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To: COR Members
From: Jeanne Hossenlopp
Date: 12/14/11
Re: Marquette University Committee on Research
Approved Minutes/ December 14, 2011 Meeting

Excused: Tim Melchert, David Papke
Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Amanda Ahrndt (ORC), Kathy Durben (ORSP), Austin Fritsch (ORC)

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

Reports:

Report from the Vice Provost for Research -
Dr. Hossenlopp announced that Tim Keane, Director for the Kohler Center for Entrepreneurship is stepping down from that position but is continuing to work on technology commercialization. The intellectual property policy is being reviewed by the Intellectual Property Review Board and will come to the COR for consideration when review is complete. Dr. Hossenlopp and Tim Keane have a proposal pending for support of faculty technology commercialization efforts.

Report from the Chair – no report.

Report from ORSP –
Ms. Durben reported that application award numbers are at $1.2 million this month, and $9.9 million year-to-date. This is down from last year but that could be due to stimulus funds that were received last year. She also described some collaborative activities that ORSP has been engaged in, and reported that another Forward Thinking Poster Session and Colloquy was recently held. Rosita Tormala has joined the ORSP staff as a new grants assistant.

Report from ORC –
Mr. Fritsch reported that the annual report was filed with the USDA and they are waiting to hear back. The Office of Biotechnology Activities has reviewed a report submitted to them and responded that the ORC is in compliance. The ARC, general counsel, and purchasing reviewed and approved a new animal procurement policy. Finally, OLAW released updated guidelines on animal use. MU’s Institutional Care and Use Committee will therefore be reviewing and will make any changes necessary to comply.

Ms. Ahrndt reported that a page has been added to the ORC website on Student Classroom Research. This will let people know when IRB review and approval are required. The information was sent to faculty teaching these types of courses.
The CTSI Memorandum of Understanding covering IRBs at 7 of the 8 CTSI institutions is being circulated for signatures. This should help facilitate the process for collaborative research, with the IRBs going through one place. The Federal Wide Assurance will change due to this. The CTSI Regulatory group is also working on developing some joint education and training opportunities. Finally, ORC will be sponsoring training sessions tomorrow on FDA regulations related to clinical drug research and device research. An expert consultant will be conducting both sessions.

**Business:**

*SFF/RRG funding results* -

Dr. Hossenlopp reported that about $250 thousand was awarded through the SFF’s and RRG’s. A breakdown of award per college/department will be forthcoming.

*Suggested improvements to SFF/RRG process* –

Two issues that were noticed on a couple of application were: page length (too long), and font size (too small). These applications were penalized. It was recommended to make sure the requirements are clear. It was discussed whether references need to be included in 4 page limit or if they can be extra pages. It was recommended to clarify on the guidelines that references are in addition to the 4 page narrative.

It was also discussed whether it is possible to have someone review applications that come in early enough and send them back for revision if they don’t make the guideline. A vote was taken to see how many are in favor of enforcing the format requirement: 6 were in favor, 3 against. Therefore, proposals that do not comply with guidelines will be returned without review, unless they can be revised and resubmitted by the deadline.

It was also recommended to add another summer stipend category of $11,000 in the budget page drop down menu to accommodate joint applications. Another issue was that some SFF proposals included a detailed RRG budget. It was recommended to include a description of what an SFF is and what an RRG is on the guidelines.

A final issue that was raised dealt with cases when one faculty member submits two proposals. After discussion, members agreed it is ok if one proposal is for an SFF and one for an RRG but members are in favor of stating that faculty can only apply for one RRG and one SFF at a time.

*Distribution of Haggerty nominations and discussion of review criteria* –

Dr. Lobner briefly discussed the criteria for the Haggerty award and the fact that it is a career award.

*Discussion of COR ideas for fostering interdisciplinary research/scholarship* –

A priority identified in the Research/Scholarship at Marquette document:

> Identify faculty clusterings in interdisciplinary areas and current strengths by research theme. Provide mechanisms to support interactions among faculty and student scholars around solving “big problems.”

Asked where we are at with the subject of indirect cost returns, Dr. Hossenlopp said it is still in conversation with finance and she hopes to have joint proposal to take to Provost after first of the year.

Dr. Hossenlopp also shared that over the summer two groups of faculty met to talk about interdisciplinary research. One group met on the topic of Race, Class, and Gender, and
the other one on the topic of Community Engagement. Dr. Hossenlopp will share the final reports from the two committees with the COR. Fr. Pilarz has stated at Academic Senate earlier in the week that he would like to know more about the challenges to interdisciplinary research.

The committee discussed some of their varying perspectives on the extent of collaboration and/or research interaction and some of the challenges faced in obtaining support from upper administration.

**Academic financial conflict of interest policy revisions** –
A new set of federal guidelines were released, and a revised policy needs to be in place by next August. Documents drafted by Doug Smith were shared with the COR and Dr. Hossenlopp would like to get committee feedback for potential revision prior to consideration by Academic Senate. In a discussion of these documents the following questions/concerns were raised:

- Ms. Durben shared that the guidelines currently apply to NIH. NSF is still deciding what to do. Also, in the FAQ it states that if your institution has a more restrictive policy, you must report according to those restrictions.
- The guidelines state: Training must occur prior to the time an extramural grant is submitted to the sponsor. It is challenging to complete training prior to submission. Sometimes there is only two weeks’ notice of a grant opportunity. Also, this may be problematic for new faculty coming in. An additional challenge would be determining if there is a conflict of interest, and having a management plan, before submitting the proposal.
- CTSI is looking to see if consortium-wide training could be offered for CTSI participants.
- Questions that will be addressed by Ms. Durben and Dr. Hossenlopp in a follow-up meeting with Mr. Smith:
  - Should the form be signed by a dean?
  - What is the format for the training?
  - Who is going to do the training? Will it be available online?
  - Does it **have** to be prior to submission?
  - Is this a blanket policy for all submitted grants?
  - Can we transfer certification from other institutions?

The meeting adjourned at 10:23