

Minutes,  
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH,  
April 13, 1994,  
206 Sandy Hall,  
3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: M. Bezold (for G. Apgar), R. Paterson (for R. Bates), T. Brandon, P. Eyre, J. Johnson, H. Kriz, A. McNabb, J. Nespor, R. Olin, L. Peters, P. Rasnick, H. Tze, H. Wisdom

MEMBERS ABSENT: P. Edwards, C. Flora, J. Lee, M. O'Brien, J. Pinkerton, R. Reneau, E. Stout, J. Wightman

INVITED GUESTS: D. Shelton, S. Trulove

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Dr. Eyre motioned approval of agenda; Dr. Wisdom seconded. Agenda was approved.
2. MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 1994: Dr. Eyre motioned approval; Dr. Paterson seconded. Minutes were approved.
3. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS (IRB), DR. JOHNSON: Dr. Johnson provided the history behind the creation of the IRB. On July 12, 1974 the National Research Act (P.L. 93-348) created the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The Commission continued deliberations at the Smithsonian Institution Belmont Conference Center and from that came the Belmont Report. Guidelines were published in the Federal Register and then became a part of Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46). The Office of Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) was established under Health and Human Services.

From the Belmont Report there are guidelines that we use.

1. The boundary between research and routine practice of medicine or therapy is determined by asking is it proving a hypothesis with experimental design?
2. To determine assessment of risk/benefit we ask: In. issues are ethical principles followed? Respect for persons demonstrated? Is risk minimized; Benefit maximized? Risk may be physical, psychological, social, economic. There must be safeguards on all fronts and monitoring where appropriate.
3. Guidelines for selection of subjects should not be discriminating; not coerced; and ability to give consent.
4. Informed consent for all participants must be at the educational level of the subject and this agreement should consist of elements of informed consent; purpose of experiment and stated that it is research; what will be done; who will have information; right to refuse or withdraw; risks, benefits; compensation; contacts with phone numbers for research and conduct of research; children - must have assent in understandable language to them. Special situations of informed consent are placebo and

deception. Lack of objection does not constitute consent. Human subject research includes survey, sensory, observations, and records.

The steps the investigation must take are complete protocol and design of consent forms and survey instrument. The investigation should submit all materials called for to the department reviewer or committee. The department submits the entire package to the Research Division for approval. The approval may be exempt; expedited; or approved by the full board. The IRB membership consists of faculty, Health and Safety, Legal Counsel, community member, medical doctors and other medical personnel. The Associate Provost for Research chairs the IRB. Full IRB review is automatic if it involves children; involves more than minimal risk or experimental procedure; susceptibility to criminal or civil liability; radioisotopes, X-ray; fetus, pregnancy, or lactating involved; medical therapy; or cognitively impaired involved. Approval is granted for 12 months unless change in protocol. Virginia Tech has a multiple assurance number for all proposals going to NIH.

Dr. Johnson provided IRB packets which explain the procedure and contains the forms to be used. She mentioned a notebook which was published by the Office of Protection from Research Risks. It costs \$30. and has everything to be known about IRB.

Dr. Nespor asked about institutional research (gathering data on the students). Dr. Johnson responded that it does not go before the IRB that it is not experimental and does not have an hypothesis. Dr. McNabb stated that a researcher could not masquerade behind a task of simply data gathering and then publish the results. She said that if a data-gatherer end up publishing the results, then they clearly fit the research framework. Dr. Eyre said that that is a good point and that there probably is a gray area. Dr. Johnson said that she would check the notebook for more information on the institutional research subject. Dr. Nespor asked about representation from all areas on the IRB. Dr. Johnson said that the attempt is made to represent those colleges and departments that seem to have most of the work involving human subjects including qualitative research. Dr. Nespor asked about the confidentiality issue in relation to video and audio tapes. Dr. Johnson responded that it is typical that it is either confidential or anonymous at the onset, but if it cannot be either one then that needs to be made very clear at the onset. Dr. Eyre asked about non-confidential surveys and the subjects right to refuse to participate in such activities. He stated that some of these would not be valid ones without certain individuals participation. Dr. Peters said that the individual's rights are paramount. He suggested that maybe parts of the survey could be done at another university to help the validity issue. Dr. Nespor asked about the assent form for small children. Dr. Johnson responded that if they cannot write for whatever reason, then the assent form can be read to them. Dr. Nespor asked if there is any coordination with other IRB boards. He mentioned that there is a proposal before the State Board of Education to have each school district create its own IRB. Dr. Johnson responded that currently the answer is

no, but there are guidelines for coordination. Dr. Johnson said that there is a model in place for implementation and it could be easily activated. Dr. Olin asked if the IRB takes a majority vote. Dr. Johnson responded no. It is discussed until there is a unanimous decision.

4. REPORT FROM DWIGHT SHELTON: Mr. Shelton said that fortunately, overall we have seen a decline or lessening of the level of concern in whether higher education is charging indirect costs inappropriately. Certainly, the government continues to be interested in this issue and that there is an underlying current of lack of trust. The Federal government continues to want to hold down total indirect cost payments. The current year Clinton budget has a provision in it that states that individual indirect cost payments made to an institution for the fiscal year 1995 cannot be higher than the amounts that were paid in 1994. Mr. Shelton said that for some institutions that will be a problem. He stated that during the severe flooding in the Midwest specific bills were introduced to retract funds available for indirect cost payments. He said he feels that the Federal government believes that indirect costs are a discretionary expenditure and one that they can try to reduce.

Mr. Shelton said that one of the biggest things for higher education institutions are their applications to what is called the Cost Accounting Standards Board. They have very stringent, different set of rules than that which higher education has operated under. He said that it has been decided that the cost accounting standards would not be applied to higher education institutions.

Mr. Shelton said that one item that is being discussed at Virginia Tech in the indirect cost arena is the concept of direct charging to sponsored activities, clerical and support type costs. There is a group or task force working on this. If this is not addressed and the Federal government more stringent application appears then we lose the ability to direct charge some of these types of activities to projects. He said he is hopeful that we will come up with a compromise.

Mr. Shelton provided a handout on indirect costs. He gave an overview of the handout. He stated that there are three categories for direct costs and four categories for indirect costs. The three categories for direct costs are: 1) instruction; 2) research; and 3) public service. The four categories for indirect costs are: 1) academic support; 2) student services; 3) institutional support; and 4) operation and maintenance of plant. We basically are trying to develop a process of taking those four and putting them back into the three direct cost categories. Mr. Shelton explained the process.

He stated that they negotiate with the Federal government as to what the indirect cost rate will be. Last time he said that this was done Virginia Tech started out at 62% and the Federal government started out at 40%. We ended up with 54%. Mr. Shelton said that we did this rate last time in 1990. On June 30,

1994 we will not have an approved indirect cost rate. He said that we were supposed to submit the rate by the end of March but that he had asked for a one month extension. Mr. Shelton said that we will soon submit one to the Federal government. The indirect cost rate is going down. It is going down because right now we are having trouble developing one above 50%. That means the actual rate will be somewhere in the 40's. No matter what we send them they are going to lower our number. He said the Federal government are under-staffed right now and that they are behind on their workload. The University of Florida submitted their rate in December and they still haven't heard anything from the Federal government. This university will go on a provisional rate on July 1. We will either be directed to use what we currently have or the Federal government will give us another number that we will negotiate. Our current rate is 56%. The Federal government has capped the administrative portion of indirect cost and that is costing us 6-7 percentage points already.

In response to a question by Dr. Johnson, Mr. Shelton stated that we are hearing that they are 2-3 points down for several schools. Rates do depend on how aggressive they were during the entire process. UVA went from about the same range we have to a 48-50% range. Mr. Shelton said that if we end up with an extremely low rate, we can negotiate it for just one year, and if it is a good rate then we may try to extend it for 7 years. Ms. Rasnick asked about the sponsored projects being 53.5% and come July they may go down and meanwhile all these projects are being automatically charged, will all that have to be taken out. Mr. Shelton responded that the rules technically say that we would, but that this is a negotiating point with the government.

5. UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH EXPERIENCE, RESEARCH PERCEPTION AND PUBLICITY: Dr. Olin provided a handout that described the charge of the task force to study undergraduate research. It contains four items. He also reported that John Muffo mailed to him an assessment update article which he provided the membership. He stated that at the end of the article it states that a university should have some mechanism of addressing the issues that this task force will be doing. Dr. Peters stated that it should be written undergraduate students rather than just students. Dr. Olin stated that this will be added. Dr. Paterson motioned approval. It was seconded. The motion passed.
6. PROPOSAL FROM CGSP'S RESTRUCTURING COMMITTEE: Dr. Olin said that CGSP wants to eliminate its subcommittee that deals with graduate research policies. Instead they want to solidify the interchange of information with our commission. Both commissions have felt that this interchange of having a member on both commissions has really been helpful. They want to write into the university governance a policy that ensures this process; in particular they want this process to ensure having one member of our commission going to theirs and the opposite way the next year. Dr. McNabb mentioned that it would an hour and a half every week for someone. Dr. Olin said that they are trying to hold the meetings down to once a month for both commissions. Dr. Peters

said that a point should be made that the person who is serving on both commissions should not have a committee assignment. Dr. Olin asked for a motion. Dr. Johnson asked if this will be a two-way communication. Dr. Olin responded that it is supposed to be both ways at one time. One person reports both ways. Dr. Eyre mentioned that it sort of suggests that the two commissions have so much in commission maybe it should be reconsidered that they be joined. Dr. Peters said that restructuring committee looked at that suggestion and rejected it. Dr. Johnson motioned approval of the proposal; Dr. Eyre seconded. Motion passed.

7. MINUTES OF COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY SUPPORT: Dr. Olin reported that Mr. Williams will be coming to the next meeting to talk about data processing and systems. He stated that the membership may want to read over the minutes of the Commission on University Support before Mr. Williams comes next time. Dr. Olin asked the membership if they want their minutes copied and distributed to them. Dr. Eyre said that he felt that it would be useful. Dr. Eyre motioned that we receive the minutes for information. Dr. McNabb said that perhaps we should have the minutes reported to the group in the way that the Library minutes are reported. She stated that it should be left up to the chair as to whether the whole thing is distributed or reported. Dr. Eyre agreed and Dr. McNabb seconded the motion. Motion was approved.

8. ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

RFO/php

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

April 27, 1994

206 Sandy Hall

3:30 PM

Members Present: G. Apgar, R. Bates, R. Schubert (for P. Edwards),  
C. Flora, H. Kriz, J. Lee, A. McNabb, R. Olin, L. Peters, P. Rasnick,  
E. Stout, H. Tze, J. Wightman, H. Wisdom

Members Absent: T. Brandon, P. Eyre, J. Johnson, J. Nespore, M. O'Brien,  
J. Pinkerton, R. Reneau

Invited Guests: M. Williams, S. Trulove

1. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed with the addition of library minutes to agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes of April 13

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Minutes were approved with the spelling correction of a name.

3. Report from Director of the Computing Center

Mr. Mike Williams presented an update on computing support for research. Research computing consumes 1/3 to 1/2 the effort but funding from research is about 15% of total budget. The discontinuance of mainframe computing is inevitable. Mr. Williams reported it will be approximately 3 to 4 years for all to not be dependent on the mainframe. Mr. Williams described the differences between distributed and central mainframe computing. The primary difference is cost with an upgrade on the mainframe costing 5 to 6 M compared to \$2,000 of the distributive computing.

Changes that impact research computing needs are 1) workstation software support programs have been instituted, 2) there is a growing establishment of computer servers, 3) Computer services is scaling up with departments spending approximately 9 to 1 on computing equipment compared to central computing, and 4) network information resources are available. There has been discussion between Mr. Blythe and Dr. Peters about setting up a research computing advisory group.

Dr. Wightman asked about the Illinois computer center which has obtained extensive funding and is a pseudo free body of the university. The Illinois center has developed a strong delivery of network services.

4. Interdisciplinary Research Center Reviews

University Center for Transportation Research: Dr. Stout reported that the funding for this center has jumped dramatically but the Center has not comparable changes in the Center. Eight recommendations were made by the review committee speak to that need including development of a strategic plan and formation of an administrative advisory board. The review committee recommended that the Center be reauthorized for 2 years to address the recommendations. At that time, the Center will be reviewed for reauthorization. A motion was made and seconded to accept the report.

Virginia Water Resources Center: Dr. McNabb reported that during the review, this center had a large state budget cut. The review committee recommends that the Center continue and that publications be condensed and generated fewer times per year and that the center consolidate the public

information effort to accommodate the reduction in funding. The review committee also recommended closer ties with the campus. The Center has initiated their recommendation that faculty from around campus be brought in to contribute to the research program. A motion was made and seconded to accept the report.

Systems Research Center: The review committee recommended that the Center continue and that Dr. Nance continue as director. An on campus advisory committee was recommended. A motion was made and seconded to accept the report.

Dr. Stout, on behalf of Dr. Johnson, thanked the members of the Interdisciplinary Review Committee for the work they have done this year - McNabb, Wightman, Nespor, and Reneau.

The High Energy Physics review is nearly completed and the Powell River Project in draft form. Those reviews will be considered in the fall.

#### 5. Library Minutes

Dr. Kriz reported on the Library Minutes for March 16. He stated that they have not been formally approved.

#### 6. Other

Dr. Stout responded to a question raised at the last meeting about compliance of regulations for research on human subjects. The definition of research as stated in the 45 CFR 46 is research for generalizable knowledge that will be published in an open forum. Data for internal purposes is not research. Dr. Flora suggested that there be an update meeting for those who do surveys, especially in the Center for Survey Research and that there be a workshop on the topic. Dr. Stout responded that there needs to be a campus wide effort. Dr. Stout stated that UCLA is under serious investigation because the IRB did not follow compliance regulations.

#### 7. Homework Assignment

Dr. Olin asked the membership to E-mail discussion items for next year's Commission agenda.

#### 8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.