In Attendance: Ash, Beal, Bilimoria, Borchert, Caplan, Edwards, Goldberg, Han, Kirsch, Madigan, Mahoney, Manas-Zloczower, Muzic, Nadeau, Nelson, Palczewski, Sheridan, Singer, Swaidani, Weitzen, and guest: Michele Krantz
Absent: Beall, Coticchia, Helper, Kalafatis, Okoye, Rozek, Salata, Scharf, Sideras

Welcome / Approval of 4/7/08 Meeting Notes (Attachment #1)

Dr. Goldberg welcomed everyone, and new Council members were introduced. The April 7, 2008 meeting notes were approved as written.

Implementation of Recommendations from Commission on Research and Graduate Education

Dr. Singer provided an overview of the recommendations of the *Commission on Research 2004 final report* (Attachment #2). She handed out a summary of the 15 points for discussion (listed below). And a Q&A followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Research council *</th>
<th>9. Rapid HR assistance and competitive compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Eliminate overhead on tuition</td>
<td>10. Near real time accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partial subsidy of grad tuition</td>
<td>11. Tech transfer communication *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuition free grad courses post requirement *</td>
<td>12. FFS operations increase; org structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allocation formula changes *</td>
<td>13. Research space costs uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Associate deans for Research/Grad Studies *</td>
<td>14. Yearly progress reports to Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FTE Dean and infrastructure</td>
<td>15. Endowment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Proactive Central Admin</td>
<td>a) Proposal development professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Streamlined regulatory approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) IRB variability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those items with an asterisk (*) have been achieved since the report, while the remaining items still need to be addressed.

**Brief Review of Strategic Plan**

Dr. Goldberg provided an overview of the Strategic Plan and reminded Council that the plan is posted for all to read on the website [http://www.case.edu/stratplan/](http://www.case.edu/stratplan/)

There are areas in the Implementation of Recommendations plan that can be married to the four goals in the Strategic Plan. There are “collaborative areas” and a group would have greater power when dealing with issues.
**Goals from CWRU Strategic Plan:**
1) Enhance its education and research
2) build a diverse community
3) strengthen partnerships
4) advance institutional resources.

Dr. Goldberg informed the Council that President Snyder will be presenting to the Board some metrics on accountability:
1) Research dollars
2) Salary levels
3) More international students
4) Alumni giving

The Council was informed that the University Steering Committee has been altered to be a group to be more appropriate for planning. Each School was asked to join the steering and/or planning committees. The Chair of each School’s steering committee met with the University steering committee. They will be the “Primary Group” who will make decisions about the Implementation Plan.

There are metrics to measure each of the four major goals in the Strategic Plan and that is timeline. We are now in the process of negotiating that level of metric.

Dr. Goldberg expects to have a draft by the end of September. The idea now is that the new Provost would meet with research people from each school, add those numbers up and develop goals from there. We will continue until we get to some reasonable goals. This year is the first for implementation. Initializing the process and getting baseline data is estimated at 4-5 months. We will then look at what actually be accomplished during the first year. A task force may be created for this project, utilizing as appropriate the faculty senate.

Dr. Goldberg asked Council to start thinking about – what are the barriers to productive collaborative research? Key is to eliminate the barriers. Solutions will be provided to those barriers.

Dr. Singer informed Council that their list of recommendations will be prioritized. A number of Council members gave examples of their encounter with barriers to collaborative research. For example, some NIH grants were described as an “administrative paper nightmare.” And that the current administrative structure in budgeting sets up barriers for faculty to interact. A discussion ensued of Centralization vs Decentralization vs Departmental structures and their various barriers.

Dr. Caplan suggested having meetings with administrators in different silos to get them talking about how to sort out all of the paperwork involved.

Christine Ash, of office of Planning and Institutional Research will look at how to reduce barriers to collaborative research.
The following list of “barriers to research” was based on the Council’s input during the discussion.

1) IRB HARMONIZATION
2) WRITTEN POLICIES ON COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH
3) CODING OF AWARDS
4) CENTRALIZED POLICIES

Update on PADS (Proposal and Awards Database System)

Mike Edwards presented an overview and a handout of the Mission/Vision and Goals of Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, which included an explanation on its metrics. The examples show a snapshot of a management tool to be built upon. The example used was one month’s data; however, quarterly examples are to be provided at the next meeting (Attachment #3). The overview was followed by Q&A.

Dr. Singer noted that industry is one area where we have lagged. It is a growth area and NIH is an area that has flattened (Attachment #4).

Vacancies
Dr. Singer reported on vacancies. There are a few open in the School of Medicine: Pediatrics, Radiology, and Epidemiology.

Dr. Goldberg mentioned that currently there is not a comprehensive list of faculty, identifying each, in every University department.

Conflict of Interest Policy

Chris Sheridan updated the group on the latest draft of the Conflict of Interest (COI) policy worked on by the COI Drafting Committee. Deans and others have provided feedback on this draft policy. The Conflict of Commitment and Conflict of Interest are two areas that were addressed. The Committee determined that 1) there has to be substantial increases in the COI office. 2) Its success depends on faculty buy-in. As an institution, we could be at risk without an adequate policy. Our goal is to have something approved before the Board of Trustees meet in December. She will email the most recent draft, version 22, to the Council (Attachment #5).

Council guest, attorney Ms. Michele Krantz, from the office of University Counsel, expanded on the topic of COI. Some faculty had a perception of the policy being adversarial. The intent is not meant to be adversarial. The policy is helpful for both faculty and institution. There are different ways to manage various conflicts, such as a financial conflict, and when human subjects are involved. Feedback from the Research Council can be used to build the policy.

Some Council members provided feedback and comments about the COI policy. There was some concern about the policy sending a message of policing, and that it implied a presumption
of guilt. A question arose about who would be an advocate for faculty in a legal situation. Another commented on about the language of document; that it was vague.

Dr. Goldberg mentioned possible development of templates, which could be used as an aid in different situations that faculty may face regarding perceived or potential conflicts.

Michele Krantz described to Council the makeup the Case COI committee. If any member on the Research Council is interested in serving on the COI committee, they should tell their Dean. Senator Grassley’s work helped bring attention to the issue of conflict of interests. The main goal for the COI policy is to protect faculty.

Questions/Comments from Council arose regarding COI policy:
--- Regarding timeframe for implementation: can it be built in time to deal with thousands of reports? Chris Sheridan responded that the President is aware of the steps involved. She will refer to Mike Edwards’ analysis to what can be done and when.
--- How does faculty handle online courses?
--- How does faculty handle profits from books they write, which may be used in their own class?
--- How does faculty handle stocks when they may not know what their broker/financial advisor is purchasing?
--- Why not have policy read, we are innocent rather than guilty trying to prove our innocence.

Dr. Han informed Council that the Medical School faculties state that they have no COI when giving a lecture. And Dr. Bilimore commented that at Weatherhead, faculties are encouraged to be consultants. School-wide differences may exist at CWRU regarding faculty consultant work. Of concern is time involved. We may loose competitiveness with industry, negotiating time can result in lose of industry grant.

Michele Krantz explained that conflict is not necessarily a bad thing; the fact they [faculty] have to report, does not mean it is guilt. The policy helps both Faculty and University if challenged. If a faculty is doing both research and consulting for the same sponsor, it is that intersection that gives the appearance of conflict.

**Wrap-up**
The discussion of COI continued until the adjournment of the meeting.