COMMISSION ON RESEARCH
February 11, 2015
325 Burruss Conference Room
3:30pm – 5:00pm

Minutes

Attendee: France Belanger (Chair), Randy Wynne (Vice Chair), Tom Martin (for Ben Knapp), Tom Inzana, Srinath Ekkad, Nathan Hall, Iuliana Lazar, Elizabeth Grant (for Annie Pearce), Barbara Lockee, Robert Vogelaar, Scott Klopfer, Sue Teel, Tara Reed, Jewell Trent, Jonah Fogel, Paul Knox, Adrian Ares, Alan Grant, Beth Tranter (for Dennis Dean) and Wendy Vaughn (recorder).

Absent: Cheryl Carrico, Jennifer Irish (for Jesus de la Garza), Chris Lawrence, and Jake Tully.

Guest: Peggy Layne, Ken Miller, David Moore and 4 Graduate Students from EDHE 6304.

I.   Approval of the Agenda – A motion was made and the agenda was approved as revised.

II.   Announcements
   a.   Introductions
   b.   Approval of the Minutes of December 11, 2014 – Minutes were approved electronically.
   c.   March meeting moved to March 4 due to Spring Break – F. Belanger reminded the committee of the next meeting date.
   d.   Vice President for Research and Innovation Search Committee – F. Belanger reported the search is moving along. "Innovation" has been added to the title. Up-coming meetings to discuss the initial pool of candidates.
   e.   Dennis Dean named Interim Vice President for Research & Innovation effective February 1, 2015 – F. Belanger reported this appointment and cited this was recently announced in the VT News.
   f.   COR member selected to Virginia Tech Intellectual Properties (VTIP) Board of Directors – F. Belanger reported VTIP will meet on February 16th to select this representative and thanked COR members who volunteered.

III. Unfinished Business
   a.   Report of Ongoing Activities
      i.   University Library Committee – N. Hall reported the construction of ICAT studios is complete and many are now open.
      ii. Centers and Institutes Update – S. Ekkad reported 5-Year Institute Reviews are underway for ISCE and Fralin and also for one institute director.
      iii. Research Faculty Initiatives

1. HR Sub-committee – A report is expected to be given in March.
   iv. Research Administration –
      1. CREST Development Program Projects – S. Ekkad provided a timeline on conducting proposed features demonstrations and features for research administration set up on-line. An Advisory Board is setting the priorities and should be reaching out to you regarding the process and to receive feedback. A pre-award module, developed first, is currently being piloted in sponsored programs. Conflict of Interest may be developed in the fall. All modules will eventually be integrated and provided at one site. One or two completed modules will go live in July with training planned for May for faculty. Right now you can go to MyVT to see what is available and track your research. K. Miller commented some financial information is available which allows you to drill down. Those reports are now available in an easier format than Banner reports. Comments regarding the project can be sent to Martin Daniel.

b. COR Committee on Policy 13015 Ownership and Control of Research Results – R. Wynne reported there is now progress. Department heads have now agreed they should be the responsible party. Randy will draft revisions to the policy with the committee and should have available at the next meeting.

c. COR/CFA Joint Committee on Policy 13020, Misconduct in Research regarding Self-Plagiarism – F. Belanger reported the language change discussed at the last COR meeting to the policy and the language proposed for the faculty handbook.   Allegations of ethical misconduct will be handled by Faculty Ethics Committee. The proposed changes are being reviewed by all stakeholders. Handbook changes were submitted to Jack Finney and Karen DePauw. Finney forwarded the proposed language to CFA. Suggested language from CFA was incorporated. DePauw is taking this proposal back to Commission on Graduate Studies. Previously, Vice President Bob Walters reviewed and agreed on the language.

T. Inzana added that ORI does not consider self-plagiarism as misconduct. Taking this into account and also the number of gray areas with self-plagiarism it is being handled as an ethics issues. B. Tranter indicated changes will serve a purpose for federal compliance environment as well as university policy.

d. COR Committee on Research Needs – I. Lazar reported that the committee first met in January and identified the top five barrier categories that prevent the faculty from research.

      1) Teaching Support for Research-Active Faculty
      2) Reporting, Administrative, and Service Tasks
      3) Sponsored Research Administration
      4) Research Resources and Funding
      5) Research Metrics and Recognition

It was determined that a survey should be sent to gather information and leave open. There was a discussion of how to structure the survey and to whom it should go.   Previous COACH survey results were discussed. Discussion ensued as to needs to be identified by categories. The following open ended questions were asked in the survey distributed.

A) For each of the categories below that apply to you please identify the top three to five barriers that prevent you from developing your research program and conducting quality research at Virginia Tech.

Research Resources and Funding
Reporting, Administrative, and Service Tasks
Sponsored Research Administration
Research Metrics and Recognition

B) Please identify the top three to five activities/policies that Virginia Tech does best to support your research program

C) Please feel free to share any additional comments you have about conducting research at Virginia Tech

President Sands indicated in a meeting with chairs he is interested and would like information by May. The committee will have additional meetings once the survey closes on March 6 to analyze the results. Ideas from the COR members can be provided to I. Lazar.

IV.   New Business
  a.   Support for Faculty Research by the Office of Compliance, Discuss of Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the National Science Board Document on Compliance – David Moore presented on Reducing Investigators' Administrative Workload for Federally Funded Research. (See handout).

V.   Adjournment at 4:50pm

**REDUCING INVESTIGATORS'
ADMINISTRATIVE WORKLOAD
FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH**

NATIONAL SCIENCE
NSB
National Science Board
Est. 1950
FOUNDATION

"... these findings and recommended policy actions, ***if implemented***, together with the findings and recommendations of existing reports and new initiatives stemming from recent Congressional inquiries, will strengthen the U.S. research enterprise.

MARCH 10, 2014

IV. INCREASE UNIVERSITY EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

"For research subject to IRB and IACUC [and IBC and RSC] review, effective practices and institutional assistance can result in significant time savings."

"... institutions communicate the origin of compliance requirements to researchers and avoid adding unnecessary requirements to those already mandated ..."

"... Federal agencies collaborate with research institutions, and Organizations representing investigators and institutions to identify and disseminate model programs and best practices (e.g., for financial management and IRB/IACUC review) that could be adapted for use at other institutions."

NOTE: **"Best Practices" often involve regulatory creep, resulting in imore stringent practices than is required by the regulations**

IV. INCREASE UNIVERSITY EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

"For research subject to IRB and IACUC [and IBC and RSC] review, effective practices and institutional assistance can result in significant time savings."

". . .Universities review their IRB and IACUC processes and staff organization with the goal of achieving rapid approval of high-quality protocols that protect research subjects."

NOTE: This fails to point out that the staff do not approve the protocols – that, by federal law/regulation, must be done by the compliance committee members, sometimes, as specified by the regs, at a convened meeting.

Anthony Decrappeo, David Kennedy, Josh Trapani, Tobin L. Smith.
Reforming Regulation of Research Universities. IN:
Issues and Science Technology, November 27, 2013.
http://issues.org/27-4/smith-5/

They propose remedies for oversight of:

- human subjects
- animal research
- export controls
- effort reporting
- financial reporting
- COI / research integrity
- Select Agents & toxins
- hazardous materials

The cost of self-imposed regulatory burden in animal research

Joseph D. Thulin,[*,1] John F. Bradfield,[†] Valerie K. Bergdall,[‡] Laura A. Conour,[§] Andrew W. Grady,[‖] Debra L. Hickman,[¶] John N. Norton,[#] and Jeanne M. Wallace[**]

What has the Office of Research Compliance done to improve timeliness and efficiency of Protocol submission, review and approval . . .

and when did it do it . . .

2009/10 – Online Protocol Management System: IRB

2013/14 – Online Protocol Management System: IACUC

2014/15 – Development of "Smart" Protocol Form: IBC

2014 – Procedure Change to Review Protocols outside of Quarterly meetings: RSC

JOURNAL OF CLINICAL RESEARCH BEST PRACTICES

Vol. 10, No. 12, December 2014   "Happy Trials to You"

Consistency in IRB Review

By David B. Resnik

Numerous studies have found that institutional review boards (IRBs) and research ethics committees (RECs) often treat similar studies differently with respect to how they evaluate risks, benefits, study design, the informed consent process, and other aspects of research (Silverman et al 2001, Hirshon et al 2001, McWilliams et al 2003, Angell et al 2006, Kimberly et al 2006, Mansbach et al 2007, Taljaard et al 2014, Higgerson et al 2014). For

At Virginia Tech: 1,100 new protocols annually
1,060 reviewed/approved by ORC staff
40 reviewed at full committee meetings

To achieve consistency . . . . .