

BFC Research Affairs Committee --- January 12, 2024 Minutes

Present: Ben Kravitz (Co-Chair), Jillian Kinzie (Co-Chair), Karen Rogers, Dan Tracey, Kaylie Hash, Cindy Hmelo-Silver, Wen Qi, Ashley Clark, Seth Freedman, Lana Spendl (rep),

The meeting began with happy new year wishes. The December 2023 minutes were not available for review and approval.

Ben reviewed the agenda including updates from Brea, Discussion of research ranks, and Go-around with updates, issues, and discussion items.

Brea was unable to attend so Kaylie Hash briefly reported on updates from IU Research and the Office of the Provost. Remarks included an update on IU's Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR). Several faculty listening sessions related to ICR policies being developed for the Bloomington campus were conducted in December 2023 with the task of developing a framework and guidelines surrounding ICR use and accumulation. The ICR allocation formula for centrally administered (IU Research managed) CIMs, was formalized December 11, 2023: <https://research.iu.edu/about/centers-institutes/irc-allocation-formula.html>. There are new ideas about catalyzing research in aging and environment and those who have ideas about faculty who would be helpful in enhancing IU's research impact in these areas are encouraged to reach out to Brea and Kaylie.

Ben then invited an open forum. There was a discussion about the firing of Susan Glowacz, the BIACUC Administrator. Not much information can be provided, as this is a personnel matter. The position involved the review of animal oversight, and if there are differences between how things are being handled in Bloomington and Indianapolis, there is cause for concern as the offices are centralized. This removal happened quickly and now research is impacted.

Susan was the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) manager for Bloomington. She sent reviews for IACUC protocols, put together minutes for monthly meetings, training for IACUC for new PIs. Kept up on regulatory issues. The concern is that the rationale for firing was based on inflated charges. Infractions seem to be minor and were used as an excuse to terminate. People working with Susan appreciated her role, and now researchers at IU are affected. Committee members were asked to gather information from colleagues to describe how their research is being impacted by this dismissal.

Discussion centered on IU administration interest in combining offices, and perhaps the centralization process exposed discrepancies that could not be overlooked. The concern then turned to the way the dismissal was handled and its negative impact on research. In addition, because the process moved quickly it introduced additional problems. Dan will provide the committee additional information as he learns it.

Another topic of discussion was the suspension of Abdulkader Sinno for violating university policy when he submitted a room reservation form. Some wondered if this is germane to the BFAC Research Affairs committee. The issue will be discussed in Faculty Council, and will be in the Chair's remarks. Lana confirmed that BFC is taking this up.

Wen reported that we will be replacing Digital Measures as the Faculty Annual Report platform. Two vendors are being considered. The Associate Deans are seeking feedback on the two platforms and

there are recorded demo session from both vendors. It is expected that this will roll out in the next two years. Contracts will need to be negotiated.

The committee then turned to the Research Ranks Policy including discussion of the 4 documents provided to committee members in advance of the meeting including: Proposed Revisions to Research Ranks on the Bloomington Campus; and the Research Ranks at Indiana University BL-ACA-A5 original, red-lined, and clean. Ben introduced the purpose of the updated policy for research ranks on campus. Jillian and Ben have taken a first cut at policy changes and are seeking input.

This is our major policy and the plan is to get this rolled out this year. Discussion started with points in need of clarification. The major concern is why we should have the title “Research Professor” and who should have it. Ben expressed that the idea is to protect research faculty and to clarify expectations about what positions do and how they should be best leveraged for research advantage.

Committee members asked for clarification of the difference between Research Professor (RP) and Research Scientist (RS) - internally what’s the difference? The distinction is mostly about defining the RP as an independent researcher, relying on soft money and building an independent research project reputation. The Research Scientist role is to sustain and lend specific expertise to a research project.

Cindy inquired about the relationship between Research Tenure and eligibility for NSF CAREER grants. We should try and distinguish this and IU eligibility for NSF CAREER grants. Depending on the answer, this could be persuasive. The plan is to keep Research Tenure in the current document. We want to keep it on the agenda, and recognize something that is already in policy that protects faculty who have been here a long time and contribute significant project stability.

Discussion continued on the distinction between RS and RP. The idea is for the RP to be an independent PI, and the RS is contributing specific capabilities. The RP role seems an important title to designate the senior person who makes significant research contributions, yet as an RS they are not in charge of their own publications or able to submit grants. Questions then centered on how these positions will be determined and who gets which title. This seems to be an important conversation with unit heads, and then OVPFAA can have a conversation.

The qualifications for rank were then discussed. Post-Docs can enter the rank for Assistant Scientist in a more straightforward way now that the policy is clarified. This had not been the case previously; the policy has not been enacted fairly or consistently. Research Associate is not an appropriate title for Post Docs and this practice should not continue.

Promotion criteria were also briefly discussed. Should the unit need two sets of promotion criteria for these two roles? If no guidance is in the promotion policy then that could make it difficult. Criteria similar to the research track faculty are needed and it will be up to units to decide. To be promoted you have to meet the criteria. OVPFAA will rely on what the department guidelines say. The Committee wonders if there a plan in place to have unit level policies reviewed and approved by OVPFAA. Ben drafted a policy but Judah advised waiting on this until after the broader policy is

adopted. We can do some preparatory work on promotion criteria. Kaylie has Research policy on promotion for OVPR that might help us get started.

We have reserved first reading of the revised BL-ACA-A5, March 5 and second reading on April 2.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 am. Respectfully submitted by Jillian Kinzie