MINUTES OF THE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Avenue, M/S ML 34   
Fresno, California, 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate

Ext. 8-2743

October 12, 2022, 10:04 a.m.

**Members present**: Sankha Banerjee, Rhett Billen, David Drexler, Tamás Forgács, Joy Goto, Jonathan Pryor, Aaron Shuelke, Martha Vungkhanching, Cliff Yu.

**Members absent**: Jenna Kieckhaefer, Monique Bell

(1) Approval of agenda (MSC).

(2) Approval of the minutes of 9/8/22   
(3) Communications and Announcements

(a) Laval Applications are going to be due October 20th, 2022. The committee will review the applications and make a decision during our November meeting. The review process will be a standard process (based on NSF and NIH review methodologies) where each committee member will be assigned about 3 proposals and then the reviews will be discussed in the committee. If any applicant wants an explanation of the rejection of their proposal, the committee will provide and share a summary of their review. (Dr. Forgács)

(b) Vice Chair position – S. Banerjee has agreed to be Vice Chair. (Dr. Forgács)

(C) Dean Goto has invited all the committee members to the Claude Laval presentation on Thursday, November 17, 2022, at 2:00 pm at the Fresno State Library 2206.

(4) Discussion items

(a) Post-award grants administration was discussed in the committee. A lot of issues are being found in post-award administration. There have been delays all over campus on the timeline for setting up cost centers and sub-contracts. The administrative structure for pre-award and post-award was discussed. The pre-award administrators have met with post-award administrators. They have discussed major issues with the shortage of staff and personnel. An ad-hoc task force from CSM was sent to Dean Meyer and a draft was also sent out from Dean Goto to the rest of the deans. These reports have also been shared with the President, Provost, and cabinet. Dean Goto will also have a meeting with other Deans and AVPs to discuss these issues in November. There also has been a discussion to bring back GRAB (Grants and Research Advisory Board).

Dean Goto also discussed models from other CSUs and the grant approval processes on campus through platforms like KAULI. Also, there has been an increase in the number of grant activities on campus for the last 4 years and is expected to continue this fiscal year. Ideas like college liaisons and grant administrators were also discussed.

(b) The first draft for APM 510 revisions was discussed in the committee. Specific language regarding predatory or deceptive conferences and journals was discussed. The language for research misconduct was also discussed. The current APM includes a cumbersome and complicated process of evaluation of an allegation of research misconduct. This includes the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, the Provost, and a faculty review committee. In this situation, the faculty committee has limited say in the process where the peer-review process from the committee can be completely overruled by the Provost. The proposed changes will make the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies as the primary point of contact. The Dean will evaluate whether a review needs to happen based on the research misconduct complaint. The Dean will then appoint a faculty committee who evaluates the alleged research misconduct. This committee will share their finding and evaluation with higher administration (e.g. the Provost). The Provost then makes a final decision based on the review and suggestions of the committee. The decision can also be made a little faster and timelines should be outlined in APM 510.

One other issue that was discussed is the “reporting responsibility”. The APM needs to identify this as well. It was discussed in this committee that anyone can be a reporter for research misconduct (e.g. students, faculty, staff, and any other campus employees).

Dean Goto discussed auditing and research misconduct and Title IX. There is a draft of the policy that came from the chancellor’s office and other CSUs that will come to the research sub-committee for evaluation. This might be made available for the committee to review.

The committee will take up the Laval application reviews in its November meeting. The APM 510 draft is planned to be finalized by the December meeting.

(5) Adjournment 10:53 a.m.