

Senate Research Committee (SRC)
September 17, 2018
Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: University Senate Overview, BOR Policy Review: Research Involving Human Subjects, Conflicts of Interest in Research, SRC Agenda Planning for the 2018-19 Academic Year, Works Faculty Activity Reporting System Overview]

PRESENT: Philip Zelazo (chair), Alex Ardagh, Bill Arnold, Gregory Cuomo, Crystal Dyer, Jennifer Franko, Sumanth Gopinath, Leslie Kennedy, Boyd Kuhmer, Tucker LeBien, Al Levine, Julie Olson, Nicole Pilman, Nelson Rhodus, Susannah Smith, Claire Stewart, Christian Teyssier, Kathleen Vohs, Carston Wagner, Pamela Webb, Harrison West

REGRETS: Tasoulla Hadjiyanni, Diana Karwan, Michael Kyba,

ABSENT: Carol Carrier, Crystal Dyer, Jeanette Gundel, David Roberts, Teresa Rose-Hellekant, Vaybhav Shaw, Logan Spector

GUESTS: Frances Lawrenz, Associate Vice President of Research, Office for the Vice President of Research; Debbie Dykhuis, Executive Director, Institutional Review Board, Office for the Vice President of Research; Jon Guden, Associate Director, Office of Institutional Compliance; Ole Gram, Assistant Vice Provost, Faculty and Academic Affairs; Erin Edwards, business analyst/special projects manager, Faculty and Academic Affairs

OTHERS ATTENDING: Bri Kenney, Dan Gilchrist, Jason Langworthy

Chair Philip Zelazo welcomed the committee and the members introduced themselves.

1. University Senate Overview

Bobbie Erichsen, senate associate, University Senate Office, provided an overview of University Senate Governance, and how the Senate Research Committee fits into that structure.

2. BOR Policy Review: Research Involving Human Subjects

Frances Lawrenz, Associate Vice President of Research, Office for the Vice President of Research (OVPR), told committee members that the policy update was part of a routine review, but that it was also prompted by the [Implementation Team](#), which is charged with reviewing the recommendations of the external review panel and considering other changes necessary to strengthen the University's human research protections and make it a national model. Lawrenz explained three main changes to the policy, which were mostly based on recommendations by the Faculty Consultative Committee.

1. The section titled "guiding principles" was added to the policy.

2. The language in the policy originally used the terminology “subjects” in referring to people involved in the studies, and that was changed to name these individuals "participants."
3. Not all IRB protocols require continued review anymore, so that detail was removed from the policy language.

Tucker LeBien asked how the language threshold was determined for the Board of Regents policy, when taking the complexity of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) into account. Lawrenz informed him that the Board of Regents policies are intended to set broad parameters, and then the administrative policies are put in place to operationalize the parameters. Put another way, the Board of Regents policies help clarify the philosophy of the institution, she said.

Committee members also discussed some of the language in the “guiding principles” section of the policy.

3. Conflicts of Interest in Research

Zelazo introduced the agenda topic and told members that it was added to the agenda after the [Dr. José Baselga controversy](#) at the Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center. Jon Guden, Associate Director, Conflict of Interest Program, then introduced himself and explained that his office receives roughly 11,000 reports of external professional activities each year, and those reports are the primary way that they get faculty and staff to disclose their external financial business interests. He said the Conflicts of Interest Program reviews external significant financial interests, and they define those interests in two ways: (1) through use of National Institute of Health (NIH) standards (this applies to anyone doing public health service funded research or is involved in clinical health care); or, (2) through the use of National Science Foundation (NSF) standards (more than \$10,000). Some of the financial or business interest disclosures that they look for include:

- consulting or speaking fees;
- equity held through stock, stock options or start-up investments;
- service on an advisory board or board of directors; or,
- service in an executive role for a business entity (for-profit or non-profit).

All of these interests would be disclosed on a [Report of External Professional Activities \(REPA\)](#), Guden explained, and the report describes what disclosures are required.

If significant financial or business interests are disclosed, the individual will be asked additional questions on the REPA, and a conflict review panel will assess the disclosures, if necessary, Guden said. That panel will determine whether there is a conflict, and if so, if the conflict can be managed. Guden told the committee that in almost all cases, the conflict can be managed with oversight and conflict management plans, but added that the highest risk areas involve human participants. Guden walked members through a few scenarios wherein a conflict may not be manageable. Guden said the key is to be transparent.

Guden said the Conflicts of Interest Program is mostly driven by federal funding agency standards. Pamela Webb, associate vice president, OVPR, added that NIH and NSF standards require conflicts to be disclosed before a conflict can be submitted to them, and the University

cannot legally submit a proposal unless a REPA is on file (it does not have to be complete, but it must be started). If there is a need for a conflict management plan, Webb explained, then that plan has to be in place before any money is spent.

Webb also told members that there is an option for a retrospective review, which has been invoked a few times. If a Principal Investigator (PI) realizes after a project has started that a conflict was not disclosed, the University has to go back and analyze the full project to determine whether the PI had bias as a result of the information, she said.

LeBien asked what the COI Program would do in a case where an investigator failed to disclose conflicts that were then reported by another individual. Guden said that they would likely bring the matter before a conflicts review panel for discussion, and then make a recommendation based on the [Individual Conflicts of Interest and Standards Governing Relationships with Business Entities policy](#).

4. SRC Agenda planning for the 2018-19 Academic Year

Zelazo asked members for input on the 2018-19 SRC agendas. Members provided the following potential topics:

- Nelson Rhodus offered to update SRC on the Public Engagement Council (PEC). He explained that the council is planning to discuss the research value of community engaged service, and told members that he could bring questions to the council from the SRC, or report in an SRC meeting what came out of that conversation.
- Claire Stewart recommended discussing research impact.
- Bill Arnold suggested talking about government agencies, most prominently the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), declaring that agencies won't use data in making decisions unless all of the data is available, and how that might impact some of the research at the University. This issue will likely raise questions about funding status, etc., he explained. Zelazo wondered if that would fall under a broader overview of research openness and the changes in many fields pushing towards pre-registration and data sharing. Stewart commented that the [Open Access Policy](#) is under review this year.
- Arnold also suggested discussing whether there is movement towards allowing postdocs to keep their University email accounts; he explained that undergraduate and graduate students are able to keep their email accounts, but not postdocs.
- Sumanth Gopinath told members that he is on the Presidential Search Committee, and explained what the role entails. He offered to collect any questions or comments from SRC to bring back to the committee, and said he'd be able to provide an update to SRC on the search at the October meeting.

Works faculty activity reporting system overview

Ole Gram, Assistant Vice Provost, Faculty and Academic Affairs, and Erin Edwards, business analyst/special projects manager, Faculty and Academic Affairs, joined the committee [to present Works](#), which is an online activity reporting system for faculty members. Gram explained that the project was born in 2008 from a recommendation by Senate Committee on Information Technology (SCIT), Senate Research Committee (SRC), and Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) members, requesting a faculty activity repository. The benefit of the system is

that faculty only need to input information one time, and are then able to pull the information for multiple purposes (e.g. report routing, the merit process, P&T, accreditation, salary equity reviews, etc.).

Rhodus asked if information is already being collected on faculty. Gram said yes, and clarified that each department determined how much information they wanted input into the system. There is not a mandate in place for colleges to report, however, 50-60% of faculty are on-boarded, he said.

Arnold asked how the data scraping is done for the portions of the system that auto-populate. Edwards reported that the system is built to import any recorded role that is reported on a grant in Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA). There are a lot of systems on campus that manage this type of data, she added, and all of the administrators are continually communicating on how to foster a one stop shop for faculty. She acknowledged that this is not always possible, but said they are trying to work across campus to list the same data in each system.

Arnold expressed concern that the state may require the University to hand over this data at some point. Gram told Arnold that he shares that concern, but cautioned that there is a Faculty Data Governance Committee in place to review data requests, and added that there are other systems of record for much of the information in Works, and data requests would likely be pulled from those systems. The Works system is about communicating what faculty is doing with outreach, and public engagement, he concluded.

Edwards then showed committee members an example of an annual activity report.

With no further business, Zelzo adjourned the meeting.

Bobbie Erichsen
University Senate Office