

**University of Massachusetts Amherst
Research Council of the Faculty Senate
Paul Utgoff, Chair
2005-2006
Minutes
May 5, 2006**

PRESENT: T. Butterfield, C. Clifton, K. Danai, A. Foulkes, E. Glogowski, N. Khan, M. Malone, E. May, K. Melnattur, D. Ostendorf, W. Patterson, S. Scarpati, L. Sievert, C. Sprague, J. Swinney, M. Taunton, P. Utgoff

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting, April 7, 2006, were unanimously approved.

Dean Michel Malone, representing the Provost, corrected and updated information on the new faculty mentoring program. The program is being supported with external money, not campus money, from the Mellon Foundation. We have a planning grant, and will apply for a full grant during the fall. The program is being administered by Mary Deane Sorcinelli whose title is Associate Provost for Faculty Development. This is not a grant for mentoring and teaching. Matt Ouellette is the new Director of the Center for Teaching. In her new role, Mary Deane will direct the mentoring project for the campus, and will be looking for ideas to incorporate in the fall proposal, and some of those that are proposed by the Research Council they will do. The Provost is delighted to see this interest and would be happy to come to talk to the Research Council about mentoring this Fall. He also reported that the Vice Provost for Research Search Committee had completed its work.

Vice Provost Paul Kostecki was attending the system-wide Research Council meeting in Shrewsbury.

Nigar Khan, representing Graduate Dean Mullin, reported that Chancellor Lombardi was interested in tracking doctoral and masters students through their tenure at UMass Amherst and the Graduate School was developing that process. She also commented that the 30 year celebration of John Mullin's career at UMass Amherst was attended by about 180 people from across the country and that \$65,000 was donated in his honor for scholarship and a seminar room in LARP.

Andy Mangels, representing Administration and Finance, updated the Council on the Additional Compensation policy presently being reviewed by his office.

Tony Butterfield, Chair of the Graduate Council, reported that the Curriculum Fee Task Force had developed a memo which requests a waiver of the Curriculum Fee for Research Assistants funded by external grant dollars. Faculty Senate Secretary, Ernie May, suggested that Butterfield meet with the Rules Committee and the Chancellor regarding the waiver. Dr. Butterfield is considering that offer.

Carol Sprague, Director of OGCA, reported that a revamped IPF form has been developed and OGCA will be looking for input. She also handed out a list of proposals submitted by organizational unit stating that proposals are up from FY05 and the University is on track for a successful year.

Graduate Student Senate representative, Krishna Melnattur, was introduced and welcomed to the Council.

Graduate student, Elizabeth Glogowski, brought to the Council's attention the concern of graduate students that there is no way for them to talk to other graduate students about their research development. Several suggestions were made including an annual campus-wide poster session. Nigar Khan suggested that this concern be made known to the Graduate Dean.

Jean Swinney, Chair of the Research Centers/Institutes subcommittee, submitted to the Council a Research Centers and Institutes Evaluation form (see Attachment A) which should be considered with the Faculty Senate Document 97-027. It was **MOVED**, seconded and passed unanimously to submit the Research Centers and Institutes Evaluation form to the Provost.

Paul Utgoff submitted "Data Ownership, Retention, and Access at the University of Massachusetts Amherst" (Attachment B). After brief discussion and minor modification, it was **MOVED**, seconded and approved with 1 abstention that this policy be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

Charles Clifton, Chair of the Joint Authorship subcommittee, presented to the Council a "Policy Statement on Joint Authorship at the University of Massachusetts Amherst" (Attachment C). After discussion, it was **MOVED**, seconded and unanimously approved to submit the policy to the Faculty Senate. Graduate Council Chair Butterfield will send this electronically to the Graduate Council for their vote so that the policy may be simultaneously submitted to the Senate by both Councils.

Lynnette Sievert, Chair of the Research Policy subcommittee, submitted a memorandum which will be sent to Provost Seymour regarding "Faculty Research Mentoring: recommendations for the Campus Research Community" (Attachment D). After brief discussion and minor modification, it was **MOVED**, seconded and unanimously approved to forward this memorandum to the Provost.

The Research Council adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

ATTACHMENT A

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Research Centers and Institutes Evaluation

“All centers and institutes are to be reviewed by the Provost at least once every five years, as outlined in Faculty Senate Document 97-027 and Board of Trustees document T96-096. The information requested here is for the purpose of this review.”

I. _____

Name of Research Center or Institute _____

Funding Sources _____

Director(s) _____

Departments Involved in Center _____

Date of Last Review _____

II. _____

A. Brief description of the Center or Institute's overall purpose: Including a description of the college/school/departmental interactions:

B. Brief description of the Center or Institute's projects and activities:

III. _____

A. Brief description about the effectiveness of the Center or Institute's projects and activities in carrying out its stated overall purpose in the period since the last review.

B. Brief description of the evaluation of the effectiveness of projects and activities.

IV.

A. Brief description of the Center or Institute's annual budget or fiscal plan

- 1) University financial support
- 2) Center/Institute generated financial support

B. Brief description of the ways that the fiscal plan aided the completion of projects and activities and/or the overall purpose.

Although we realize that your Center or Institute might not have been reviewed for quite some time, "All centers and institutes are to be reviewed by the Provost at least once every five years, as outlined in Faculty Senate Document 97-027 and Board of Trustees document T96-096. The information requested here is for the purpose of this review. Thank you.

ATTACHMENT B

Data Ownership, Retention, and Access at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

Approved by Research Council on May 5, 2006. Forwarded to Faculty Senate on May 5, 2006.

The University of Massachusetts at Amherst supports a wide variety of research and scholarly activity. A fundamental component of many research investigations is the creation and use of data. It is in the interest of the research enterprise at large to make such data available to others, to the extent possible. This is important for furthering new research efforts and for enabling others to examine previous research in detail. It is in the University's interest to facilitate these processes, and to assist and protect those who conduct research and scholarly activities on behalf of the University.

External Policies and Guidelines

Various federal agencies have formulated policies regarding data ownership, retention, and access. For example, see [Part C.53 of the Office of Management and Budget's \(OMB\) grants management circular A-110](#), the Council on Government Relations (COGR) document [`Access to and Retention of Research Data: Rights and Responsibilities.'](#) Chapter 6 of Steneck's [`Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research,'](#) and the various requirements regarding research data stated by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute for Health (NIH), and other government funding agencies. Some publishers impose requirements on the access to data as a condition for publication.

The Amherst Campus policy (this document) applies to all campus research and researchers, regardless of funding source, if any. For sponsored research, any relevant policies of the sponsor shall apply in addition to those provided here. Any apparent conflicts of policies are to be resolved in writing and approved by the Vice Provost for Research prior to accepting an award, contract, or other binding agreement.

Data Definition

Data shall be construed as all recorded information, regardless of medium, and all actual samples or examples, that were created or gathered and that could serve to influence or support a research finding or conclusion. Data does not include such items as research papers cited by the researcher, preliminary notes or paper drafts, reviews, or related communications, or items that are already the property of others. This definition is intended to characterize current research norms, not to modify them.

Data Ownership

The Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts is the **owner** or **joint owner** of all data that is created or collected by its employees or contractors, except when the creation or collection of such data is governed by a written agreement or contract to the contrary, approved in writing by the Vice Provost for Research. Terms of the campus policy on intellectual property may apply as well.

When another research institution or entity has joint ownership rights to data, agreed in writing prior to creation of the data, the data shall be owned jointly as agreed. Each such institution shall have unfettered access rights to the original data. Such an institution not holding or serving as custodian for the original data may copy the data and own the copy.

When a creator of data ceases to be an employee or contractor of the University, the creator must leave the data in the physical possession of the owner(s), but will continue to have access rights to the data. The creator may take a copy of the data, at creator's expense.

Data Custody

The researcher(s) who created the data typically serve as the **custodian** of the University's data. Such researchers act on behalf of the University, without limiting the University's ownership rights. Data may not be removed from the University premises, except on a temporary basis when work occurs elsewhere, without written approval of the Vice Provost for Research. The custodian of the data shall take all reasonable steps to protect the data from damage or loss, including damage or loss due to catastrophic events. The owner of the data shall provide storage space and financial support as necessary to maintain the data. The University may elect to serve as custodian of the data, but may not limit the creator's access to those data.

Data Quality

Data shall be maintained in a manner that prevents alteration or that makes any and all alterations evident. For example, written data should be recorded in a bound notebook with numbered pages. If a datum is revised, the reason for revising it must be documented and dated. Electronic data should be kept on a read-only medium, or in a read-only mode. The creator of data should be able to document and defend any modification of the data.

Data Retention

Data shall be retained for at least three years after its creation. If the data were created as part of a sponsored research project, then the data shall be retained for at least three years after the final report to the sponsor has been submitted, or the ending date of the project, whichever is later. The data shall be retained for a longer period as dictated by any applicable policy or written agreement. If more than one minimum period of retention is deemed to apply, the data will be retained for the longest of these periods. If the data led

to the granting of a patent, then the data shall be retained for the life of the patent and its extensions. The data shall be retained while any litigation or legal action or investigation of allegations regarding it is pending. The data shall otherwise be retained for as long as anyone expresses, in writing, an interest in its retention. In no case will the data be discarded or destroyed when it is known to be in use.

Data Access

Researchers shall endeavor to make their data publicly available as soon as possible, and to the extent possible. Access may be delayed while the correctness of the data is being verified, until an initial publication based on the data appears, for the minimum period needed to file a patent application, or for any other reasonable need. Data should be released early if benefit to the public is likely.

No data may be published or made available in a form that would breach a confidentiality. For example, the medical and financial records of an individual are private. The identity of human subjects is also typically held in confidence. The confidential aspects of confidential data are to be protected by both the custodian and the owner of the data. This may include physically securing the data. When a means of hiding the identity of a protected individual or entity is possible, say by the encoding or removal of names, such steps will be taken so that the data may be made public to the greatest extent possible. If the data cannot be made satisfactorily anonymous, it shall not be made public, and the Vice Provost of Research will be informed of the existence of the data and the reasons that it cannot be made public. The creator of the data must make every reasonable effort to release the data in a useful form. If the veracity of confidential research data is challenged, the creator must cooperate with the Vice Provost for Research to devise a means to satisfy the challenge. As owner, the University will defend any challenge, with the cooperation of the researcher. All applicable laws and legal protections regarding confidentiality will be obeyed.

Data that is deemed sensitive may require restricted access or other limitations. The owner and custodian of such data will comply with applicable laws.

Applicable non-disclosure agreements must be honored. However, the Vice Provost must approve any non-disclosure agreement ahead of time and be a co-signer. Such agreements shall generally be of limited duration, to give a sponsor sufficient time to file a patent application or for other protection.

When a collaboration comes to an end, and data was created during the collaboration, each member of the collaboration shall retain access to that data.

ATTACHMENT C

POLICY STATEMENT ON JOINT AUTHORSHIP AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST

May 5, 2006

A modification of a policy adopted by the Graduate Council, April 2, 1990, which is available at <http://www.umass.edu/research/ogca/policies/jntauth.htm>

The authorship of any published scholarly work must reflect the contribution of all who deserve to be included. It is the responsibility of the faculty member or other person in charge to guarantee that fairness and accuracy are exercised in listing the authors.

The research process includes conception, design (procedures, method), data collection, data analysis, and manuscript preparation. The relative importance of each facet of research can vary among projects and among disciplines. The determination of who is listed as an author, in what order, should be based on the magnitude of contribution made to each facet of the research and on the relative importance of each facet. All authors should have made some significant contribution to the research, and their responsibilities should determine the way they are listed in any resulting manuscript. All parties involved in the research should jointly determine authorship when it is clear that a decision about eventual authorship will need to be made. When appropriate, the nature of each author's contribution can be described in the publication.

At the University of Massachusetts, much research involves a professor-student relationship with varying contributions possible from each. Publication or circulation of scholarly work is integral to graduate education. Therefore, graduate students should be vigorously encouraged to participate in the research process. Some general guidelines should prevail. If the student is given and accepts primary responsibility for all areas of a research project, the student should be first author of manuscripts, or sole author if the professor has not made substantial contributions to the study. If the professor conceives and designs a project and is instrumental in other areas of research, the professor should be first author. It is generally inappropriate for a professor to be sole author of the primary report of original research conducted by a student as part of the requirements of a degree.

These are general conditions, but special ones may also obtain. 1. Directors of research units or laboratories should not automatically be authors on research publications from their research organization, nor should authorship be automatically tied to providing funding for research. 2. Simply executing a job for which pay is taken (e.g., collecting data) does not automatically convey the right to authorship. Significant contributions to the research must be made. 3. Student papers written as part of course requirements should not be co-authored by the professor unless the professor has made a significant contribution to the paper at some phase of the project, including revising the manuscript after it was submitted to fulfill course requirements.

Since each scholarly work has its unique features and history, no set of objective criteria can address every conceivable type of joint authorship circumstance. The proper and fair acknowledgment of the actual contributions of colleagues, students, and staff remains the duty of the person circulating the work or submitting it for publication. In making the decision on authorship only professional considerations should be taken into account. Under no circumstances should authorship be used for a purpose other than to reflect on the contribution of the collaborators to the work in question. In cases of doubt about proper credit, consultation among the collaborators and with colleagues, the Department Head, and/or the Dean is encouraged. In such discussions, the following specific guidelines may be useful, although they are not intended to be in any way binding:

1. If a contribution is of a clearly technical nature (such as performing routine chemical analyses, transcribing interview records, or tabulating raw data), an acknowledgment could be sufficient. The same applies to professional help such as material preparation and instrument construction, drafting, statistical or computer assistance, and so forth.
2. If, however, the central topic of the publication is the presentation or evaluation of a technique (including computer software), then a technical contribution may be of sufficient importance to merit authorship.
3. If an individual suggested an idea that had an impact on the work development but did not actively participate in its implementation, acknowledgment of the contribution will be sufficient.
4. If an individual contributed a key idea or ideas, and/or made other substantial creative contribution to the work in its design, execution, interpretation, and/or summary, then (s)he is entitled to authorship.
5. A graduate student whose thesis work is used as the major source of material for a publication is entitled to authorship. However, (s)he is not automatically entitled to authorship if some material from the thesis is used in a review paper, proposal, progress or final report written by the advisor or project director. In such a case, a reference to the material's origin is sufficient.
6. And finally, administrative or financial responsibility by itself does not merit authorship.

Despite these guidelines, coauthorship is often difficult to allocate. In the case of professor and student, it should be allocated generously to the student in doubtful cases. In every case, however, it is essential to discuss coauthorship with all possible collaborators before and at each step during the project so that misunderstandings will be less likely to arise at the time of publication.

On occasion, authorship credit may be disputed. In such a situation, any or all of the involved parties are entitled to use the services of the University Ombudsperson, without threat or fear of reprisal. Of course, if any party believes that an instance of misconduct

has occurred, the University's policy regarding Charges of Misconduct in Research and Scholarly Activities may be invoked.

| The Research Council and Graduate Council therefore recommend to the Faculty Senate a motion as follows: MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the foregoing statement as the Joint Authorship Policy of the University of Massachusetts - Amherst.

Draft Memo

May 5, 2006

To: Charlena M. Seymour, Provost

From: The Faculty Senate Research Council

Re: Faculty Research Mentoring: Recommendations for the Campus Research Community

Cc: Paul Kostecki, John Mullin, Mary Deane Sorcinelli

Preamble

As a University, we have not had to think about growth for a long time. That has changed with the Chancellor's 250 Plan. With the increased number of faculty hires, the scale and scope of our faculty development needs are greater than they have ever been. What are we going to do to ensure the research and scholarly success of our new hires? In the interest of promoting synergism across the campus, we address these recommendations for faculty research mentoring to all levels of the University. These are recommendations, not mandates. Some departments already implement some of the best practices that we propose. These recommendations are put forward as a means to improve the research productivity of all faculty here at UMass Amherst.

University-level Recommendations:

Gather data

- (1) We wish to see, annually, a report that shows the following data: how long does it take new faculty to submit their first extramural grant proposal? Does this happen by the first, second, or third year? What is the breakdown by department?
- (2) We wish to see a report that shows how many faculty stay at UMass to the point of tenure and beyond. Institutional research does not study the retention of faculty, although they have data that could be used for that purpose.
- (3) Is the loss of faculty at tenure due to a lack of research? Is the lack of research due to a lack of mentoring? The answer to these questions will require time-intensive study. We recognize that some faculty with adequate mentoring do not meet expectations; however, some faculty apparently receive no mentoring at all. We would like to see the provost's office give answers in the aggregate regarding tenure (yes/no) and characterization of research, teaching, and service (poor, fair, strong, excellent). We would like to see the collection of

qualitative interview data, and we want these results made available to the Research Council.

- (4) We would like to see exit interviews carried out and analyzed for all faculty who leave UMass prior to retirement. We want the Provost's Office to create an exit interview form that allows us to identify barriers to research that faculty have encountered.

Increase communication

- (5) Facilitate deans talking to deans to share the models of research mentoring that work in different colleges. The mechanism for this is already in place. The deans meet with the research administration in once/month meetings
- (6) Provide a mechanism for department heads/chairs to talk to department heads/chairs across colleges to share models of research mentoring. One possibility could be research mentoring as a session topic at the annual heads and chairs conference.
- (7) Continue to promote the research that is happening around the University to the entire UMass community.

Promote seminars

- (8) Continue Bruce McCandless' seminars on proposal writing.
- (9) Continue "Preparing for Tenure" seminars with a greater emphasis on research and funding sources.

Fund new initiatives

- (10) UMass should be as proactive about research development as it has been about teacher development. Develop a Center for Research modeled after the Center for Teaching with similar programs and perks (e.g., a release from teaching for one fellowship, a new computer for another) with the stipulation that faculty develop externally funded research and scholarship. Responsible conduct of research should be included in the curriculum. Representatives from extramural funding agencies and campus experts could be brought in as guest speakers.
- (11) Provide Departmental Research Grants (DRG) for faculty research mentoring to encourage research among junior and senior faculty. Follow up by evaluating the 4.2 reviews for research of untenured faculty, and funded research productivity of all faculty. For example, departments could propose release time from teaching, workshops, or group lunches with the goal of supporting grant development.
- (12) Endow a mentoring table at the faculty club (the VPR mentoring lunch) where once per week two faculty from different colleges, two heads (chairs, or associate heads) or directors of centers or institutes from different colleges, or two deans or associate deans from different colleges are paired to discuss faculty research mentoring. Departments with different strengths in research should be paired, for example, Art and Art History paired with Computer Science. The office of research affairs should coordinate the pairing.

Intra-College Recommendations:

- (1) Develop and implement initiatives to increase research productivity.
The Center for Research on Families in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is one successful model. Meetings twice a week with lunch encourage grant writing through accountability (updates of progress), and through statistical and logistical support. The benefit of this model is that it jump starts new faculty into a focus on funded research, and it gives a nudge to established faculty who have gotten comfortable in their academic trajectory. The limitation of this model is that it only lasts for one year. Another model comes from departments and colleges where a pre-review panel evaluates grant proposals prior to submission.
- (2) Invest in grant-writing assistance
Models for this range from a network of people who know how to do budgets (CSBS) to someone who actually writes grants for investigators (Nursing). Pre-qualify the grant-writers in the Connecticut Valley to better facilitate the availability of proposal writing resources to the research community.
- (3) Encourage faculty to make better use of automated alert services such as IRIS, COS, NSF, or NIH.
- (4) Pair new faculty members with established faculty who share common Research interests, but who reside in different departments within the college.

Intra-Departmental Recommendations:

- (1) At the time of hire, stress the relative importance of research and scholarship, and then maintain continuity of the rules. Spell out that a new faculty member could make up to an additional 33% of their salary during the summer on sponsored research projects. Provide funds for an undergraduate assistant. For example, some engineering faculty are given an undergraduate assistant for up to 10 hours per week for the first two years. Explicitly state that new hires are expected to pursue research funding and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline.
- (2) Develop a checklist for new faculty to review each year, for the first three years or longer. The checklist could be administered by either the Chair of the personnel committee or the Chair/Head of the department. Ask really obvious questions such as (a) what journals are you going to submit to? (b) what conferences are you going to attend and when are the abstract deadlines? (c) what is your research time line? (d) who funds what you do and what are your grant submission plans? (e) who will write your external letters?
- (3) Provide a rotating course release so that at any time at least one (or two or three) faculty member(s) in the department has a course release to write a grant proposal. (This could be funded by the DRG program, see above in University-level recommendations.)
- (4) Provide travel money. It is impossible to put a price on the value of networking for nurturing collaborative grants.

- (5) Use the AFR personnel committee and department head/chair paragraphs as an opportunity to evaluate faculty members' progress in order to tailor research mentoring.