Plan for communication, prioritization and approval process for research re-engagement in the School of Kinesiology

We prepared our “SoK Laboratory Space Usage Request Form” using the UMOR master template, with several revisions to make it appropriate for our needs. On May 8, we sent this form to the faculty. The document was accompanied by an email to provide some information on the process. During our School Faculty Meeting on May 12, we presented information on the prioritization and approval process. We responded to all faculty questions during the faculty meeting based on the information available at that time, and we acknowledged that at that time, we lacked the information for definitive answers to some questions. We have been transparent about the prioritization and approval process to all researchers in the SoK. The steps for reviewing and approving faculty requests have been: 1) Faculty were informed of the opportunity and process for requesting lab research re-engagement. 2) All five applications that were submitted were reviewed. 3) For the request to be considered, the faculty member was required to explain why this research activity could not be performed remotely and required the controlled laboratory environment and/or access to specialized equipment. All five applications were deemed to meet this requirement. 4) Prioritization factors included: a) the work was essential for the timely progress of a Ph.D. student towards graduation, with greatest priority for students who were within one year of expected graduation; b) the work was performed by a pre-tenure faculty member; and c) the research was supported by extramural funds. All five applications met one or more these prioritization criteria. 5) Each faculty member identified the specific members of her/his research group that were requested to participate in research re-engagement. Fortunately, our UMOR-determined upper limit for numbers of individuals allowed to return to the lab was sufficient to accommodate all of the faculty requests. We promptly informed each faculty member making a request about the decisions for participating in research re-engagement. After engaging with faculty via email, we held a Zoom Town Hall meeting with all of the PIs involved in research ramp-up on March 28. We gave detailed information about the UMOR guidelines and processes, as well as specific information about the process in CCRB. We responded to questions from the faculty. On June 1, we held a second Zoom Town Hall meeting with all of the members of the research teams (staff, graduate students and PIs). We covered the information from the March 28 Zoom meeting, and gave additional information that had become available in the meantime. We again responded to questions from the people at the Zoom meeting. We will continue to communicate with faculty about the ongoing process as circumstances evolve and the relevant information becomes available. We will promptly make available any information that UMOR provides for dissemination to the faculty. We will also remain re-engaged with faculty and research teams after the return to the lab. We anticipate regular communications with the researchers via email and Zoom meetings. We have also encouraged the researchers to contact those of us directly involved in the lab research ramp-up process (especially Associate Dean for Research Greg Cartee; Facilities Manager Perry Titus; and Laboratory Coordinator Adam Kraft).