I. Welcome and Approval of Consent Agenda, Alicia DeNicola, Faculty Council Chair

Dr. Susan Ray moved to approve the consent agenda; Dr. George Shepherd seconded the motion. The motion carried.

II. ORCID Campaign Launch, Jody Bailey, Head of Scholarly Communications Office

Jody explained what an ORCID iD is, what the benefits are, and why it is being implemented now. An ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) iD is a free, unique, digital persistent identifier (DPI) for researchers. Benefits include: Eliminates problems with name similarities, variant spellings of names in non-Roman alphabets, name changes, etc.; allows researchers to populate their record like a CV; saves time: Enter once, reuse often (e.g., grant applications); stays with you throughout your career; interoperability with major research databases. More info about ORCID [here](#). Implementation is starting now because Emory must comply with National Security Presidential Memo 33, which directs researchers receiving federal funds to use a DPI starting in 2023. Register and connect to Emory [here](#).

Questions and comments from the floor:

1. I think it’s great that we are having consistency across Emory, since ORCID has already been implemented in SOM and is required for tenure.
2. Are we implementing this for undergrads too?
   a. Not at this time, since they rarely receive federal funding. However, I would still encourage them to get an ORCID now if they are thinking about continuing their career in academia.
3. Are there any publishers that require ORCID?
   a. Yes, most (100+) of them.
4. Why would scholars from fields who seldom apply for grants also need an ORCID?
   a. Working on FACET integration—once you populate your ORCID, you don’t have to update FACET.
5. When you get feedback from faculty, what are the common problems they encounter?
   a. We created our FAQ for these common problems, and the good news is there is a fix for all the common problems.
III. Cybersecurity, Derek Spransey, Senior Information Security Specialist, and Brad Sanford, Chief Information Security Officer

Cybersecurity training was first implemented in Fall 2020, initially only required for staff and new faculty. Roughly 87% of staff have completed the course, and the department is working on updating and improving the course. More information coming in the next few weeks about enrolling all faculty in cybersecurity course. Several regulatory regimes require training for all employees, especially since Emory conducts sensitive human subject research and produces world-class research. The security of Emory’s IT assets is a shared responsibility, and 85% of reported breaches have human error component. Training topics include sensitive data handling, password security/multi-factor authentication, phishing and scams, malware, reporting security issues. Derek requested feedback from faculty: What topics could we consider for inclusion in future versions that are especially important to faculty? Is there other security guidance or documentation that you’d like to see us create?

Questions and comments from the floor:

1. Can you talk about any specific stopgap measures in cybersecurity at Emory? How do you contain any security breaches?
   a. We have many teams monitoring and detecting security threats and responding to them. Attempts to compromise networks and user accounts happen daily, and if we are doing our jobs, you don’t notice us.

2. Advice about passwords? Since we can’t reuse passwords and must change it every year, are password managers secure?
   a. Future password-less options might be in the horizon, but in the meantime password managers are helpful; we have discussed providing one as an enterprise service, but no plans to implement yet.

3. Interconnectedness is key—even if you don’t personally manage sensitive data, access to your account might lead to a bigger breach and is still a security breach.

4. How safe is having the browser store credentials?
   a. There is malware that specifically targets stored credentials in browsers, so not 100% safe. I would personally prefer password managers over browser stored credentialing.

IV. University Research Committee Report, Carlos Moreno, URC Chair

Dr. Moreno reported on the structure and function of URC. URC oversees a competitive annual research grant program to support research and creative projects in fields with limited external funding, as well as to explore new areas of research that are likely to attract future external support. There are 6 award categories: Performing/Visual Arts, Biological and Health Sciences, Humanities, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Interdisciplinary research with 2 or more applicants. This is the only pilot research grant that is open to all regular full-time faculty at Emory. The URC budget is supplemented by the Halle Institute for Global Research for research primarily conducted outside the U.S. Beginning in January 2023, URC will migrate from Office of Provost to Office of SVPR reporting to Dr. Kimberly Eck. It will still be funded by Office of Provost, just with a different reporting structure.
Carlos presented data from the feedback form results, as well the changes implemented in response: research plan reduced from 8-6 pages max, max grant amount ($30K) not changed because it would reduce total number of grants awarded.

Questions and comments from the floor:

1. Can you speak on the significance/implications of movement out of Office of Provost towards SVPR, since SVPR is heavily medical health sciences focused? There is already limited external funding for humanities, whereas medical health sciences have a much wider selection.
   a. There were 3 parallel streams of research support, Medical School, Lanny, Deb Bruner. President and Provost made the decision to unify them. It’s true that SVPR might have been more focused on biomedical health sciences, but her duty has changed and is now to be better custodians of university-wide research.
   b. To the extent that Humanities don’t feel served by SVPR, we should fix that instead of creating another entity.
2. Is there any recognition for publications that have come from URC grants? Maybe we can do better at quantifying and advertising the impact and outputs of URC grants.
   a. We do ask awardees to fill out a post-award report as well as acknowledgments within the publication, and there is ongoing data collection.
3. We need to account for Inflation: $30K can’t buy the same things as it could 10 years ago.
   a. We’re moving to a RCM budget model for units, which means central non-revenue-generating units are constrained to operating costs of not more than 4% of each revenue-generating unit’s budget per year. We determined the operating cost of the university then allocated it to the schools, and they don’t have a say. Unless we give some things up, we can’t increase the URC budget. The Office of the Provost is certainly open to suggestions, but we are trying to keep a lid on ongoing programs.
   b. 4% cap on size of bill (common good services provided by units that do not generate revenue) allocated to revenue-generating units. We do not tax schools on tuition and research revenue, so we have no cash flow centrally.
   c. If we can draw even 0.5% more from our endowment, that would free up $50M. But our school-based endowments are much smaller than it should be compared to our peer institutions. Main source of revenue for schools is tuition.
4. Different ways of conceptualizing how these funds could be used, e.g., travel, one-time big purchases, etc. This might mitigate the issue about how much it means for various disciplines.
   a. We would like feedback from faculty about whether this money impactful the way it is being used: is this still the best way to support overall university research? Please send feedback directly to the Provost.

V. Report on Faculty Input for Research Grant Support

Should we have a listening session with Deb Bruner for input from Faculty Council for their new hire? What was her vision? Bring someone in to connect the silos, kind of a switchboard operator. We could ask faculty what they want, but we don’t always give a clear answer. What do we already have on the ground, centrally but also internally in different schools? RAS is constantly short-staffed and has a huge turnover—nothing one person can fix. Please leave feedback
1. President Fenves suggested that this is a place for the Deans of the colleges, not central admin of the University. But I don’t think we are at the place, financially or logistically, to implement this, even though it is the best way to proceed for pre-award research grant support.

2. Some fields/disciplines are simply not well understood by SVPR, and the materials they provide are not relevant. We should also focus on back-end streamlining of reporting processes; comparisons to what peer institutions have might be helpful.

3. The need is maybe felt more strongly in ECAS and Oxford and less so in SOM since we already have many resources. Every school has different needs. Someone at the central level that can help set up and develop these school-based programs.

4. Is the need school-specific or is it scholarly-domain specific? Sounds like humanities and social sciences need help more than natural sciences. Also need support for smaller grants, because there is plenty of support in place for bigger grants.

VI. Executive Session

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.