MINUTES OF DEANS’ GROUP
October 22, 2003

Attendees: Ron Henry, Chair
Adamson, Colarusso, Fritz, Harris, Hurt, Kaminshine, Kelley, Louis, B. Moore,

Guests: Charity Scott & Bob Curry

Blue Ribbon Committee report on human subject protection: Bob Curry serves as Chair of the IRB Committee for the U the Blue Ribbon Committee charged with assessing research integrity compliance across campus.

Scott presented on issues addressed in the report: IRB functioning, infrastructure, and, educational programs. She advocated for a better model than more IRB review. Federal law, however, requires IRB review of research that poses potential risks to human subjects. The IRB has to weigh risks against benefits and the benefits have to outweigh the risks.

Colarusso: “assessment by colleges” what is implied by that?
Scott: the appointment by each college of a point person to assess current college compliance, address compliance departmental issues in a way that allows the IRB to focus on scientific methodology – what is the boundary between IRB assessment of methodology and certifying scientific methodology.
Adams: not mentioned in the written record of the report are (1) the role of the Senate Research Committee in information gathering to allay fear that this is not a centralized issue, and (2) the dept. chair has review responsibility for certifying scientific methodology.
Curry: graduate students often turn to IRB for assistance. That should be handled in the departments with the onus on faculty to assist their graduates with methodology.
Scott: we could make an amendment to the report regarding peer review. Federal law, however, requires IRB review of research that poses potential risks to human subjects. The IRB has to weigh risks against benefits and the benefits have to outweigh the risks.
Adams: this should be included in the report or referred to in the manual.
Henry: the point is that department chairs have overall responsibility to review and attest.

Colarusso: not all faculty will need training. Many are already supervising research initiatives.
Curry: we are asking for more careful review within approval boundaries. We thought training of faculty for research integrity compliance was already in place. We are looking for a better model than more IRB review. There will be a tutorial offered in January for faculty to become certified in scientific methodology required every 5 years. Faculty with responsibility for approval of scientific methodology will take the tutorial. Implementation of the tutorial is a requirement, it will have a GSU focus, and the 5 modules will be available on the GSU website.

B. Moore: how did the committee come to the decision on an AVP for research integrity?
Scott: our peer institutions currently have this position. The amount of federal responsibility is expanding, a competent specialist with expertise within our purview. Someone to liaise with the faculty, the Senate, and from that aspect liaison with the research community, and know of new developments in protective standards.

Adams: there needs to be a definition of what is research, and a definition of what constitutes pilot work by st chair or someone needs to be aware of potential risks with this type research.
Curry: this is in the manual. Pilot studies have potential for harming. A decision needs to be made on whether required.
Kelley: I move for a requirement for IRB approval.
Henry: Deans to do: distribute the report to all faculty; notify chair or someone needs to be aware of potential risks with this type research.

Guests:
Charity Scott & Bob Curry

Blue Ribbon Committee report on human subject protection: Bob Curry serves as Chair of the IRB Committee for the University; Scott served as chair of the Blue Ribbon Committee charged with assessing research integrity compliance across campus.

Scott presented on issues addressed in the report: IRB functioning, infrastructure, and, educational programs. She advocated for a better model than more IRB review. Federal law, however, requires IRB review of research that poses potential risks to human subjects. The IRB has to weigh risks against benefits and the benefits have to outweigh the risks.

Colarusso: “assessment by colleges” what is implied by that?
Scott: the appointment by each college of a point person to assess current college compliance, address compliance departmental issues in a way that allows the IRB to focus on scientific methodology – what is the boundary between IRB assessment of methodology and certifying scientific methodology.
Adams: not mentioned in the written record of the report are (1) the role of the Senate Research Committee in information gathering to allay fear that this is not a centralized issue, and (2) the dept. chair has review responsibility for certifying scientific methodology.
Curry: graduate students often turn to IRB for assistance. That should be handled in the departments with the onus on faculty to assist their graduates with methodology.
Scott: we could make an amendment to the report regarding peer review. Federal law, however, requires IRB review of research that poses potential risks to human subjects. The IRB has to weigh risks against benefits and the benefits have to outweigh the risks.
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B. Moore: how did the committee come to the decision on an AVP for research integrity?
Scott: our peer institutions currently have this position. The amount of federal responsibility is expanding, a competent specialist with expertise within our purview. Someone to liaise with the faculty, the Senate, and from that aspect liaison with the research community, and know of new developments in protective standards.

Adams: there needs to be a definition of what is research, and a definition of what constitutes pilot work by st chair or someone needs to be aware of potential risks with this type research.
Curry: this is in the manual. Pilot studies have potential for harming. A decision needs to be made on whether required.
Kelley: I move for a requirement for IRB approval.
Henry: Deans to do: distribute the report to all faculty; notify chair or someone needs to be aware of potential risks with this type research.
B. Moore: We would want to see the training module before we would require all faculty to attend.
Louis: faculty of every department where a protocol has gone through should attend.
Kaminshine: we do very little in this area in Law, but would attend. To the extent that we are evaluating pedagogy we need to be aware of the risks.
Harris: if it is an area of risk to GSU, it is appropriate for the leadership to be aware.
Henry: each college should appoint one person to be liaison to the Senate Research Committee; previously I of the SRC to the Blue Ribbon Committee so they can report back to the Senate committee. We need assessment of compliance.
Kaminshine: are the staffing recommendations what you will go along with?
Henry: we will move into meeting them in a phased-in manner adding 1 person in IACUC, and 1 in IRB, [we we will bump up the current position of the IRB compliance officer. The AVP position will require bud]
Meanwhile, Louis & Murphy can share some responsibility for 1. Streamlining grants & contracts. 2. Cc Support of faculty research. If there are no more resources we will have to find the money within the

B. Moore: You're proposing increasing the budget for the Research Office. This increase is being taken out of th weighed against other budgetary needs.
Henry: I agree, but with the exception that the university could have been at risk if there was not more mon faculty and administrative costs provided specifically to the university in indirect costs provided the m

Deans’ Group

Henry: the minutes of the meeting on 10/15/03 will be forthcoming.
Fritz: Registrar forms discussed at the last meeting, as a temporary solution, will be available for download signatures can be e-mailed to the chair, then on to the Registrar. GA Residency determination current1 will move to the Registrar’s office, where it will be more closely audited and monitored for Hope compl Office will do determination of residency from credentials, for undergraduate and graduate admissions process will continue as is.

Continuing discussion on core programs:

Colarusso: The 1st round of core vs. non-core discussion was more superficial, looking at whether a program or e college. In retrospect, we should have looked at what is core to the university. When you continue ti some things, it results in a lot of controversy. Now we are to go back and look at critical programs
Henry: We cannot afford to do it all. We can protect and enhance some solid programs but can we improve the money to do that.
M. Moore: the option of now does not exist. This is an opportunity to match the mission of the university to avai leave us in better shape.
Adamson: why are we being this program specific, at this point in the process?
Henry: the programs with an X are those that don't appear to connect to our core. Either core to what we c Strategic Plan areas of focus. Only 13 of our doctoral programs are producing 10 or more graduate o
Kelley: the programs in Respiratory Therapy, Nutrition, and Physical Therapy are critical to our new Institute
Henry: I thought the focus of the Institute was on policy.
Colarusso: these decisions are data driven. We have not looked at all the data to make these decisions.
Henry: then how do we get down to a group to look at?
Adamson: look at with what conclusions?
Henry: if the premise is that we cannot afford to do it all, how do we arrive at discontinuing – that is stoppin Colarusso: we can start by looking at those programs that are not viable, but there may be ways to find other res In that context, are we moving too quickly to discontinue?
Adamson: if the goal is to find programs for focused discussion on stopping, you already have some it appears y not begin with those? There will be concerns about how we got to decisions; we need you to guide u:
Colarusso: there are negative connotations on a lot of good programs looking at core vs. non-core. We should lc use those to compare all programs, and compare with central data.
Kaminshine: given the anxiety of the faculty, transparency of the process is important.

Henry: The next Dean’s Group will be November 12. Administrative Council on November 5,