

COR MINUTES

To: COR Members

From: Tom Jablonsky, Recording Secretary, and Melody Baker

Date: 10/7/09

Re: Marquette University Committee on Research
Approved Minutes/ October 7, **2009** Meeting

Present: Abdur Chowdhury, Arthur Hefti, Tom Jablonsky, Doug Lobner, Beth McDonough, Steve Melching, Keith Osterhage, David Papke, William Pink, Marianne Weiss, Pinfen Yang

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker)

Excused: Claire Badaracco, Javier Foronda, Richard Friman, William Wiener,

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Hefti at 9:00 a.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports:

Report from the Chair –

Dr. Melchert, the new Assistant Vice Provost for Graduate Programs, was introduced to the committee. He will be attending COR meetings and facilitate one of the panels for the SFF/RRGs.

Dr. Hefti reported that he was requested to present the COR's action items to the Academic Senate on Nov 16. A request was made for the COR minutes to be posted on the Provost's website, which started with September's minutes. Concerns about the public posting of minutes were discussed among the members, specifically the issue of protecting the confidentiality of faculty (such as applicants for awards). The committee agreed that faculty or student names should not be included in public postings of what will be considered executive minutes.

Report from the Director of ORSP – no report.

Report from ORC

Ms. McDonough reported that things went well over the summer and Ms. Ahrndt has returned from maternity leave. However, the ORC is still requesting funding for part time help due to an increased workload in the office. More training sessions in human subject research are being conducted by the office and there has been an increase in authorization agreements with other institutions.

Ms. McDonough stated that the McNair Scholars program needs to be informed that submissions for IRB need to be done in a timely manner. They tend to ask for approval at the last minute and this is problematic because training is required. It was recommended that she contact the program PI in these cases. Ms. McDonough asked the members to let her know if there were any other student research groups on campus that she should be aware of.

There was a recent membership change to the IRB: Dr. Paula Papanek stepped down (but will still be a backup) and Dr. Andy Starsky is the new member.

Radiation safety meters were calibrated over the summer and user limits on calcium 45 were revised to be in compliance with MU's license. Calcium 45 ownership moved to Dr. Michael Schläppi. Badges for Physics are no longer provided by ORC. ORC is only providing badges for people who fall under their license. Ms. McDonough asked the members to remind their colleagues to notify her if a student leaves so that unnecessary badges are not paid for. A recommendation was made to communicate this request to department secretaries also.

Unfinished Business:

Evaluation of Centers and Institutes

Dr. Hefti distributed a copy of the guidelines from the provost's webpage for establishing a center or institute. Centers were discussed first, because they reside in the academic unit in which they originate and report to the academic dean of the unit. As such, the dean should be responsible for reporting on the center. The members agreed that this makes sense and agree that they do not feel there is a place, nor would it be appropriate for the COR to have a role in reviewing centers.

Dr. Jablonsky shared that there are 7 institutes and 6 centers included in the 2007 report that he reviewed over the summer. It was noted that this list does not include all centers and institutes on campus, only the ones for which reports were received. A couple of members pointed out some centers in their colleges and schools were not listed. It should be recommended that a comprehensive list should be compiled of all centers and institutes and a record of annual reporting kept.

Mr. Osterhage said that in his experience, the request for reviews may be more a matter of record keeping and history. Dr. Hefti feels that because this is a committee with limited term membership, and no insight into finances, it is not possible, nor appropriate for this committee to review centers and institutes. Dr. Jablonsky explained that the provost wanted to consider whether there should be faculty governance over centers and institutes via the COR. Members feel this issue is not in the purview of the committee and do not believe it is appropriate to the function of the COR.

It was asked what the goal of the reviews is? Will a center be discontinued because of a review? Will funds be given due to a review? If the goal is to make sure centers and institutes still exist, it should be stated in the guidelines that any center or institute not submitting an annual report, could be decommissioned. In summary, the COR recommends that the review of centers should be done within the academic unit to whom they report. The COR does not see any involvement for itself in the review process. A vote was taken to make this recommendation and passed unanimously.

Institutes were discussed next. Institutes are approved by the provost, and then the senate, final approval by the president. The language in the guidelines states – *institutes report to the provost, or vice provost for research and graduate school, or their designee* (<http://www.marquette.edu/acad/documents/GuidelinesforNewInstituteorCenters.pdf>). It was pointed out however, that many institutes may not fall within this description due to the fact most of them were established long before the guidelines were written. Also most institutes reside within schools or colleges. The activities of most institutes on campus are not such that the COR would have the necessary expertise or be an appropriate reviewing body. A recommendation was made that the COR is not the appropriate body to review institutes. The members agreed that the first recommendation will be modified to include centers and institutes. Again, a vote was taken to make this recommendation and passed unanimously.

Establishing Committees

Dr. Hefti stated that three subcommittees of the COR need to be formed:

F and A Policy – the members should represent schools and colleges that submit grants and collect F & A and should have some say in how these dollars are used. This committee could include faculty from outside the COR. It was asked what the purpose of the committee would be. Mr. Osterhage said that the goal would be to garner more funds to be returned to the college. This would be a continuum of a proposal that was worked on a couple of years ago. Currently, F & A portion returned to units for distribution is 20% whereas the University keeps 80%. It is necessary to discuss the current policy due to the need for upgrading research facilities. Dr. Lobner, Dr. Yang, Dr. Melching, Dr. Weiss, and Dr. Hefti will serve on this subcommittee.

Conflict of Interest - Dr. Papke, Dr. Jablonsky, and Dr. Friman were assigned to this subcommittee. Mr. Doug Smith, General Counsel will also be on this subcommittee.

Export Control – Dr. Chowdhury, Dr. Badarraco, and Dr. Pink were assigned to this subcommittee.

Either Dr. Wiener or Mr. Osterhage will be on each these committees also.

New Business:*Distribution of SFF/RRG packets, process*

The packets, spreadsheets, procedure, and assignments were distributed to all members. The review considerations from the application kit was also distributed and discussed with members. The members were reminded that if an applicant had applied for funding from a granting agency their proposal would still be considered. However, if they are awarded a SFF or RRG, and then receive a grant from an outside agency, the applicant would be required to decline the SFF/RRG and the money would then go to the next highest ranked proposal.

The topic of significance of the research proposed was discussed. Opinion was voiced that a COR member cannot really make judgments on whether one person's research is more significant than another applicant's. The feasibility of the proposed research can be considered. Some of the issues that came up last year were discussed as well as the process for assigning points and rankings. The issue of applicants that have other funding was discussed. It was pointed out that while a faculty may have funding for one project, they may not have it for the proposed project. There is opinion that the guidelines seem to be unclear on this topic.

On the topic of ranking scores, the members agreed that as rough rule of thumb, proposals scored 90-100 were likely to be funded, proposals scored 80-90 might be funded, and proposals scored below 80 were unlikely to be funded.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:54 a.m.