FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
IMPROVING FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Academic Affairs

INTRODUCTION

The University of Antelope valley (UAV) considers the faculty one of its single greatest resources. The ongoing personal and professional growth of all faculty and staff members is essential to the continued strength of UAV. The educational environment in higher education is changing and as a learning institution UAV has the responsibility to address the particular needs of its students, profession, accreditation agencies, and the publics we serve. To ensure the quality of our educational programs, the administration and faculty of UAV are proposing a comprehensive development plan which serves to meet the strategic goals and objectives above. This proposal will support and facilitate the professional growth of its faculty by means of a comprehensive development program targeting revised teaching workloads and faculty training in the areas of scholarship and educational effectiveness.

GOALS

- Improve the quantity and quality of faculty scholarship and research
- Improve educational effectiveness and student learning outcomes by developing faculty as educators

STRATEGIES

The following three (3) strategies will be used to improve scholarship and educational effectiveness of UAV faculty and programs:

1. Provide training to faculty in the areas of scholarship and educational effectiveness
2. Secure resources for faculty to achieve their scholarly and educational effectiveness goals
3. Strategic recruitment of talented and motivated faculty
Research Policies

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide necessary guidelines and procedures for conducting the research at UAV.

Scope and Application

This policy applies to all Faculty, Students and Staff at the University.

Procedure

The policy affirms the University’s commitment to integrity in research and develops guidance for all research activity. All persons who participate in research at the university are responsible for maintaining highest standards of intellectual honesty and integrity in research.

The Principal Investigator (PI) consults with the Dean of Academic Affairs regarding the initial process for conducting research. The Proposal drafted by the PI should be submitted to the Institutional Research Committee (IRC). The IRC discusses the proposal and makes recommendations. After the proposal is approved by the IRC, the PI should submit the proposal to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). IRB makes the determination of whether the proposal is approved or not approved and will inform the IRC and PI about the decision.

Prospective investigators are encouraged to work closely with Academic Affairs during the development of the proposal.

If you have any questions regarding the research proposal feel free to contact the director of research.

Research policies for Student Research Assistants

Students wishing to work as student research assistants should do so during their academic program. Previous educational background and work will be considered. In addition to this students will be expected to meet the requirements for the employment of students, including the required grade of GPA.
Research Misconduct

Purpose

The Purpose of this policy is to maintain the highest ethical standards in research conducted in the university.

Scope and Application

This policy applies to all Faculty, Students and Staff at the University.

Procedures

University policies set forth expectations for high standards of ethical behavior for faculty and students involved in research.

Definition of Research Misconduct

- Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification or Plagiarism in proposing, conducting or reporting research.
- Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results so that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Findings of Research Misconduct

The university will take action to investigate and address accusation of misconduct in research

A finding of research misconduct requires that:

- There is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community (i.e. the humanities, social sciences, or scientific research community);
- The misconduct must be committed intentionally, knowingly, or irresponsibly; and
- The allegation should be proven by a preponderance of evidence.

Response to an Allegation of Research Misconduct

All records of allegations of research misconduct inquiries and investigations will be maintained by the IRC for a minimum of 4 years.

1. Inquiry: Allegation of research misconduct should be reported to the Dean of Academic Affairs, who will consult with the IRC. The IRC will name a panel of faculty and will secure the relevant records. An Inquiry should be completed within 30 days from the receipt of allegation. Report should be submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs.
2. Investigation: The Dean of Academic affairs, in consultation with the IRC, will name a panel of faculty to conduct an investigation. Reports should include the development of an accurate record, and the examination of that record leading to a recommendation for a finding of research misconduct or other appropriate remedies. Report should be submitted to the Dean of Academic Affairs within 30 days.

3. Settlement: During which recommendations are reviewed and appropriate corrective actions are determined. Appropriate disciplinary action will be consistent with college grievance policy. Such actions may include but are not limited to, removal from the project, salary or rank reduction, suspension or termination of employment.

4. Closing of the Case: A closeout document which explains the actions taken to assess the accusation and the conclusions should be placed in the investigation file in the Academic Affairs office. The file is maintained in accordance with the Privacy Act and agency policies which are subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

**Safe guard**

Safeguards for informants give individuals the confidence that they can put forth allegations of research misconduct made in good faith or serve as informants to an inquiry or an investigation without suffering retribution. Safeguards include protection against revenge for informants who make the allegations, fair and objective procedures for the examination and resolution of allegations of research misconduct.

Safeguards for Subjects of Allegations give individuals the confidence that their rights are protected. Such safeguards include the right to prompt written notification to the individual or institution to be investigated, description of the allegation and the opportunity to respond to allegations.

Confidentiality will be maintained during the Inquiry, Investigation, and Decision-Making Processes.
Guidelines for Ethics in Authorship for Scientific Publication

The Publication of research article represents the final stage of a research project. To be an author on a scientific manuscript is a privilege and one of the more rewarding experiences of a scientist; it is mainly used as a measure for promotion. There are certain guidelines and ethical principles for publication of scholarly and scientific articles.

Authorship credit should be based on:

1. Substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;

2. Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

3. Final approval of the version to be published.

Criteria that do not make one qualified for full authorship:

1. Acquisition of funding (alone),

2. Collection of data (alone),

3. General supervision of the research group (alone).

If a person is involved in the study but does not meet the qualification of authorship, they should be included in the acknowledgements section. Such individuals are those who provide technical help only, the chair of the department who solely provides only general support, the person who does the acquisition of funding, collection of data and general supervision of the research group.

The first author should coordinate the completion and submission of the manuscript and attend to all rules of submission. He/she should also be responsible for all communication regarding the manuscript. This person should also make sure that the contributions of all those involved in the study are appropriately recognized and ensure that each coauthor has reviewed and approved the paper for submission at all points in the process.

Co-authors should be credited based upon the individual contributions.

Duplicate publication is defined as the publication of an article that is identical or overlaps substantially with an article previously published elsewhere, with or without acknowledgment. The article should represent the author’s own original work. Short quotes are permitted if appropriately referenced. When using long quotes or tables which have been previously published the author should obtain permission from the rights holder. Relevant conflicts of interest should be disclosed in publication. Guidelines on good publication practice state that the authors can only submit their manuscript to a single journal at a time. If the first journal makes the decision not to publish or it is withdrawn by the author then the authors can resubmit the same or a revised version to another journal.
Modes of Review
By: Dr. Fields

There are four types of review stipulated in the Code of Federal Regulations. These include:

**Exempt**
Studies meeting exemption criteria are considered human studies research. As such, the CHS policy requires that exemptions be determined by the CHS and not by the Investigator. A study qualifying for an exemption is of minimal risk to participants and exempt from further review by the CHS. However, should an Investigator amend the study once it receives an exemption, the CHS recommends that the Investigator confirm with the CHS that the study still meets the initial exemption criteria. Currently, there are six categories of exemption.

**Expedited Review**
Expedited studies are of minimal risk to participants and therefore do not require full Committee review; instead, studies meeting expedited criteria are reviewed by the Committee Chair or a designated CHS member (hence the term “expedited”). Studies meeting expedited review criteria must receive continuing approval each year. Currently, there are ten categories for expedited review.

**Full Committee Review**
Studies requiring Full Committee review generally involve more than minimal risk. On occasion, there may be studies that, while technically falling within an exempt or expedited review category, are determined by the CHS staff or members to warrant full CHS review. The types of studies likely to fit this situation would be studies involving vulnerable populations (such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, people with cognitive or mental health impairments) and those taking place at international sites. Studies receiving full CHS review must receive continuing approval each year.

**Designated/Ceded Review**
Under the federal regulations, it is permissible to designate or cede reviewing authority of a study to another institution’s IRB if a Cooperative Amendment or an IRB Authorization Agreement is in place. Investigators may not assume that a study is automatically approved by one or the other institution even if such an Agreement is in place, as each IRB may decide the appropriateness of ceding or accepting responsibility for the review of each study. The CHS will not cede review to another institution if HMS/HSDM students are specifically the participants to be recruited for a study or if the students themselves are conducting the study.

*Complete process and Guidance on Written IRB Procedures can be obtained by contacting Dr. Fields.*
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS MINI-GRANT PROGRAM

Mini-Grants support the small scale research projects at the UAV campus. These funds are available through the ACADEMIC AFFAIRS department. There are a limited number of grants available annually as follows: four at $1500, three at $1000 and two at $500. These grants are only available for Clinical Research, Educational Research and Basic Science Research.

How to apply

To apply for a mini-grant, please fill out the grant application form which is available on the IRC web page along with the description of the research project and invoice. Once completed send it to the Dean of Academic Affairs. All applications for the current academic year should be submitted by November. The application will be reviewed and rated by the IRC and approved by the Dean of Academic Affairs. An award letter will be sent to you, whether or not you have been awarded the grant. It is very important to inform the status of the awarded projects at the end of each trimester till completion of the project.

After you submit the application, you will be receiving a letter within ten business days. Upon approval, allow up to another two weeks for transfer of funds. If you are awarded the mini-grant, you will be responsible for submitting invoice, appropriate receipts and documentation for the awarded project. After the approval of the grant, you must obtain an approval from UAV IRB.

Funds may not be used to supplement regular department expenses and budgets, conference and travel expenses or faculty guest speaking. Mini-grant funds cannot be redirected by the department for projects other than what was approved in the application.

Balance in mini-grant accounts are automatically returned to the general fund account at the end of the financial year. If the funds for the project need to be carried forward for the next financial year, a letter should be submitted to the CFO requesting the same.
Deadline: 5:00 pm November 30
Submit to: Dean of Academic Affairs

Project Title:

Brief description of project (please attach full description/proposal):

Please select the grant which you are applying for:

☐ Mini-grant up to $500
☐ Mini-grant up to $1000
☐ Mini-grant up to $1500

Name of the PI:

_______________________________________________________________

Email ID: _______________________________________________________

Campus phone extension: _______________________

Alternate phone: ___ (________) ______________________________

Department: __________________________

Academic rank: __________________________

Project period: ___________________ to ___________________