Dr. Reitzes was delayed in arriving at the meeting. Dr. Baumstark called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm.

**Approval of Minutes**

The first order of business was review and approval of the minutes from the October 18, 2004 meeting. No member asked for modifications to the minutes. A motion was made for approval of the minutes as written; the motion and approved by those members present.

**GSURF Report**

Ms. Barrett provided a two page handout of condensed financial information for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2004 for the Georgia State University Research Foundation. She stated that the majority of sponsored project funds are contracted to GSURF. GSURF transfers the funds back to the University to pay for research activities. The University then provides GSURF with some indirect cost money which is split 50/50 between GSURF and the departments. She stated that GSURF had revenue of about $48 million in FY04 and noted that $46.3 million of this was from research grant funding.

Ms. Barrett noted that there was residual income of $873K allocated to the departments in FY04. This represents balances in sponsored accounts for fixed price contracts where the work charged to the project was less than the contracted amount. After close out of these grants, the residual balances are transferred to department accounts. She noted expenses for FY04 included $750K for an eminent scholar chair in drug discovery and $106K paid to a Washington DC lobbying firm, Van Scoyoc & Associates.

Ms. Barrett then reviewed the FY05 budget for GSURF. She noted that there is anticipated to be another eminent scholar hired with expertise in microbiology, so $750K is budgeted for this expense. She stated that a search is underway to fill the Director of Technology Commercialization position, and the salary for this position is funded from GSURF, so $138K is budgeted for this expense in FY05. She remarked that the Van Scoyoc contract will continue in FY05 at an expense of $96K.

Ms. Barrett stated that the balance of cash held by GSURF as of June 30, 2004 was about $5.5 million. She noted that this cash is invested in an operating account and earns about $58K per year in interest income. She reported that the GSURF Board of Directors, at its December, 2004 meeting, agreed to form a financial subcommittee to help determine the best use for the ongoing interest income which accrues from investment of GSURF’s operating account. Dr. Lederberg stated that the GSURF Board is considering funding Presidential scholarships with some of this money. Dr. Morris remarked that the Board also approved funding a public relations campaign to increase awareness of the research activities/capabilities at GSU.

Dr. Romski asked if departments are allowed to spend the residual account balances that have been allocated
to them. Dr. Morris responded that in the future, when departments approach the Office of Research requesting funds for certain internal needs, he may ask that they use the funds in their residual accounts. Dr. Huhman asked if the state of Georgia can rescind funds held in residual accounts. Dr. Morris answered that under certain circumstances the state could rescind such funds. He added that funds in residual accounts cannot be used for ongoing funding purposes such as salary increases, or for bonuses, but can be used for one-time expenditures such as funding for infrastructure support. Dr. Baumstark remarked that the rationale for saving residual funds in the department accounts is for use when emergency situations arise.

Dr. Elliott asked about providing funds to faculty when they take professional leave. Dr. Morris stated that his office is working to develop a policy for this, but it has not yet been finalized.

Dr. Dixon asked about the status of the Director of Technology Commercialization search. Dr. Morris responded that the position has been advertised and a search committee has been appointed, but interviews for the position have not yet started.

Subcommittee Reports

Strategic Planning Subcommittee

Dr. Derby stated that the Strategic Planning subcommittee has completed its review of the Office of Research self study and external reviewers report. He provided a handout with the subcommittee’s five recommendations for actions to be taken as a result of the review. The recommendations are as follows:

1. Establish a system and staff that provides adequate support to faculty in all aspects of grants administration, including both pre- and post-award administration. [We currently have a system of support with staff located both centrally (Office of Sponsored Programs and Office of Grants & Contracts) and locally (staff in the various colleges and departments). There is agreement from most that the level and quality of support is currently inadequate, and the problems are likely to become more challenging as the responsibilities of research administration (e.g. compliance, regulations, etc.) increase. The solutions are not simple and the suggestions from the Self-Study are, in the opinion of our Subcommittee, insufficient to remedy most of the problems. We recommend that a committee of faculty, administrators, and staff from the Senate Research Committee and the Office of the VP for Research work together to develop a model.]

2. Funding to the Office of the VP for Research and the Office of Research and Awards Administration should reflect the size and growth of external awards (especially F&A awards), and a funding model should be developed to provide this. This linkage is necessary to fund a staff of sufficient size to handle the administrative responsibility, and to provide resources to faculty to increase the research output and grow the research enterprise.
   - For any increases in F&A awards, the Research Office should receive a percentage of the University’s share of the F&A award— we recommend 50% of the University’s share.
   - The Internal Grants program should receive a percentage of the University’s share of the F&A awards; we recommend 25% of the University’s share.

3. The various offices associated with research activities (Office of Sponsored Programs, Grants & Contracts, Compliance, Director of Commercialization) should be linked as much as possible, functionally and physically if possible. These should be located as close as possible to the faculty and administration.

4. Provide competitive salaries for the staff. It is imperative to attract and retain a trained and
knowledgeable staff that works effectively and closely with the faculty; providing competitive salaries is necessary to achieve this. The salaries should be based on regional models.

5. Develop a funding model for IT hardware, software, and services that provides sufficient resources to support research and its administration. A critical component of this is for administrators, faculty, and staff to work together to develop systems that are usable to all and support the growth of our research enterprise.

There was discussion among the committee members about the share of F&A which should be provided to the Office of Research. Dr. Emmanuel felt strongly that it was not appropriate to specify a specific percentage in the recommendations, although she agreed with the spirit of making such funding available to the Office of Research. She asked if there was any documentation which supported using 50% of F&A as the funding target for the Office of Research. Dr. Morris remarked that the key concept is to have some linkage between the growth in grant awards to the University and growth in funding for the Office of Research. He added that this linkage has not been in place in prior years. Dr. Tai added that when the recommendations get to FACP, a percentage will need to be specified.

After further discussion, Dr. Tai made a motion to accept the recommendations with the following change:

- The Internal Grants program should receive a percentage of the University’s share of the F&A awards; we recommend 50% of the share received by the Research Office.

Dr. Bartness seconded the motion, the motion passed with one member opposed.

Research Infrastructure Subcommittee

No report was given as the subcommittee co-chairs were not in attendance. It was noted that members of this subcommittee have been working with a team to develop a proposal applying for a grant to obtain funding for computing hardware to support a research network cluster at GSU.

Research Integrity Subcommittee

No report was given as the subcommittee chair was not in attendance.

Dr. Curry announced that three employees in the Safety area (Boone Brothers, Peter Farina and Mike Ling) will be administratively reassigned from Facilities to the Office of Research Integrity starting in January, 2005.

Dr. Tai remarked that he had recently taken the online training course required for animal researchers and found it to be unusually difficult, requiring knowledge of some very obscure information like the size of cages required to house certain animals. He felt that the faculty should have been more involved in development of this training module. Dr. Dixon stated she agreed with Dr. Tai that faculty need to be involved earlier in the process of developing training modules for researchers. Dr. Bartness responded that in some cases in the past, this was just not feasible because deadlines were too tight to allow for engagement of a wide range of faculty in the development of training materials. He added that development of training materials is an intense process and some faculty will not get actively involved in it even though they have been asked to do so.

Internal Grants Subcommittee

No report was given as the subcommittee chair had left the meeting.

Research Center Review Subcommittee
Dr. Reitzes announced that so far there is one entity which will need to be reviewed, the Economic Fiscal Policy Center in the AYSPS.

**Report from the Vice President for Research**

Dr. Morris reported that the inaugural *Research Update* monthly newsletter has been completed and distributed to all faculty and staff across campus. He noted that the plan is to eventually transition from a paper newsletter to an e-mail version in order to reduce costs.

Dr. Morris announced that the IRBWise software, which will allow electronic management of IRB protocol submissions and reviews, is expected to be rolled out to the University by March, 2005. He also expects online training in human subject protection regulations to be ready by February, 2005.

Dr. Morris reported that a new policy has been developed by his office regarding NIH modular grant procedures. He will send to Dr. Reitzes for distribution to the committee.

Dr. Morris stated that the Science Park project is progressing, funding from the state of Georgia which is needed for the project is ranked on Governor Purdue’s capital expenditure agenda as #7 in importance, so there is a chance it will be approved in the next budget cycle. He added that several private donors have expressed an interest in providing some funding. Also, he and a team of faculty/staff are developing a proposal to obtain a grant for $25 million to construct a regional biocontainment lab on the site.

Dr. Morris reported that he will be announcing the appointment of the Associate VP for Research shortly to replace Dr. Art Murphy who resigned last July.

Dr. Morris stated that there are several policy/procedure items being developed by his office that need input from faculty. He asked if the committee could help out with this. Dr. Reitzes suggested that an ad hoc subcommittee could be assembled on a voluntary basis from members of the committee. Dr. Morris noted the role of such a subcommittee would be advisory in nature.

**Announcements**

The next committee meeting will be held at 3:00pm on January 24, 2005 in room 718-G.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.