

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH

January 28, 2009

325 Burruss Hall

3:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: L. Coble, D. Cook, N. Clemency, M. Cavell (for C. Dawkins), D. Dean, T. Fox, R. Grange, B. Huckle, T. Inzana, D. Jones, R. Kapania, D. Leo (for R. Benson), K. Miller, R. Veilleux

Members Absent: S. K. De Datta, T. Herdman, S. Martin, R. Siegle, B. Vogelaar, P. Young, P. Zellner

Invited Guests: P. Hyer, C. Montgomery, S. Muse, R. Hall, T. Schroeder

- 1. Approval of Agenda:** A motion to approve the agenda was offered by T. Inzana and seconded by R. Kapania and carried.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for CoR meeting November 12, 2008:** A motion to approve the minutes was offered by D. Jones and seconded by R. Veilleux and carried.

3. Proposed Policy on Removal of a PI:

P. Hyer opened discussion with the CoR regarding the Removal of PI Resolution proposed by the Commission on Faculty Affairs. She explained that the CFA receives policy recommendations and requests to change revisions of existing policies as a result of its experiences with grievances, ethics complaints, and other matters. This policy was proposed as a result of a grievance in 2006. The Faculty Senate Review Committee felt that there should be a transparent procedure to address such instances. A written policy and appeal process gives both faculty members and the administration a set of guidelines for proceeding and assures the faculty member an opportunity to challenge the decision.

P. Hyer brought the Commission a version of the resolution that had been modified in view of the CoR's comments conveyed to the CFA after our November '08 meeting. She explained that the first paragraph is a response to something that was in a "whereas" statement and now it is embedded in the policy itself so it would be a context for the policy. She also discussed the concerns that the CoR had about the when the sponsor is informed and how this conforms with the sponsors rules. The sponsors' rules govern when they are informed.

R. Grange questioned whether or not the Faculty Senate actually approved the policy in 2007. P. Hyer explained that they voted on it and approved it and she verified this with the minutes from Gary Long. R. Kapania stated that he would like to see the word 'proven' in front of 'misuse of funds, etc.' P. Hyer explained that this policy addresses things that are not 'proof driven' and that this could be something less than fraud. B. Huckle added that removal would not coincide with accusation. K. Miller added that the word 'proven' could be problematic in such a policy.

T. Fox voiced his concern that in the event that a sponsor was to have a complaint about a PI, the policy as currently written simply states that ‘the Vice President for Research will involve the relevant department head and dean.’ T. Fox felt that this is a must; the VP for Research should consult with the direct supervisor of that faculty member to determine whether the charges are warranted. Others agreed that the line responsibility/supervisor for the faculty member must be consulted to prove the validity of the concerns. T. Fox felt that the involvement of the department head and dean of the faculty member would add checks and balances aspect to this policy. R. Kapania added that the VP for Research has very little knowledge of the PI and there are other people in the chain of command that are aware of what’s going on. After much further deliberation, it was decided that the policy be edited to add that the VP for Research ‘must consult with the relevant department head or dean’ in ‘evaluating the validity of the concerns.’

R. Hall stated that when a sponsor files a compliant, the post-award administrator also gets involved in that they are the person who has the contact with the sponsor. T. Inzana stated that the sponsor should have to provide some rationales as to why they want the PI removed and/or switched. R. Kapania added this could be a problem if all the sponsor has to do is place a phone call to file a compliant. It was then decided that if the sponsor initiates a request for removal, they must provide a statement in writing to the Vice President for Research.

R. Grange stated that the term ‘incapacity’ is a nebulous term and that he would like to see it further defined; it could be physical incapacity, mental incapacity etc. After further discussion, it was decided that the statement ‘unable to carry out their responsibilities as PI or Co-PI’ would be added to further define incapacity.

R. Grange also noted that the last sentence stated that ‘This policy addresses only removal of PI status’ while the entire document including the document name states the policy is for removal of Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator. After much further discussion, it was decided that the last sentence ‘This policy and removal procedure applies to investigators who hold identified responsibilities as principal, co-principal, or lead investigator’ moved up towards the beginning of the document to provide further clarification, and the last sentence would be deleted.

P. Hyer requested the Commissions approval of this resolution with these changes implemented. R. Grange asked that the document be recirculated to the Commission on Research via e-mail prior to final approval. It was decided that after these changes were implemented to the document, with changes noted, it would be reviewed by the Commission and votes would be cast for a motion to approve via email.

- 4. Meeting adjournment:** A motion to adjourn the meeting was offered by D. Dean and seconded by D. Jones and carried at 5:10pm.