

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (RAAC)
1 p.m. on Monday, December 7, 2020
via Zoom

Present:

Darlene Booker	Stacy Leotta
Audrey Callahan	Sherry Loyd
Vikki Cherwon	Carl Mahler
Valerie Crickard	Angelica Martins
Paul Cryer	Nikki Simmons
Stafford Farmer	Peter Szanton
Elaine Jacobs	Mary Welsh
Rachel Ladenheim	Shanda Wirt

Absent:

Jeremy Alajajian	Stephanie Sanchez-Esparragoza
Lesley Brown	Ellen Zavala
Denise Bradley-Fluellen	

The meeting started at 1:02 p.m.

Meeting Opening:

- I. Approval of Meeting Minutes for 11/2/20 RAAC meeting
Valerie Crickard moved to accept the minutes as submitted, which motion was seconded by Angelica Martins and passed without opposition.

Old Business:

- II. Revised Policy 50.5/Compliance with UG 200.466, Review and Feedback
Previously Dr. Tankersley had discussed the proposed changes to the policy for charging tuition to research awards. This is still a draft policy, as is the proposed timeline for implementation. He opened the floor for questions and concerns. Peter Szanton reported that faculty in CLAS asked when the policy was expected to go into effect; Dr. Tankersley responded that the proposed timeline is not official and that he was happy to share the proposed policy with them while it is still in draft form. The effective date for the start of Phase I is anticipated to be in the Fall of 2021 with tuition packages expected to be in effect by March of 2022 and full compliance expected by Fall of 2022. The Associate Deans of the colleges are currently collecting information about the status of the programs within their colleges in order to determine what changes, if any, are needed. Ms. Crickard asked whether the draft policy can be shared with the Graduate School and Dr. Tankersley responded that the Graduate School had already seen it and are welcome to see the current draft. Receiving no feedback at the RAAC meeting he asked for a motion to approve it as a draft policy to be referred to GCA and the Associate Deans to implement once plans for phasing it in were finalized. This was moved by Rachel Ladenheim, seconded by Peter Szanton, and passed without opposition.

- III. Update on Student Education Policy 50.10
This policy was approved at the last meeting. Ms. Crickard noted that Brad Trahan and Samantha Sears in the Office of Legal Affairs will provide additional comments to her this week to ensure that attestations are provided by the PI's before enrolling students in the training programs. Modifications may need to be made to Niner Research in order to identify and track training programs.
- IV. Standardization of Excel Spreadsheets for Budgets
Mr. Mahler reported that Shanda Wirt had previously distributed the template spreadsheet that is used in the College of Engineering. He will contact all the interested parties in the near future to determine what changes, if any, should be made so that the spreadsheet can be used as a campus-wide template and will circulate it soon afterwards. This standardized spreadsheet will be finalized by January and faculty will be requested to start using it immediately.

New Business:

- V. R1 Commission
In the near future Chancellor Gaber will announce the formation of a committee to lead the University to becoming an R1 institution. Twenty-five faculty will be on the committee which Dr. Tankersley will chair. The committee will be charged with two separate initiatives. The first is to analyze the criteria for becoming an R1 institution and identifying gaps that the University must address. Part of this initiative involves looking at other institutions that recently moved from R2 to R1 and analyzing the strategies that they used. This effort will include holding structured interviews with some of those institutions. The end product of this initiative will be a recommendation to the Chancellor of strategies for the University to implement. The other initiative will be to identify areas of interdisciplinary research excellence on campus, including both ones that currently exist and others that are emerging. This initiative will be a more complex effort than the other. Various research areas will be reviewed both by University personnel and people outside of the institution. A draft final report will be completed by the week of March 7. Ms. Crickard and Mr. Szanton have agreed to serve on this committee, which includes faculty, staff, and deans.
- VI. Avoiding error messages when using the new NSF Biosketch and CPS Templates
Lesley Brown and Shanda Wirt experienced an unexpected situation last year when uploading information, especially biographical information and "current and pending" awards, into NSF's Fastlane system. NSF recommends that proposers and administrators download the fillable pdf's first and populate those fields as this seems to minimize or prevent the error messages. Ms. Brown noted that the disappearance of a blue background in the fillable section of a pdf is an indicator that the field will not upload into Fastlane. The FAQ page for Fastlane, question #6, addresses the issue. Stacey Leotta said that some people use ScienceDB to maintain their biographical information to upload that

information into Fastlane and noted that this avoids the difficulties that Ms. Wirt and Ms. Brown encountered. Dr. Tankersley added that the Catalyst program encourages PI's to use ScienceDB.

- VII. Proposed revision of Policy 20.2 Deadline for Proposal Submissions to University Offices
The proposed language of Policy 20.2 was circulated prior to the start of the meeting and Mr. Szanton reviewed it with the Committee. The Policy Statement section includes information that was obtained from East Carolina University during discussions of that university's implementation of InfoEd's modules for proposals and awards. The Procedures section of the proposed policy specifies that if the deadlines are not met the PI must send emails to his/her Chair and Dean for approval before the proposal can move forward. Mr. Szanton noted that this is merely a suggestion and invited members of the Committee to propose alternatives should the specified deadlines not be met. Vicki Cherwon suggested that if the final 48 hour deadline is not met then the proposal should not be submitted and Dr. Tankersley expressed support for Ms. Cherwon's suggestion. Mr. Szanton noted that the deadlines specified in the draft policy can be changed and that it might be advisable to require that the initial creation of the IPF be made 14 days in advance of the submission deadline rather than 10 days. Stafford Farmer asked if the deadlines are business days or calendar days; Dr. Tankersley recommends making them all business days. Sherry Loyd asked if some mention should be made about providing time to evaluate University Conflicts of Interest; she recommended that this issue be noted in the policy so that researchers are aware of it. Dr. Tankersley noted that in messaging the policy some specific items such as cost share should be referenced, along with any relevant policies. At his request the policy was tabled until he has had an opportunity to review it with the Associate Deans and provide them a chance to give feedback.
- VIII. Proposed revision of Policy 20.1 PI Status
Tabled for next meeting because Dr. Tankersley is working with the Office of Legal Affairs in order to develop a more comprehensive version of this policy.

The meeting ended at 2:04.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl P. B. Mahler, II