Senate Research Committee Meeting Minutes  
Monday, February 21, 2011 at 3:00 PM  
1000 Urban Life

Attendees: Pam Barr, Tim Bartness, Dan Benardot, Laura Burtle, Sarah Cook, Robert Curry, John Decker, Debney Dixon, Don Edwards, Bill Kahnweiler, Chris Henrich, Beth Jones, Amy Lederberg, Robin Morris, Jennifer Patico, Don Reitzes, Mary Ann Romski, Rose Sevcik, Mary Stuckey, Monica Swahn, P.C. Tai, Art Vandenberg, Carol Winkler and Leslie Wolf

Guest: Caroline Lombard

1. January 24 2011 minutes were approved.
2. Rose Sevcik, Chair, asked Mary Ann to update the committee on the Research Center Review. It was decided that rather than discuss the entire document(s) again that senate members should direct questions for discussion regarding the edits and Appendix in this meeting.
   a) Question - Regarding service and instructional Centers - what would be the implications for other types of centers as related to research centers. Mary Ann stated there were many centers without “research” and these had not been the focus of our discussions, and other groups would have to address their requirements.
   b) It was asked if Research Centers would self-designated once this policy is approved, and it was answered yes, then the designee would go thru the process of review within five (5) years.
   c) It was asked whether the VP for Research’s title would be changed adding the “& Economic Development” component like the new job, which was discussed.
   d) It was asked whether the review processes would headed by the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, and it would be coordinated by them.

- There were “friendly” edits to the Center Approval and Review Process section. Committee agreed that that the term “high quality research” should include “grants relevant to the academic discipline and affiliated with the Centers” rather that using either good or excellent as the terminology. A “strong record” should be used rather than a “good record”.
- Committee agreed that a Research Center goal should be clearly defined as “value added” above the contributions of individual researchers, and the review should clearly document how the Center would increase productivity of faculty teams.
- It was suggested that there should be some reference also to the training of undergraduate students rather than just the training of graduate students.
- Motion made and Senate approved the documents with friendly amendments. Mary Ann will make the changes and send out to Senate Research Committee to review electronically. After final approval document will go to Senate Executive Committee before the end of this week.

3. Robert Curry & Caroline Lombard briefed the committee on the two policies that address conflicts of interest and commitment for GSU. He reported that NIH had made many proposed revisions in 2010. He stated the conflict policies had been presented to the Deans, Associate Deans and the Senate Research Subcommittee. He stated Leslie Wolf had provided feedback last fall by drafting a short summary and another round of revisions were completed so that faculty would understand the two documents. After a question about potential future changes, it was agreed by the committee that when there are changes there should be some Committee notification of these changes. Carol Lombard stated she would make changes and submit to the
Senate Research Committee. Committee approved the policy with the understanding that Senate Research Committee would be notified of future changes.

4. Don Edwards reported for the IACUC Subcommittee. He stated he attended the first meeting of the IACUC Subcommittee, which had been structured following the IRB Subcommittee, and which was attended by a number of animal users and he felt that many issues just needed this level of face-to-face communication. He realizes that there should also be some type of ongoing process to improve communication regarding any proposals, suggestions, preventative measures and opportunities for the community at large. He felt that everyone involved, including the IACUC Committee members, were trying to act in everyone’s best interest, but that there were some time and other limitations that created stress and strain on the system, and the process, particularly for investigators under pressure to meet deadlines. He felt the process was helpful and they will continue it to try to improve both the processes involved, but also communication.

5. Robin Morris reported the ad was out on his position. There were questions and discussion regarding the addition of the “and Economic Development” to the title although Robin stated it was currently part of his workload and the title was more in keeping with what was being used nationally. Interviews should begin in April.

6. Bob Curry also reported that he had been contacted by NIH on issues involving faculty misconduct. He will be interviewed 2/23 by the Feds to determine how GSU complies with current Federal guidelines.

7. There was a request that other compliance committees, such as the IBC, also have some ongoing discussions related to their processes and procedures like the IRB & IACUC.

Next meeting, March 21 at 3:00 PM – 315 Dahlberg Hall