

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE
Research Policy and Advisory Committee

Minutes

May 16, 2019; 1:00 p.m.

Kenwood IRC 2175

1. Call to order and approval of the agenda

Robin Mello called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

Members Present:

Mark Harris (ex officio), Linda Kopecky, Tom Marcussen (ex officio), Robin Mello, Victoria Moerchen, Doug Stafford, Jorg Woehl, Dietmar Wolfram (GFC Representative)

Members Absent:

Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska (ex officio), , John Reuter, Brooke Slavens, Michael Zimmer

Guests:

Kathleen Koch, Rachel Schiffman, Michelle Schoenecker (Office of Research); Kyle Janssen (Prototyping Center)

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Automatic Consent

The minutes of the March 14, 2019 meeting were approved as distributed.

3. Election of Chair for 2019-20

Robin Mello stated that she was willing to stand for election. Victoria Moerchen moved to nominate her as RPAC Chair for 2019-20; Jorg Woehl seconded the nomination. No one else sought nomination. Dr. Mello was elected by acclamation.

4. Roles and Responsibilities in Sponsored Research Administration

Rachel Schiffman presented the document, "Roles and Responsibilities in Developing and Managing Extramural and Selected Intramural Sponsored Projects" for a first reading by the RPAC. It is still a work-in-progress.

The document outlines the legal authority for applications and acceptance of external research awards, which is delegated to the campus from the Board of Regents. It also provides an overview of roles and responsibilities for sponsored projects for the Office of Research, the Office of Sponsored Programs, the Division and/or Department and Shared Services areas, and Principal Investigators. It was developed over several months with input from a task group (In exploring how other universities communicate this information, she found that most have definitions of roles and some have a matrix with checkboxes. The University of Michigan uses a matrix with RASCI coding (R=Responsibility, A=Authority, S=Support for those who are responsible or accountable; C=Consulted as needed; I=Informed of progress or completion); she

adapted that model for UWM. It also sets timelines for: OSP review, response to OSP questions, and receipt of all components prior to submission.

The final version will be able as a comprehensive span of all sponsored activities, or in sections by stages of the process.

Questions and comments from the discussion:

How will the research community be informed about the document? There will likely be separate meetings with each school and college, as each has its own organization and support structure.

How is PI status determined now? Faculty automatically have PI status; academic staff may request it with support from their unit. Decision to grant PI status is based on the project and the person, and can be a blanket authorization or for a specific project or time period.

How will Authority and Responsibility be determined for multidisciplinary teams? Non-financial tasks could be distributed among the group. As specific task related questions arise, consultation with OSP is recommended.

How will this be implemented at the PI level? This is yet to be determined. Some universities require first time awardees to meet with OSP to review next steps; some universities extend that requirement to awards from a different type of sponsor than the PI has had experience with; some require periodic modular training.

5. Internal Funding Programs

Mark Harris summarized recent discussions in the Office of Research about the four internal funding programs exploring:

- What we would like to fund
- What we can afford to fund
- What is funded by other administrative units

We are thinking of the programs as more of an array and will likely have to impose caps and “time-out” periods on all the awards. This is necessary due to a significant reduction in funding for the two largest programs over the last several years, and increased demand for travel awards.

There would be “tiers” of funding, with the high range still being reserved for preliminary data gathering and proof of concept as a basis for larger external grant proposals. The mid-range grants would not require follow-on external grants and would not be solely for seed funding, but would require clear outcomes/deliverables. There would still be investment in building collaborations, with two different caps in each grant program – one for single investigators, one for multidisciplinary proposals. The program to support groups learning how to change the approach to research from being an individual investigator (with or without using consultants) to working collaboratively - drawing on each member’s expertise, achieving a greater

understanding of each other's disciplines, agreeing on how to make decisions, forming the research more holistically – would continue.

If decisions about the competitive grants could be made at the same time, it would allow some flexibility in moving funds to support the best applications overall. In time, unused funds at project close out might be used toward new pilot programs.

The impact of the travel award could be expanded by opening it to all disciplines (currently limited to Arts & Humanities), but this would require imposing a lower cap (\$500 vs. \$900) and limiting the awards to one per person every two years.

During discussion, Doug Stafford noted the need for "rapid response" funds, which would allow a PI to gather additional data to fill gaps noted by external review panels in otherwise strong proposals, increasing the probability of funding upon resubmission.

6. Topics for future agendas

- School/college research plans
- Research-related data from the gradSERU (Graduate Student Experience in the Research University) survey
- The role of the UWM Libraries in Supporting Research
- Internal support needed for an R1 institution
- Reviewing progress and impediments in implementing the Plan for Research Excellence
- Research space and labs
- Policy on use of research funds upon PI retirement
- Programs in the Office of Undergraduate Research

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Kathleen Koch