COR MINUTES

To: COR Members
From: Jeanne Hossenlopp
Date: 11/3/10
Re: Marquette University Committee on Research

Approved Minutes/ November 3, 2010 Meeting

Present: David Clark, Richard Friman, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Tom Jablonsky, Doug Lobner, Steve Melching, William Pink, Marianne Weiss, Joyce Wolburg, Pinfen Yang

Excused: David Papke, Keith Osterhage

Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Beth McDonough

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Melching at 9:05 a.m. The agenda was approved.

Reports:

Report from the Vice Provost for Research-
Dr. Hossenlopp reported that she has been working on F&A issues, has given the Provost a copy of the proposal the COR put together last year, and is working with the provost on a new proposal for negotiation with finance.

Dr. Hossenlopp also reported on behalf of Mr. Osterhage that $11.9 million was awarded through September, although year-to-date total applications are down. The NSF Major Research Instrument Proposal Competition is starting. Because there is a limit on how many proposals MU can send, research infrastructure needs will be publicly discussed.

Report from the Chair-
Dr. Melching reported that his college (Engineering) has initiated its own committee on research and he may be bringing some ideas from that group to this committee in the future.

Report from ORC-
Ms. McDonough reported that the September PRIMR seminar was attended by 60-70 people and she asked for feedback concerning interest in having the seminar again. Though it is cost prohibitive to do it regularly, she will try to partner with other units.

The new policy on deviation and non-compliance has been posted to the ORC website. Also, the IRB guidebook has been completed and includes written policies in compliance with federal regulations. The IRB adopted the guidebook at its October meeting, which is considered a “living” document that will be updated regularly.

Given that ORC has been executing numerous authorization agreements, a form was created to streamline the process, especially when involving multiple institutions. Ms. McDonough is also working on a guidance document on authorization agreements, which she will present at the IRB’s November meeting.

Regarding involvement in CTSI, Ms. McDonough has been meeting with several groups. Despite rumors, there will not be a community IRB (there may be an umbrella agreement).

Lastly, Monica Stout is helping out part time again in the ORC.

Continuing Business:

Update SFF/RRG and Way-Klingler Reporting Requirement on related forms and letters-
It was confirmed that final reports are required for RRG awards as well as SFF’s. Starting this year, reporting requirements will be tracked and enforced. A motion was made that failure to submit a final report will make an applicant ineligible to apply for the next round of SFF/RRG awards. The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and all were in favor.
It was recommended that Way Klingler award recipients also submit a final report. It was suggested that ORSP add a line to the proposal registration form asking if the proposal is a follow up to an award. Tracking of activities and deliverables (publications) of the awards was also discussed with a suggestion that it could be linked to the Faculty Development Reports.

A motion was made to require an RRG final report within 3 months after the grant period, seconded, and voted on with all in favor. Another motion was made that the requirements of the report include: 1) planned and completed grant proposals, 2) planned and completed publications, 3) substantial deviations from the submitted budget expenditures, and 4) a brief summary. The motion was seconded, and voted on with all in approval. These changes will start with this year’s awards. The report template will be sent to the award winners together with the award notification.

Preparation for Nov 17th SFF/RRG reviews 3-7pm-

The members were reminded to send their rankings in by November 15th. It was clarified (from last month’s discussion) that removing the tertiary reader means that the primary and secondary readers lead the discussion on the proposal but that all readers rank all proposals. This method was discussed and members agreed that having scores from all readers is preferable to having scores from only the primary and secondary readers. There was discussion of whether scores should be submitted ahead of time or given after discussion at the meeting. The majority preferred turning in scores before the meeting in the interest of efficiency.

COR strategic plan discussion (attachment)-

While all four objectives are considered important, Dr. Hossenlopp asked members to send her the top three goals they would like emphasized in the document before the next regular meeting in December. It was suggested that all contributions could then be streamlined by a subcommittee. Dr. Hossenlopp would like to use the revised document as a basis for discussion with the deans in the spring. Members will send their top three goals to Mel for compilation.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00.