**UMCES Faculty Senate, Zoom Meeting:**

**August 14, 2020, 10:00-12:00**

Attendees: Mike Wilberg, Sook Chung, Victoria Coles, Helen Bailey, Judy O’Neal, Mario Tamburri, Mark Cochrane, Bob Hilderbrand, Alexandra Fries, Anna Windle, Kia Ramarui, and Dave Nemazie; Peter Goodwin, Lori Stepp, Dave Secor

Agenda

10:00 - Welcome (Wilberg)

10:05 - Plan for review of the VP for Science Applications/IAN (Nemazie/Goodwin)

10:30 – Questions about annual reviews for this year in the face of Covid impacts (Wilberg)

10:45 - Administrative review discussion (Secor)

11:55 - New business (Wilberg)

12:00 - Adjourn

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Agenda

**10:00 – Mike welcomed everyone.**

**10:05 - Plan for review of the VP for Science Applications/IAN (Nemazie/Goodwin)**

Senate feedback was requested on Vice President for Science Application review for and for review of IAN as part of administrative review procedures under shared governance.

Mike mentioned that Bill requested for this review.

Peter stated that this review differs from that of other lab directors due to IAN’s non-traditional way of fundraising and includes the future of IAN with other UMCES activities.

* Two reports will be developed:

1. One open report about each Lab’s potential involvement in IAN next 5 yrs.
2. The other is report is confidential.

* Process: the data collected based on what IAN has done: in-depth discussion with each lab; and anonymous feedback

* Committee will convene at a very early stage at the end of Aug; data collections (what and how); assembled information; the committee will meet Bill who gives a presentation to the review committee; and summarized as a half-day meeting

Continued the c. meeting: to finalize the review report: to board; and another confidential to Bill;

External members of reviews are approached and invited. But there was no

mention about the composition of the committee or internal committee members; Kenny Rose at HPL is chairing this review committee.

           Some questions raised:

Mario asked about IAN’s role in UMCES: how IAN fits UMCES?

Peter first addressed that Bill created a niche in the community and has been working across UMCES labs. In the next five years, where IAN would be in UMCES since all running costs except VP salary are based on soft-funding?

Dave also mentioned that IAN functions as an interface between science/scientists and Chesapeake state agency and Bay programs: to provide management policies.

Mario raised another point of whether reviewing IAN will establish a precedence for reviewing other grant-funded research programs.

Dave N. shared about History IAN that came out 1999: strategic plan: somehow integrating multiple science disciplines: transforming institution in the issue of synthesis and integration:

In 2001: Bill was hired: and strategies have been developed.

A concern was noted that reviewing IAN is different than how faculty would be reviewed. There is not a specific policy for this type of review.

Mike concluded this part, stating that, if any, more questions should be sent to Mike by Wed. Aug. 19th, as for senate responses so that he could provide these to Peter’s office.

**10:30 – Questions about annual reviews for this year in the face of COVID impacts (Wilberg)**

1. Annual review:

Peter stated that expectation in the annual review document has to be different from other previous years. In the annual review, effects of COVIDshould be summarized in a paragraph that includes the goals and plans for the beginning year and how they have been changed due to COVID.

1. Re. Promotion and tenure: those who affected by cruise, filed, lab works should state the impacts.

Mario proposed that there would be a formal statement for annual review, as  impacts on research could go beyond just the first six months and raised concerns about adopting the same standards and expectations as before.

Peter responded that he is aware of the situation and would put out a formal statement:

Peter shared that we all have difficulties of sharing with directors how we failed and what are/were the challenges in an honest way.

Victoria raised concerns and requested clear guidelines because not everyone affected equally: Should be some statements re. those who are affected at different levels.

To address all these, **Mike mentioned about a subcommittee, Review committee, as the senate. Starting in September and providing information by the end of this year for next year's annual review (possibly involving Denise Yost- suggested by Peter).**

**10:45 - Administrative review discussion (led by Dave Secor)**

Secor stated that it was charged by Peter a year ago:

The goal of the committee is to come up with options for improving pre and post award functions in UMCES. The committee is composed of faculty and administrative staff.

Dr. Secor requested faculty input via a survey instrument: survey would be reviewed by the senate.

Come up with an assessment and to submit the executive committee:

Timeline: it should be done by the end of this year (2020);

Putting survey questions together this month: Sept: implement; Nov;

Dec; the senate and associate review in Dec.

**Questions:**

Mario asked about the final products? And how will these be used?

Dave responded that they are options for potential implementation.

For example, in pre-award and post-award processes: where an admin needs help/ assistance from UMCES?

The committee will identified problems associated with each lab as well as at CA: pulling all the HR/Admin people together across the UMCES

Mario raised some issues about connectivity in the steps: processes in regards to budgets:

Dave shared that better tracking is needed.

Mike stated that the goal is to improve grant management. The process should help direct investments.

Helen and Dave said roles and responsibilities need clarification.

Judy mentioned that the HPL hired a person, Julie (contract grant specialist), who helps the proposal submission; this person's role in HPL has become essential.

Dave stated that a person is needed in each lab which connects to ORAA and mentioned about IMET (Monica’s role); Victoria shared about Julie’s role in HPL and said that the PIs have to see the connectivity/process or progress of budget category and purchasing the equipment/executing the budget.

**Re. survey,**

Mario asked about how the survey would be conducted? How to phrase questions/survey monkey?  (Perhaps Lisa Wainger could help)

Helen said we need to carefully craft questions; Victoria: how to address the survey to get a broad spectrum of response.

Mike suggested that the committee would first see the survey response and then take follow-up steps including communication between the PIs and ORAA on ways to improve efficiency; Administrative procedures should be all documented; training the PIs informing about the steps;

(example Julie at HPL did the training the HPL PIs.

Peter thanked Dave for taking up this; faculty evaluation: Lynn; committed to wanting this work;

**Dave: what should be included as survey Qs:**

Victoria: specifics about invoicing; addressing, NCE follow though;

Mario: not traditional invoice procedure, for example, fixed cost; post-award; little energy in post-award; the inaccuracy of the current state of accounts.

Victoria shared an incident that a partner institution invoice had not been paid in time: in fact, a six mo. Delayed.

Judy: Standardize procedure: invoicing: scheduling in the calendar

Victoria: report: NCE etc.; should be calendar;

Mike: there should be clear guidelines for the responsibility of PI and ORAA as PIs getting more involved in the execution of posts-award.

Dave: PIs get proper help from CBL personnel on pre-award preparation but not much post-award.

Mario: Grant managements: Once an award comes in, it is not clear how the lab personal and ORAA would work the post-award process.

Dave: Should be a timeline of each post-award execution:

Victoria mentioned about using a project management software: the full life cycle of a project: pre-post; completion; Look into a program that can streamline these aspects of grant management. Also, make sure to include include positive questions in the survey (i.e., what is currently working well).

Mario: take a look at the private sectors working with federal contracts: to adopt

A better approach: volunteered looking into one

Helen and Dave: DARPA: Required detailed tracking of each step. Very time consuming, but it might be useful as a more general model.

Potential topics for the survey:

Dave: managing salary projections: salary and benefits;

Mario: mentioned about the inflexibility of cayuse;

Mike: projections may be a secondary issue after better information about current spending on grants.

Helen: projecting salary etc. would be useful

Sook: IMET uses IT WORKS

Mark Cochrane: executing post-award proposal: connectivity of each step:

Victoria: invoicing before the end of the grants:

Mario; Some funding was previously lost because invoicing came too late;

Helen: DARPA: tracking monthly budgeting-

Mike: The post award is the most important part because it’s a contractual obligation. UMCES current focus seems to be on proposal submission. This may lead to institutional risk.

Institutional limits:

MC: Hard to set up the contracts and to spend the funding?

Mario: maybe a problem lies in going through College Park because this adds complexity:

Mike: the problem of going through the College Park: information flow among Adm.

How to improve efficiency (i.e., reduce the amount of time things need to be entered) and reduce errors.

Next meeting: at the end of September:

Dave would Draft the survey- which will be the next meeting agenda.

11:55 - New business (Wilberg)- no new business

Mike asked a Volunteer for Annual review committee and a senate representative for vice president review committee?

Next meeting agenda:

12:00 - Adjourn