

Minutes of the Research and Scholarship Committee:

April 13, 2012

Present: Matthew Johnson, Frederick Lopez, Haluk Ogmen, Stowe Shoemaker, James Garson, Jack Fletcher, Janok Bhattacharya, Randall Lee, Gemunu Gunaratne, Alan Burns, Vincent Tam, Ray Cline, Abdelhak Bensaoula, Stuart Long, Dmitri Litvinov Rathindra Bose, Anne Sherman, Brooke Gowl, Kirstin Rochford, Maribel Salazar, and Christie Peters.

Absent: Wynn Chin, Pradeep Sharma, Michael Harold, Chinhui Juhn, Robert Palmer, and Coleen Carlson.

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Report: Dr. Bhattacharya reported that there was a quorum present. The Chair attended a meeting of the UCC and there are several policies that need to be brought to the RSC attention. He will send these to the members and member comments should be sent to him by April 30, 2012. Dr. Ogmen reported that he had heard that there is a new policy that will change the reporting structure of the DBA's to the CBA's rather than reporting to the Chair of the respective departments. Dr. Bhattacharya is on the UCC and will watch for this policy and bring it to the RSC for comments when it is presented.

Review and approval of minutes from March 23, 2012 meeting: Dr. Lee made a motion to approve the March minutes and Dr. Gunaratne seconded. The motion carried.

Dr. Bose Report:

1. Financial Conflict of Interest: Dr. Bose presented the implementation plan and pointed out that there will be changes to the proposal transmittal so that a PI can recognize if there is a conflict and if a management plan is needed. If there is not, he/she will be contacted to send it through the process. In addition, the departments will be responsible for managing the conflict. We will make the August 24, 2012 deadline imposed by PHS.
2. Changes in Human Subjects and Animal Care training: This was discussed by Kirstin Rochford, Director of Compliance. Animal Care training, which used to be a 4-hour live-taught course, is now being updated to be a 1-hour live-taught course (for security access to the animal areas) and the remaining training (~2 ½ hours) will be through CITI online. A short refresher is required every 3 years. The IACUC will check this training prior to new protocol approval, renewal, and the addition of personnel and the training will remain a stipulation until complete. For Human Subjects, UH formerly required only PHS applicants to take the training; however, our Federalwide Assurance with the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) indicates that UH will treat all research the same, regardless of the source of funding. This means that we must extend the education/training requirement to all individuals engaged in the design and conduct of research. The Committee for the Human Subjects will begin checking training for all personnel, and IRB approvals cannot be finalized until the training requirement is complete. Accepted online courses are CITI (recommended, as CPHS has access to training certificates) and NIH training. A refresher is required every 3 years.

3. **Animal Care Facilities:** Significant funding has been put into the facility in SR2 to bring it up to code for the next AAALAC inspection. Funding for the new animal care facility in the new Optometry building is significant. The University wants this to be a state-of-the-art facility. There will be an AAALAC visit in June, 2012. Unfortunately, the TMC animal care facility will not pass. Putting more funding into it would not be cost effective. Dr. Bose, in conjunction with the Dean and Associate Dean of Pharmacy, made the decision to shut it down. Unfortunately, before an official announcement explaining the current issues was submitted to the faculty, word got out to the faculty. This required Dr. David Brammer to send an email out to the faculty resulting in significant concern. There will be a forum on Friday, April 20, at TMC for all to attend and to discuss the issues. Dr. Bose encouraged the faculty to come to the forum so that all of the issues can be discussed.

Centers and Institutes: Jack Fletcher, Stowe Shoemaker, Haluk Ogmen, Brooke Gowl, and Cris Milligan. Dr. Ogmen reported that the members had received the information on the three centers and they have an April 23 deadline to complete the review. Cris Milligan gave an update on the guidelines and policy. The evaluation process is not adequately outlined and there is not a complete list of which centers and institutes belong to the departments, colleges, and DOR. Cris has looked at 12 peer universities and developed recommendations for UH. She indicated that after the reviews, she will concentrate on SAM and DOR guidelines.

Core Facilities: Dr. Lee indicated that we were ready to vote on the RFP. There was one suggestion for a change in wording from Dr. Cline. The change will indicate that funding from outside sources can come from any source, not just the National Science Foundation MRI program. Dr. Cline moved to pass the RFP with the amended change; it was seconded and passed.

Tuition Support for Graduate Students: The subcommittee has recommended to Dr. Bose that tuition should be put on all grants and, when awarded, the PI will be provided an equivalent amount that he/she can use on hiring non-grant supported students. There will be a stipulation that this will be considered uncommitted cost sharing and that it must be used during the life of the grant for tuition. There was a brief discussion on this and a motion was made by Dr. Garson and seconded by Dr. Gunaratne. Below is the motion that was passed:

The motion is to recommend to Dr. Bose that graduate student tuition be budgeted on all proposals submitted by the University of Houston to all outside sponsors are to utilize and support graduate students, as long as this budget item is allowable by the sponsor. In return for charging graduate student tuition to grants, Dr. Bose will establish a cost center for each PI who is successful in garnering such outside sponsored funds. The amount of funds deposited in the cost center will be equivalent, on a per-capita basis, to the amount of DSTF funding awarded per graduate student by the PI's respective unit during the time that the grant is active, and will be adjusted annually to reflect any changes in the level of DSFT support. These funds must be used exclusively for graduate student stipends, tuition, and/or fees and must be utilized within the duration of the grant. If there are funds remaining in the cost center after the expiration of the sponsored grant, they will be returned to the Division of Research. In the proposal budgets, these funds will be designated as

uncommitted cost sharing for the project. It is acknowledged that these funds are separate from the funds provided under the DSTF program.

Internal Awards: Dr. Tam, chair of the subcommittee on Research Excellence Awards reported that the subcommittee met and made its choices and recommendations to Dr. Bose. Dr. Garson reported that the GEAR subcommittee will meet on April 19 to make their recommendations. These will be brought back to the RSC at the May 4 retreat. There was a discussion about putting into the guidelines the fact that nominations will remain active for 3 years. Also, it will be noted in the guidelines that letters of support must be from external sources. The idea of “pre-screening” was put forth and all agreed to discuss it at the May 4 retreat.

Research Space Allocation: This will be discussed at the May 4 retreat. Dr. Lee suggested that the RSC adopt a motion to require the Provost to vet their finds on space through the RSC.

New Business: None

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Dr. Lee and seconded by Dr. Cline. The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

UH Division of Research Core Facilities Proposal Guidelines

The Division of Research (DOR) anticipates significant funding to develop new Core Facilities and enhance existing Core Facilities to advance the research infrastructure at UH. Core Facilities are defined as major research instrumentation, laboratories, or facilities that will be used by a broad group of researchers within and outside UH. Guidelines for the preparation of proposals are given below.

Deadlines and Dates: Proposals must be submitted to the DOR on or before October 1 on an annual basis. The DOR anticipates funding approximately three proposals each year. Proposals selected for funding will be announced no later than December 1.

Eligibility: Faculty members at the University of Houston who are requesting funds for major Core Facilities (defined as \geq \$400K) are eligible to submit a proposal. If selected for funding, the proposal must be augmented and submitted to the NSF-MRI program by the fourth week of January in the following year (i.e., ~7 weeks after being selected); otherwise, the proposal will be defunded.

Minor Core Facilities: Researchers seeking Core Facility support of less than \$400K may request these funds directly from the Vice President for Research (VPR) on a case-by-case basis. In these situations, all infrastructure and/or instrumentation costs must be documented, and evidence of substantial multi-user need must be established. Further, the VPR will expect a written commitment for matching funds of 20% from the proposer, department, and/or college.

___ 1. Cover Sheet

The project title should be concise and convey the goal of the proposal. Applications must identify only a single PI and up to four co-PIs. Other major participants may be indicated as "Senior Personnel".

___ 2. Project Description (maximum length: 10 pages, including all figures and charts)

A. Instrument/Facility Type and Location

Broadly describe the nature of the proposed instrumentation and/or facility, and specify the physical address where it will be located (i.e., provide the building name and room number).

B. Research Activities To Be Enabled (suggested maximum length: 4 pages)

Describe the research and training activities and projects that will be enabled by the desired instrumentation and/or facility. Include brief summary details of existing support for these activities and projects (e.g., external and/or internal funding). In narrative or tabular form, describe the personnel by research area, number, and type (e.g., senior personnel, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students, undergraduate students). Include only those who will most actively use the instrumentation for research and training on a regular basis. Other more minor users of the instrument, when applicable, should be described in a more condensed format.

C. Description of Instrumentation or Facility and Needs (suggested max length: 2 pages)

Provide a technical description of the requested instrumentation and/or facility, including manufacturer and model number where appropriate. Clearly explain why the requested equipment or facility is needed. The existence and availability of comparable instrumentation or facilities in close geographical proximity should be outlined in the Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources – see Section 6 below.

D. Impact on Research and Training Infrastructure (suggested maximum length: 2 pages)

Describe how the instrument or facility will serve to attract researchers and make a substantial advancement in UH's ability to conduct cutting-edge research. Describe how the instrument or facility will enhance the quality of student education, research, and training.

E. Management Plan (suggested maximum length: 2 pages)

Investigators must provide detailed business and management plans with information on space, technical staffing for operations and maintenance, training of users, access for external users, and sources of funding (e.g., funds generated by user fees) and plans for long-term operations and maintenance. Describe the following: 1) renovations and/or infrastructure needed to accommodate the instrument/facility; 2) specific details of the oversight, operation, and maintenance of the instrument/facility (both initially and long-term); 3) anticipated costs and the technical expertise needed to operate and maintain the instrument/facility; 4) if the expertise is currently unavailable, describe how it will be obtained; 5) procedures for allocating user access, if appropriate; and 6) plans for attracting and supporting new users. Include information on anticipated usage and downtime. Sufficient detail should be given to enable reviewers to evaluate whether the project includes appropriate technical expertise and infrastructure to allow effective use of the instrument and/or facility as well as facilitate multi-user accessibility.

___3. Biographical Sketches

Include two-page biographical sketches of the PI and any Co-PI(s) (i.e., those personnel listed on the cover sheet) as well as any designated Senior Personnel who will be major users of the relevant research instrumentation. If applicable, also provide a biographical sketch of the individuals responsible for the management and maintenance of the instrument. The format for the biographical sketches should be NSF style.

___4. Budget and Budget Justification

Provide yearly and cumulative budget pages. The budget justification, which must not exceed three pages, should itemize and clearly describe all eligible project costs. All budget items must be justified and commensurate with the scale and sophistication of the instrumentation/facility.

___5. Current and Pending Support.

Provide a listing for the PI and Co-PIs (i.e., those listed on the cover sheet) as well as designated Senior Personnel.

___6. Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources

Provide a listing of similar and/or related instrumentation/facilities at or near UH.

___7. Supplementary Documents

Examples include: (a) Itemized vendor quotes are strongly advised for all proposals. Although a proposal might reference and include a quote for a specific make and model, the proposer is reminded that the standard UH procurement processes must be utilized to establish the appropriate item(s) to be purchased; (b) Statements from individuals, on institutional letterhead, confirming substantive collaboration efforts and/or usage of the instrument.

8. Core Facility Designation

Please check whether the facility is best characterized as (a) University-wide, (b) College-based, or (c) Department-based. As an example, the NMR Core Facility managed by the Department of Chemistry has regular users from Chemistry, other departments in NSM, other colleges on campus, and outside the campus. As such, the best characterization is "University-wide."

University-wide

College-based

Department-based