation: The Research Council should take appropriate steps toward integrating and extending the conflict of interest policies.

5. Data access and management

A policy was considered but not passed by the Faculty Senate:

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ora/data1.html> Many, but not all, major universities have a policy for data access and management.

Recommendation: The Research Council should consider the need for a University policy on data management.

Discussion of such a policy should consider at least the following topics:

- the definition of research data and the need to exclude some categories of products of scholarship
- the relation of data management to intellectual property rights
- the basis of the University's ownership of data
- the obligations (and limitations of obligations) of investigators to preserve and provide access to data
- the rights (and limitations of rights) to take data when a faculty member or student leaves the University
- the University's responsibilities to protect its investigators against legal action and to assist them in responding to requests for access to data. The RCRS Subcommittee can provide a summary of the data access and management policies of a selected group of universities, together with links to the policy statements.

6. Mentor and trainee responsibilities

The Policy Subcommittee of the Research Council is actively investigating mentoring on campus. **Recommendation: The Research Council should wait for the recommendations of the Policy Subcommittee in this domain.**

7. Collaborative research.

A "Memorandum of Understanding" covering sharing of funds, credit, and responsibility exists at <http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/forms/hpmou.htm>. This memorandum serves the University's present needs adequately, but there are issues of allocation of credit to individual researchers, departments, programs, colleges, etc. that will need to be dealt with in the near future.

Recommendation: The Research Council should remain alert to the possible need to develop a policy regarding such allocation of credit.

8. Authorship and publication

A 1990 Faculty Senate document exists as policy in this area:

<http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/policies/jntauth.htm>

The policy may need updating to reflect new topics including publication in digital space.

Recommendation: The RCRS subcommittee should examine the current policy and make recommendations for changes.

9. Peer review

There seems to be no UMass policy in this area, and most peer review activities involve outside-university bodies. However, there are reasons to think that a policy affirming the University's commitment to appropriate principles of peer review might be valuable.

Recommendation: The Research Council should consider the need for a succinct policy concerning peer review.

At a broader level, the Research Council might want to discuss the need for an overall policy in RCRS, or at least, the need to prepare material that makes existing policies and practices clear and accessible and facilitates understanding of these policies.