Dr. Reitzes called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The first order of business was review and approval of the minutes from the previous meeting, which was held on November 17, 2003. No member present at the meeting asked that changes be made to these minutes. Dr. Reitzes made a motion for approval of the minutes. The motion was approved by those members present at the meeting.

Openness in Research

The Research Infrastructure subcommittee is co-chaired by Ms. Byrum and Dr. Manson. The subcommittee was asked to develop a policy which will provide explicit guidance to the University on how funding agreements should be structured with regard to openness in research. Dr. Manson asked for clarification about what the issue of openness refers to specifically. Dr. Louis responded that some of the federal agencies which offer funding for grants are requiring restrictive clauses to be put into their funding agreements. Some of these clauses restrict how and when the published results of research can be used. One common restriction disallows research conducted by students from being used in their theses.

According to Dr. Louis, most universities have explicit policies on this issue. He has provided the Research Infrastructure subcommittee with examples of such policies from several universities, including the Universities of Arizona, Minnesota and Stanford. Generally these example universities’ policies do not allow acceptance of a contract which has any restriction on publication, but this does not apply to classified research. Dr. Louis noted that other universities will accept some period of delay before publication of research is allowed, for example 90 or 120 days. Dr. Manson asked if these restrictive clauses essentially imply veto power by the funding agency, and Dr. Louis answered yes.

Dr. Turnbull questioned whether the University really needs to put a filter on the projects faculty, who are in effect professional researchers, can choose to work on. He argued that faculty should be trusted to exercise sound judgment in making decisions about which projects they take on. Dr. Elifson noted that he had participated in some important and rewarding research projects which were classified, and therefore had significant restrictions, but he would hate to have faculty miss such opportunities because of a more restrictive internal policy on openness in research. Dr. Louis countered the policy will provide the University with a level of protection when negotiating funding agreements with sponsoring agencies.

After additional discussion by the Committee on this issue, Dr. Reitzes noted he felt a consensus had been reached. He stated it would be advantageous for faculty to have an explicit policy regarding openness of
research to rely upon when negotiating with sponsors, but there also needs to be an appeal process developed for exceptions to the policy. Dr. Manson asked if the stated time frame for delay of publication should be a specific number of days or just a “reasonable” period of time. Dr. Louis responded the policy needs to be drafted so that the delay period is not open-ended. Dr. Netzel asked that the policy state specifically there can be no restriction on publication of student, graduate student, or post-doctoral research.

**Standing Subcommittee Reports**

**Research Center Review (Dr. Reitzes)**

Dr. Reitzes stated he has not received a mandate from APACE to go forward on review of specific research centers; he will notify subcommittee members as updates are received.

**Internal Grants (Dr. Romski)**

Dr. Romski reported the Internal Grants subcommittee has met twice, and finished the Research Program Enhancement (RPE) grant review. She received several comments about the RPE grant application process being too cumbersome for both competing and non-competing renewals.

The Committee had asked Dr. Romski and her subcommittee to review the internal grants program for transparency. There have been complaints from applicants that the process of awarding internal grants seems mysterious, they would like to see formal documentation of the process. Dr. Romski provided members present at the meeting with a draft of documentation for the review process which she stated is not yet complete. She asked for comments, noting that the Internal Grants Review committee will begin meeting in January, and it would be nice to have this document finalized in the near future.

Dr. Baumstark asked about the issue of member confidentiality, he wondered about the intent of the following statement under the heading *The Review Process*: “They <members> are not to discuss any applications or anything that occurs during the review process with others outside the review committee.” Dr. Baumstark felt this was too restrictive and not practical. Dr. Romski responded the intent is to protect the reviewer from being contacted by applicants whose proposals are rejected by the committee. After discussion by the group, it was decided the description under the heading *The Review Process* with regard to confidentiality would be modified to be less restrictive.

Dr. Louis stated he felt the description under the heading *Eligibility Criteria* seems too prescriptive. For example, he took exception with the requirement that members of the committee be tenured, which should be a goal, not a requirement. Dr. Louis remarked further the requirement that the member have external grant funding is too restrictive. He noted that some Humanities faculty members who have significant research experience have only received internal funding. After discussion by the group, it was decided the first sentence under the heading *Eligibility Criteria* would be changed to be less rigid in terms of the tenure status of those faculty asked to serve on the Internal Grants committee.

Dr. Netzel expressed concern about the number of reviewers assigned to each grant. He felt that all proposals should have three reviewers, and each reviewer’s scores should count equally. Dr. Louis countered by saying it is difficult to get enough reviewers to serve on the committee as it is, so requiring three reviewers for each proposal is not feasible. Dr. Tai stated having either two or three reviewers should not matter, but he took exception with the requirement that reviewers may not reside in the same department as the PI or Co-PI. Dr. Turnbull remarked the focus needs to be on acting rationally about allocating scarce faculty time. He favors leaving the description under the heading *Assignment of Reviewers* and *The Review Process* somewhat loose and flexible so that it is not too restrictive. After further discussion, it was decided to leave *The Review*
Under the section *Committee Procedure*, Dr. Tis asked about the intent of the sentence “materials related to previous reviews in prior years may be consulted”. Dr. Romski responded that many RPE grants are awarded for multiple years, and the reviewer usually needs to see information pertaining to the original award. It was decided to modify this language to only pertain to RPE grant proposals.

Dr. Netzel then brought up the issue of anonymity. Under the heading *Committee Anonymity*, he recommended a change be made so the names of committee members are disclosed each year, since this would demonstrate transparency. Dr. Baumstark agreed, stating the committee could be accused of conducting “secret” meetings if it does not disclose the names of members. Ms. Byrum mentioned that state open records law most likely requires this information to be disclosed. Dr. Bartness stated the intent of this section is to protect the reviewer from being harassed by applicants. He then noted there are other committees at GSU which publish members’ names. Dr. Bartness reminded the group if an applicant contacts a member of the committee, he/she can be disqualified from applying for future grants. Dr. Louis argued it is very difficult to find faculty who will agree to serve on the committee, and if the policy requires their names be disclosed, it may be more difficult to get faculty to serve. Dr. Tai supported disclosure of member names.

After additional discussion, it was decided the issue of anonymity would be tabled until the Internal Grants Review committee members can be polled to find out if they would object to having their names disclosed, as suggested by Dr. Lederberg. The section entitled *Committee Anonymity* will be removed from the document for the time being and replaced with a section entitled *Applicants and the Review Committee*, where applicants will be directed to contact the Vice President for Research (or Associate VP for Research) with any questions about the grant review process. A motion was made by Dr. Reitzes to approve the Internal Grants Review document with the above changes; it was approved by all members present at the meeting. Dr. Romski will make the changes and e-mail to Committee members for review before the next meeting.

**Research Infrastructure** (Dr. Manson and Ms. Byrum)

Dr. Manson and Ms Byrum reported that their subcommittee will work on drafting a policy regarding openness of research.

**IRB Advisory** (Dr. Tis)

Dr. Tis reported she has been receiving a variety of complaints from faculty across the University about their protocols being rejected by the IRB committee for reasons related to research methodology. Dr. Tis’ understanding is that protocols are to be reviewed by the IRB only on the issue of human subjects being at risk, not on methodology of research. She has spoken to previous members of the IRB committee and has been told research methodology issues are within their domain. Dr. Louis responded that Dr. Curry, chair of the IRB, would be happy to attend a Research Committee meeting to answer any questions related to IRB procedures. Dr. Tis noted there have been a lot of regulatory changes recently which involve human subjects, and it may be that some faculty are simply overwhelmed with all of the new requirements. Dr. Reitzes suggested Dr. Tis meet individually with Dr. Curry to get some clarification on these issues. Dr. Tis plans to do so in the near future. Dr. Reitzes asked her to let the Committee know if its assistance is needed.

**Strategic Planning** (Dr. Derby)

Dr. Derby stated he has reviewed three documents related to University strategic planning that were provided...
by the Provost:

- Procedure for review of programs/activities
- Procedure for review of RFPs
- Guidelines for areas of focus.

He remarked the FACP Committee has approved the documents, so they are probably in final form rather than draft form. He noted the calendar for review by college administration is as follows:

- Pre-proposal: review by 2/6/04
- Respond to pre-proposal: 2/20/04
- Full RFP due: 3/21/04
- Funding decisions will be made by mid-April.

Dr. Lederberg expressed concern about the lack of transparency by the University administration in the decision making process with regard to redirection of funding for programs and activities. She stated the amount of funding involved is about $10 million, and believes more time should be taken and more input sought from the colleges and faculty before decisions are reached. She wondered why decisions must be made by April when cuts in faculty positions cannot be implemented until September. Dr. Derby responded the Provost wants to be able to put all of the redirection changes into his FY05 budget proposal, which has to be presented to the Board of Regents in the spring; this is the reason decisions must be made by April. Dr. Tai noted the P&D committee, on which he serves, will hear the action plan timetable at its next meeting and will be able give input to the Provost at that time.

Dr. Netzel asked if the Committee has an assigned role in the evaluation of the action plan. Dr. Reitzes responded that the Committee will have a representative on the committee that reviews programs. Dr. Tis noted the Committee usually has a role in redirection of funds decisions, but this time has been kept out of the loop. Dr. Lederberg asked if members of the Committee agree with the timetable that has been proposed by the Provost. Dr. Derby responded he may not agree with the timetable, but feels there is little he or other faculty can do about it. This position was generally supported by others on the Committee. Dr. Romski stated the Committee probably cannot change the timeline for decisions, but can ask the Provost about the review process and how the Senate fits into the process. Dr. Lederberg then conceded the best time to voice concerns will be during the next P&D committee meeting. Dr. Reitzes then announced that discussion of the topic be tabled until the next Committee meeting.

**Standing Subcommittee Reports Postponed to January Meeting**

**Responsible Conduct of Research** (Dr. Baumstark)

Dr. Baumstark provided members a draft of the policy on responsible conduct of research which his subcommittee had developed. Dr. Reitzes asked the Committee to review the draft; it will be the first order of business at the January meeting.

**University Computing** (Dr. Manson)

Dr. Manson stated he will be meeting with Dr. Louis to discuss computing issues before the January meeting. He will provide an update at that time.

**Vice President for Research**

Dr. Louis provided a handout of grant proposal and award activity for the University for the month of
November, 2003. He asked Dr. Reitzes to provide time at the beginning of the January meeting to discuss some issues, the primary one being the Committee’s mission statement which was adopted at the November 17 meeting.

Dr. Reitzes agreed Dr. Louis’ issues will be the second item of business on the agenda for the January meeting.

**Old Business**

Dr. Reitzes reminded the Committee that it had objected to a plan to distribute indirect costs only after expenditures. He was pleased to report that Mr. Rackliffe, the acting VP of Finance, will drop this method of distribution and return to the practice of distributing indirect costs based on amount estimated from the initial announcement of the award. Dr. Reitzes asked Ms. Barrett to report to the Committee on how this issue is resolved at the January meeting.

At the November meeting, Dr. Reitzes was asked by the Committee to contact Dr. John Peterson about getting data on minority faculty grant activity. Dr. Peterson responded his office is only charged with analysis of data on untenured minority faculty. He is willing to ask the Provost if data on tenured minority faculty should be collected. Dr. Reitzes asked Ms. Barrett to collect some data in advance as follows:

- External grants awarded to minority faculty
- Minority supplements received by the University

Dr. Louis stated the information regarding external grants awarded to minority faculty is not available since minority status of grant awardees is not collected by the Office of Research.

Dr. Reitzes stated it would be easy to let NIH grant awardees know about the availability of minority supplements, and the Committee should help facilitate this process. He asked Dr. Romski to write a memo requesting Dr. Peterson to add a focus on junior faculty scholarship in his report.

**New Business**

Dr. Bartness noted there is a problem with federally funded staff not getting raises. As a result, they are leaving the University for other institutions where the pay is higher. He reported the University of Georgia and Emory have circumvented this problem of not being able to give raises by sending a petition to the Board of Regents. Dr. Reitzes asked Dr. Louis to contact the Vice President of Research at University of Georgia to find out how to accomplish something similar at GSU.

**Next Meeting**

Dr. Reitzes stated the next meeting will be held on Monday, January 26, 2004 at 3:00pm in Room 718 of the General Classroom building. He then adjourned the meeting at 5:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Gary Brennaman