Faculty Senate Research Committee
Final Report FY14, 8 April 2014

The following document includes reports on Standing Charges 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and Specific Charges 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Standing Charge 1

> Monitor the administration of the General Research Fund (GRF) and make recommendations, as needed, to ensure its effectiveness and appropriate utilization.

No specific GRF issues were raised during FY14. For further consideration of the GRF, see Specific Charge 4.

Standing Charges 2 and 3

> **Charge 2**
> Monitor the execution of the University's Restricted Research Policy (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX) in handling requests for exceptions.
> **Charge 3**
> Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.

As chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC), Celka Straughn served as an ex-officio member of the Restricted Research Committee. There were no appeals of decisions made by the Restricted Research Committee during FY14.

Straughn met with the Restricted Research Committee (FSRRC) for their 1/31/2014 meeting. In addition to other FSRRC issues, members discussed FSRC charges relating to restricted research and to follow up on an FY13 suggestion about the possibility of informing faculty further about restricted research issues through some sort of training, since federal laws are changing regarding restrictions and with greater severity for noncompliance. It was determined that an optional faculty training module regarding the restricted research process and associated compliance requirements should be developed for targeted groups for whom it is likely to be pertinent. The Office of Research will take the lead on developing this tool and will consult the FSRRC and the FSRC for their input on draft tutorials.

The Office of Research is also working on issues regarding the increase in activity in areas relating to restricted research, working with industry, the DOD and international collaborations. Other issues not named are rare instances, but the Office of Research is prepared if anything arises. The Office of Research is planning to create training materials to share, especially with new faculty as well as other faculty, and possibly graduate students. The Office of Research will keep the FSRC informed.

Standing Charge 4

Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited. Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx.

There were no cases presented to the FSRC. This is an issue that comes up rarely and would be generated by the Office of Research, most likely in the case of policy changes/review. Further information is located in the policy library. It is the FSRC's role to ensure a fair review process and that those selected have enough time to develop proposal (usually a month).

Standing Charge 5

Continue working with the ACEC (Academic Computing and Electronic Communications) Committee to process needs for and issues with computing and telecommunications for research, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures and monitoring ongoing and new developments in IT. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx as needed.

The FSRC had no direct communication with ACEC. Committee member Larry Hoyle volunteered to serve as the FSRC representative to ACEC and he attended the March meeting.

Specific Charge 1

With regard to Standing Charge 4, explore ways to accomplish initial reviews electronically since getting a face-to-face committee meeting takes time and these cases are often rushed.

The Office of Research finds that there is need for face-to-face meetings as materials are all already submitted electronically and it seems to run smoothly. Decisions usually are made very quickly so that PIs have as much time to prepare.

Specific Charge 2

Continue to consider issues related to the use of Academic Analytics for external evaluations of the University and internal research evaluations for departments, programs, and faculty; the applicability of AA metrics to diverse disciplines; and the flexibility or possibility to incorporate other qualitative and quantitative metrics (such as the PRO/Digital Measures system) into AA method of analysis. Examine how metrics from AA and PRO are being determined and used, and if these are well adapted to different disciplines and types of research activity. Explore how these metrics are impacting faculty research, research opportunities and the understanding of faculty research profiles.

Rodolfo Torres, Associate Vice Chancellor for the Office of Research, reported that full implementation of PRO (Professional Record Online) is likely take another full year. All information for PRO is provided by the faculty and is largely an expanded version of one's curriculum vitae. One goal for PRO is to replace forms for P&T and sabbatical; it will also

replace all unit annual reports. It has features to produce reports, but PRO data do not generate metrics. Currently PRO is used in Business for merit evaluations. PRO has a feature that allows for searches of faculty research backgrounds and expertise. A useful tool for the FSRC, PRO will include information on GRF grants.

Torres also explained that Academic Analytics (AA), a system that aggregates faculty information, gathers data from a variety of other sources. While AA does not draw from a full, complete range of sources, AA information tends to be accurate (e.g. publications, citations, conferences, grants, awards). There is some delay in information by a couple of years and the information is generally quantitative. AA has a feature for a faculty scholarly productivity index, a metric with weights similar to those of the National Research Council (a more controversial feature) that compares to a national mean. Weights differ according to disciplines. AA can explore various comparisons, e.g. with funding sources (only federal agencies). KU's current subscription does not allow for individual faculty records.

AA is used primarily for chairs, deans, and directors to access. It is currently used by the Office of Research for funding questions and research investment, some deans for decision making, and all chairs have the option to use it, and some do already. The FSRC raised the question about comparison among KU units (e.g. Journalism and Business – is this used and/or useful?). AA is useful for comparisons with peer units at other institutions; it has a new tool to select peers for comparison (useful for benchmarking and to try and understand what peers are doing to achieve success). AA analyzes departments and PhD programs (not MA level). It is possible to have AA run certain studies as part of the basic fee. The FSRC questioned whether units use AA information for accreditation. AA data cannot be used for publishable comparisons.

The Office of Research will try to provide a consulting service for departments to learn more about AA. There seems to be a lack of clarity of information about how AA is used among faculty at large. Additionally, as AA appears to gather data only from traditional scholarly publications and proceedings, how does this affect faculty in units that may fall outside of this productivity index (e.g. faculty who produce creative activity as part of their scholarly work). In FY15 the FSRC can contact deans, the Office of Research, the Provost's Office, and research units to inquire as to how AA is currently being used, its usefulness, its challenges and other possible relevant issues, including:
     - how the Provost's Office uses AA to compare units across campus (e.g. in relation to budgets)
     -how deans use AA to compare to peers and across campus
     -how AA may be used as part of review processes, in particular post-tenure review
     -how AA is used for funding opportunities
     -how useful is AA for research centers (e.g. for cross-disciplinary work).

Specific Charge 3
     In coordination with ACEC, RGS, and KU Libraries, investigate issues of research data (collection, analysis, storage, curation, etc.).

Management of research data continues to be a key issue and one gaining in urgency, particularly as funding agencies update policies for data management plans (e.g. open access). These

agencies may soon require and check that researchers make data available. While Great Britain has some models in place, it seems KU can be a US leader in this area.

The FSRC strongly encourages KU to develop plans and structures for data management. FSRC members Larry Hoyle, Daniel Spencer and Derek Reed formed a subcommittee and convened a meeting with members of the Office of Research (Rodolfo Torres) and KU Libraries (Jamene Brooks-Kieffer) to discuss issues and ways to move forward. Key issues include: research replicability, academic integrity, transparency, publication/research citations, compliance, data storage, data preservation, data management and the repurposing of data for uses unanticipated by the original researchers. Policy is needed with regard to ownership, administration, maintenance, and privacy, among other issues. Infrastructure needed includes physical aspects, software, and human resources. Challenges range from awareness, confidentiality, workflow, disciplinary crossing, collaboration, lack of tools and post-project funding.

For the development of a KU plan it will be important to involve KU IT, the KU Libraries, ITTC, among other campus units, faculty input as well as the FSRC and ACEC Faculty Senate Committees. Therefore, the FSRC recommends the creation of a task force comprised of members from across these constituencies and convened by the Office of the Provost and the Office of Research.

References

Akers, Katherine G. and Jennifer Doty Difference among Faculty Ranks in Views on Research Data Management. Available at http://www.iassistdata.org/downloads/iqvol36_2_doty_0.pdf

Cassidy, John The Reinhart and Rogoff Controversy: A Summing Up http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/johncassidy/2013/04/the-rogoff-and-reinhart-controversy-a-summing-up.html

Erway, Ricky. 2013 Starting the Conversation: University-wide Research Data management Policy. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research.

Jahnke, Lori and Andrew Asher, Spencer D.C. Keralis 2012 The Problem of Data. Council on Library and information Resources available at http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub154/pub154.pdf

Research Data Stewardship at UNC Recommendations for Scholarly Practice and Leadership 2012 available at: http://sils.unc.edu/sites/default/files/general/research/UNC_Research_Data_Stewardship_Report.pdf

Vines, Timothy H, Arianne Y.K. Albert, Rose L. Andrew, Florence Débarre, 4, Dan G. Bock, Michelle T. Franklin, Kimberly J. Gilbert, Jean-Sébastien Moore1, Sébastien Renaut and Diana J. Rennison. The Availability of Research Data Declines Rapidly with Article Age Current Biology - 19 December 2013

White House directives on open data http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/2013/m-13-13.pdf

<u>Specific Charge 4</u>

> Drawing upon the FY13 Research Committee Report, and in coordination with RGS, review and possibly reassess the total allocation system and structure of GRF awards.

Due to the lack of coordination by FSRC Chair Celka Straughn, this charge did not receive any attention. Nonetheless, it remains a significant area for the FSRC to address, particularly in the coming year in advance of the next review scheduled for FY16.