

RECORDED MINUTES
Research Policy Committee

January 10, 2005 Meeting
3:30 PM

PRESENT:

Amy Arai, Ph.D.	Robert Helfert, Ph.D.
Lydia Arbogast, Ph.D.	Jodi Huggenvik, Ph.D.
Carol Bauer, M.D.	Peter Patrylo, Ph.D.
John Bradley, M.D.	Sophia Ran, Ph.D.
Kathy Campbell, Ph.D.	Bradley Schwartz, D.O.
Don Caspary, Ph.D., Ex-Officio	Linda Toth, Ph.D., Ex Officio
M. Steven Evans, M.D.	Ko Watabe, Ph.D., Ex Officio
Mark Francis, M.D., Chair	
<u>ABSENT:</u>	
Tim Koschmann, Ph.D.	
Laura Rogers, M.D.	

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The December 13, 2004 minutes were unanimously approved.

Announcements

- Dr. Toth announced that the ADRFA office will be sponsoring a series of monthly Grants Outreach Brown Bag Lunches (GOBBL) beginning on Wednesday, January 26, 2005 in the Dirksen conference room. The first session will feature suggestions and discussions for successful research operation, successful publication, and successful grant proposals.
- Dr. Francis asked if there were any comments concerning the Policy on Research Involving Students and Residents from the EPC that he e-mailed to RPC members. There were no comments.
- Dr. Helfert updated the RPC on the Faculty Incentive Plan. The office of Finance and Administration has been exploring the feasibility of this plan. Their findings will be discussed at their next meeting scheduled for January 25th. If revisions are necessary, the RPC will be asked to approve any changes. Once approved, the proposal will be sent to the Dean, who will meet with the basic science and clinical chairs. Once approved, implement in FY 2006 is anticipated.
- Dr. Huggenvik announced that Kim Espy, Ph.D. will be serving an administrative intern with Dr. John Koropchak, Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Dean at Carbondale. They will be exploring means to enhance research at the School of Medicine. The committee discussed how to best help Dr. Espy in her efforts, particularly in light of similar efforts by Dr. Toth that were discussed at the last RPC meeting. The committee was agreeable to meet with Dr. Espy if she feels this will be helpful. Drs. Toth and Francis will scheduled a meeting with Drs. Espy and Koropchak during their trip Springfield on January 25th to determine how best to proceed.
- Dr. Francis reported that concerns about MTAs have been raised outside of committee meetings. Dr. Toth has been working on this issue. We will discuss this as a future agenda item and invite Mr. Larry Aut and Ms. Ann Evans.

I. EAM and CRC Grants:

Dr. Watabe, Chair of the CRC, asked the RPC to address two items raised by the CRC.

1. Currently clinical and unestablished investigators can submit their grant proposals for a pre-review by the CRC in February before the main review in April to allow the PI to get feedback to make appropriate modifications. The CRC questioned the need for a full committee meeting to review the February 1st CRC submissions. After extensive discussion, the RPC voted that it would not be necessary for the CRC to meet for this initial review. It was felt that the three written critiques will provide the PIs adequate and perhaps more timely feedback to make modifications to their grant application. This will then decrease the burden on faculty time for this CRC meeting.

The initial review process will be as follows:

- Clinical and unestablished research faculty can submit for the February 1st early review. Proposals will be sent to three assigned reviewers as in the past. However, the reviewers will not assign a scientific merit score to their critiques.
 - These critiques then be compiled and sent to the applicants. The applicants can use the critiques to revise their applications prior to the April 1, 2005 deadline for submissions for funding.
2. The CRC questioned how to review EAM grants that are presented as five-year NIH grant proposals when EAM funding is only for one year. On the one hand, five-year proposals allow the reviewer to put the one year EAM project in perspective and give the reviewer a better idea of how the grant may fair when submitted to the NIH. On the other hand, a grant that is appropriately written for one year of funding may not seem as competitive to reviewers as the five year proposals.

After extensive discussion, the RPC voted to accept grants that include plans that extend beyond the one year of EAM grant support. However, the PI must clearly state, either in a cover letter or by indicating by bold or italics throughout the text, what they plan to achieve during this one year of funding. If a grant is submitted without such a clear indication, it will not be reviewed or be considered for funding.

Reviewers can use their discretion on how to handle the material beyond the one year proposal for EAM funding. They could choose not to review this information. Alternatively, reviewers can use this information to either raise or lower their priority score for the EAM proposal.

Dr. Bauer raised the issue of eligibility of non-faculty members applying for CRC funds. A number of issues were raised in the discussion. What is the purpose of funding? Could non-faculty submit under the auspice of a faculty member? Would changing the rule allow post-docs and graduate assistants the ability to apply for funding and would this be appropriate? Dr. Caspary asked the committee to let him review the issues with Dr. Bauer outside the RPC and then return with this issue to the RPC. Dr. Bauer and the Committee agreed.

Concerns were raised on the behalf of a faculty member who did not receive funding during the last EAM funding cycle. Dr. Watabe indicated that he discussed the review with the concerned faculty member. Dr. Caspary stated that the faculty member was advised to contact him to discuss his grant but that the faculty member has not yet contacted him. A suggestion was made that faculty who review grants or who vote on the CRC should not submit grants. Current and former CRC members and chairs did not feel this was necessary since these members must leave the room during the review of their grant. No faculty member involved in the review of grants reported anything to suggest that grants are not handled fairly. It was also pointed out that given the small size of our faculty that there would be very few people to review grants in this scenario. It was also felt that outside reviewers would not only be costly (thus decreasing funds available for grants) but logistically very difficult to manage.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.