Present:            Don Reitzes (Chair), Paul Alberto, Albertha Barrett, Tim Bartness, Roberta Byrum, Robert
Curry, Dabney Dixon, Steve Dobranski, Kirk Elifson, Crawford Elliott, Anne Emanuel, Kim
Huhman, Anne Kruger, Amy Lederberg, Steve Manson, Robin Morris, MaryAnn Romski,
Detmar Straub, Lyn Thaxton, Laurie Tis, Bill Waugh

Dr. Reitzes called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The first order of business was review and approval of the minutes from the September 20, 2004 meeting. No
member asked for modifications to the minutes. Dr. Reitzes made a motion for approval of the minutes; the
motion was seconded and approved by those members present.

Subcommittee Reports

Dr. Reitzes stated that the agenda would be changed for this meeting since Dr. Morris would be making a
presentation regarding the Science Technology Incubator/Commercialization building project. There would
first be a report from the Internal Grants subcommittee and then Dr. Morris would make his presentation.

Internal Grants Subcommittee

Dr. Romski reported the subcommittee had met three times since the September 20, 2004 Committee meeting,
she then distributed copies of a handout showing internal grants activity for the last three years. She noted
that there was no data for Dissertation grant activity for the 2003/2004 year, and she did not know if this was
because there were no applications submitted or not, but assumed it was for this reason. 2004/2005 was the
first year someone could submit a Dissertation grant application and request to receive the funds to be
received later rather than sooner.

The subcommittee reviewed the application process for RPE, RIG and Mentoring grants. Some changes
were made to the process for each, with the most significant changes being made for the RPE grant. There are
three categories. New applications require a full proposal. Noncompeting renewals used to require a full
proposal, but now require only a 1 page application unless there is a change in the membership, which then
requires a justification for the change but not a full proposal. There were minor changes to Mentoring grants,
the mentor will no longer be provided a $1,000 award; the total award of $10,000 will go to the applicant.

Final edits and documents related to these changes to the internal grants program will be forwarded to Dr.
Morris for posting on the VP Research website. Dr. Reitzes asked if noncompeting renewal applicants will
receive a notice from Dr. Morris about the deadline to submit, he answered yes, award dates are available on
the web and RPE applicants will be notified of renewal status. Dr. Retizes asked if the option to defer the
Dissertation grant funds was described in the application, Dr. Romski will check and report back to him.

A motion was made to accept the internal grants subcommittee report, was seconded and approved by those
committee members present.
Report from the Vice President for Research

Dr. Morris reported there have been three federal inquiries/actions filed against GSU over the last month or so and gave an update on their status.

**OLAW:** There was an incident of noncompliance animal research brought to the attention of the federal regulators at the end of last year. They sent a letter asking for a response to 20+ issues they wanted addressed, we responded in the summer. A second letter was received in September from OLAW asking for more detailed responses, and a response will be sent from Dr. Morris by the end of October. Dr. Morris noted that all of GSU’s federally funded research could be shut down if we do not satisfy the OLAW requirements. He added that all researchers using animals will have to participate in training in the use of animals and be certified starting November 1.

**USDA:** GSU had an unannounced spot inspection by the USDA recently which uncovered some minor issues of noncompliance with laboratory practice regulations that have now been corrected. He noted the USDA has a regional office in Atlanta and it is probable they will drop by for spot inspections on a regular basis, so we must be prepared.

**AFIS:** GSU also recently had an evaluation by this group which pointed out other areas of noncompliance.

Dr. Morris stated that the Office of Research will soon begin publishing a monthly newsletter for distribution across campus. The main goal is to open communication lines between faculty/staff and the Office of Research.

Dr. Morris reminded the group that his goal is to grow grant awards from $60 million to $100 million over the next five years and that he is pushing to obtain a portion of the annual indirect cost funds to support growth in the Office of Research. He asked for support for indirect cost funds from the Committee, and Dr. Reitzes responded that the Committee has supported this for the least several years.

Dr. Reitzes asked if Dr. Morris will continue to provide the monthly research activity financial report. Dr. Morris stated there are some problems with the database which has delayed production of this report for the time being.

Battelle Consultant Report

Dr. Morris presented a report from Battelle on the proposed Science Park that GSU will be constructing in the next few years. There will be three buildings in the park, a science teaching lab building, a research lab building and a commercial technology transfer building. This is part of an initiative to have GSU be involved with Central Atlanta Progress to develop a health/bioscience district in downtown Atlanta. Battelle has been engaged to review GSU’s strengths and weaknesses in this regard and to analyze the potential for success of a development of this type in downtown Atlanta. Ultimately, Battelle will assist in the development of a business plan for the commercial technology transfer building for GSU.

Highlights from the presentation follow:
- The Atlanta region ranks 24th in total NIH funding compared with other similarly sized benchmark cities. The region has experienced a solid growth rate in NIH funding over the last several years. Per capita NIH awards per faculty member are lower in the Atlanta region than they should be, however.
- The Atlanta region has a diversified research base on par with most of the major academic benchmark
centers, being well represented in the engineering and life science disciplines.

Development of the Atlanta bioscience industry cluster lags behind other benchmark areas and is not very specialized or sizable even though the state has infused significant funds into this area. Boston, by comparison, is much more specialized and has experienced rapid growth in the bioscience area.

The Atlanta region does have significant size and expertise in the communications and IT industry clusters.

The Atlanta region has experienced strong growth in pharmaceuticals and biotech R&D, but does have a fairly small base in these industry clusters.

Fulton County, where GSU is located, does not have a large percentage of regional biotech activity, that activity is primarily concentrated in Gwinnett County.

Atlanta regional venture capital funding is ahead of most the benchmark cities, but the amount of funding devoted to biotech is fairly weak, the primary emphasis for venture capital funding in the biosciences area is the health care service and medical device industries.

The regional employment index is ahead of most benchmarks and we do have a comparatively strong base of employment in the biosciences, it is mostly focused in the clinical area.

The Atlanta region does not have as many people graduating with degrees in the biosciences as compared to the benchmarks.

GSU was the first university in the Atlanta region to develop an incubator for commercialization of academic research (Collabtech).

There is no space currently available in the Atlanta area for post incubator development activities, the minimum size for this type of space is 10K – 15K ft².

Space needed currently for post incubator activity is about 15K – 20K ft², Georgia Tech is considering development of at least 100K ft² building for such a purpose.

Battelle’ s ten year projection for the need for space of this type in the Atlanta area is about 130K – 160K ft².

Existing Atlanta regional commercial bioscience firms do not generally look to local universities for bioscience research expertise, but tend to have a global focus. Most of the firms do not have an awareness of research capabilities at GSU.

In downtown Atlanta, there is no commercial bioscience industry, it is all institutional.

No new class A office space is expected to be developed in downtown Atlanta over the next three years, in fact it is anticipated that over 1 million square feet of occupied space will be vacated during that period.

Areas of current academic research at GSU which have greatest potential for development of commercial applications include: drug discovery, molecular genetics, cardiopulmonary care sciences, applied and environmental microbiology and psychological assistive technologies. Emerging areas of research growth include bioinformatics, biodefense, cancer research and public health.

GSU’ s strengths include a positive culture to pursuing industry collaborations:

- Tenure decisions do not penalize for industry collaborations as long as independent research program in place,
- Recognition that industry funding would diversify base of research funding,
- Protection of intellectual property seen as working well.

GSU’ s weaknesses include:

- Overall level of industry research funding is small - less than $1 million or 2% of research base compared to 6% for universities nationally,
- Capability to commercialize technology into new ventures is limited,
- There is no active industry liaison program
- GSU’ s core labs are not publicized or marketed,
- The GSU alumni network is growing, but has not been a resource,
- Untapped relationships with extensive alumni network of IP attorneys.

Potential partners for collaboration include Grady, CDC, Emory and Morehouse.
Dr. Morris then presented a synopsis of the different types of pre and post incubator facilities that have been developed by comparable research universities in several of the benchmark cities included in the Battelle report. He noted that there are a variety of financing models which have been utilized to obtain funds to construct these facilities. Most are not quite self-sufficient commercial developments and need some assistance from government agencies.

In conclusion, the Battelle report recommends that the technology commercialization building which GSU plans to build be developed as a mixed use facility with a variety of companies of different sizes that can leverage GSU’s core competencies. He added that a development of this type will have a good chance of success if able to sign a significant anchor tenant (possibly GSU). Public subsidies will likely need to be offered to lure private companies to move into the facility, and CAP is working on this. It is also important that a professional property manager be contracted to run the operations of the building.

**Announcements**

The next Committee meeting will be held at 3:00pm on November 15 in 718-G.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.