

Present: Michael Harold, Wynne Chin, Pradeep Sharma, Maria Solino, Karl Titz, Robert Palmer, Michael Zvolensky, Alessandro Carrera, Gregg Roman, T. Randall Lee, Alan Burns, Richard Bond, George Zouridakis, Abdelhak Bensaoula, Christie Peters, Rathindra Bose, Mary Ann Ottinger, Jennifer Duncan, Cris Milligan, Kirstin Rochford, Ruth Shapiro, Joan Nelson, Rozlyn Reep, Ashley Merwin

Absent: Gregory Marinic, Ezemenari Obasi, Haluk Ogmen, Gangbing Song, Stuart Long, Jack Fletcher, Stuart Dryer, Luis Torres, Allan Jacobson, Jacqueline Hawkins, Mark Clarke, Selesta Hodge

The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:36 pm.

Welcome by the Chair: Dr. Harold welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Approval of January Minutes: Dr. Harold thanked Rozlyn Reep for doing an excellent job with the minutes and asked for a motion to approve. Dr. Lee made the motion and Dr. Roman seconded. The minutes were approved.

Status Report by VC/VP Dr. Bose:

Dr. Bose started his report by saying he was delighted to be at the meeting and that it is an exciting time for the Division of Research. The Provost has met with many distinguished candidates for Fall 2014 hire, who will contribute as excellent scholars. This will bring challenges to DOR in terms of startup packages, laboratories, etc. They want to provide a competitive package and are working with the Provost office to look at hiring plans. Dr. Bose is going to do his best to attract the best and brightest to campus. These individuals will set the direction for where the institution will go in the next 20-30 years. He urges deans and department chairs to go after the best in their searches for candidates, even if it means filling positions at a slower pace.

Dr. Bose continued his report by saying one challenge the Division of Research faces is the A-81. This policy will impact how the department manages grants, etc. Next week he will be attending a conference (Council on Governmental Relations) in Washington, D.C. and will receive more information to inform the committee and campus.

Dr. Bose stated that since his arrival at the University of Houston he has wanted to create a research administration that was the best in the country. He was happy to report that DOR at UH is the second most efficient unit on campus, second to the parking department. Dr. Bose began restructuring to bring that level of efficiency which took him longer than anticipated. A lot of people left in operations and he had too many directors who did not work well together. The last part of reform was finding a Pre & Post Award expert who worked well with faculty. Dr. Bose believes

he has found this individual. This person is Jennifer Duncan and she is the new Assistant Vice President for Research Administration. Ms. Duncan came from the University of Missouri. UM was experiencing issues with the federal government and Ms. Duncan was hired to help resolve those issues. They had a clean bill of health last year due to her hard work. Jennifer Duncan and Beverly Rymer will be working together with Pre & Post Award and research financial services. Dr. Bose introduced Ms. Duncan to the Committee.

Jennifer Duncan told the committee she was happy to be there and that her goal is to serve faculty, have a world class system and build communications with others. Jennifer gave the committee an overview of University of Missouri (UM) via PowerPoint:

- UM had \$2 million total revenue.
- Grants & Contract proposed budget was \$1,494.2 million.
- State support was decreasing while more revenue was coming in via tuition.
- Was Awarded 208 million (2006) to 228 million (2013).
- Organizational structure:
 - Office of Research (cores & centers, compliance, administrative support, technology transfer).
 - Sponsored programs (cradle to grave approach and high specialization opportunities).
- Big Wins:
 - Overall enhanced technical expertise
 - A-133 Audit (clean bill of health)
 - PHS conflict of interest (99% compliance approval rate)
 - Electronic approvals implementation (proposals approved within PeopleSoft.)
 - Specialized research administration training (NCURA type training for campus; certificate series training); training guides – SPPG (procedure guide).
- Opportunities for best practices:
 - OMB reforms; unfunded mandates; continuing resolutions; sequestration; tenure policy; technology implementations; facilitating/managing research communications; staffing; growing research with shrinking federal dollars.

Ms. Duncan asked the committee for any questions or comments. Dr. Sharma mentioned that he would like to see staff added to Post-Award. Dr. Harold expressed agreement with Dr. Sharma. Ms. Duncan responded by saying that they need to make careers in Pre & Post Award more attractive and learn how to retain staff. Ms. Duncan also stated that perhaps the roles in Pre & Post Award and Central (college RA's) need to be more defined and make sure there is collaboration.

Dr. Bensaoula asked Ms. Duncan about compliance issues and ideas regarding ITAR. Ms. Duncan responded by saying it was a good question and staff are aware of the issues. She will talk with Dr. Bose and see what resources they need in DOR, but believes it's Central's role to provide that type of guidance and stressed collaborations.

Dr. Harold told Ms. Duncan that the committee looks forward to working with her.

Subcommittee Reports:

New Faculty & Small Grants: Dr. Torres was unable to attend the meeting. His update was tabled for the next meeting

Excellence & Research: Dr. Lee reported that his subcommittee has all of the nominations and they are in the process of determining awards.

GEAR: Dr. Ogmen was unable to attend the meeting, but Dr. Harold stated that the subcommittee was waiting for colleges to submit proposals to DOR and the committee will hear from them in coming weeks.

Centers & Institutes: Dr. Zouridakis reported that his subcommittee was charged with the review of four centers: 1.) Texas Obesity Research Center; 2.) Center for Advanced Materials; 3.) UH Coastal Center; 4.) Center for Advanced Computing and Data Systems.

The subcommittee came up with evaluations and recommendations for each center:

- 1.) Texas Obesity Research Center (TORC): The committee agreed that the performance of the Center met the objectives set in the Center's mission statement. They recommended that future reports include additional details on the Center's activities which would further strengthen their assessment.
- 2.) Center for Advanced Materials (CAM): The committee agreed that the performance of the Center met the objectives set in the Center's mission statement. There were no recommendations.
- 3.) UH Coastal Center: The committee agreed that the performance of the Center met the objectives set in the Center's mission statement. Since the Center is slated to change status from a University Center to a Departmental/College Center, they believe it would be in the Center's best interest to initiate a more rigorous fee-collection mechanism, as it was recommended in previous review cycles. Otherwise the Center is not viable.
- 4.) Center for Advanced Computing and Data Systems (CACDS): The committee understands that the Center is undergoing a transition and is remaking itself into a high-performance computing center. Based on the documents provided, they understand that:
 - A.) CACDS absorbed the computer facilities of RCC (Maxwell cluster) and as a result, all users and projects that were

- previously RCC's Maxwell are now part of CACDS. Is this the basis for the indication that CACDS has received 44 awards and provided "support for research efforts involving \$27M of external funding and resulting in over 100 scientific contributions?"
- B.) A "dual reporting line" for four full-time RCC staff was created. Is this the basis for the report of 18 FTE faculty and staff and 42 students?
 - C.) The exact membership of CACDS is unclear.
 - D.) No faculty is listed as splitting credit with CACDS. The number of proposals or total dollar amount credited to CACDS is not clear.
 - E.) There is little information on space use of the second floor of the PGH building: who uses this office space, which housed several faculty, students and post docs and former TLC2 staff? The website is out of date.
 - F.) The strategic plan does not provide specific information on expenditures and use of revenues.
 - G.) There is no information on who and how CACDS dealt with "legacy issues" in the annual report.

The committee recommends that for the purposes of better understanding the report and the Center's specific activities, that the Center address the points above in more detail, possibly as an addendum, so that a full evaluation is possible.

Dr. Bose stated that he appreciates the subcommittee's report and the CACDS Director will be responding to the points raised. He appointed 2 committees: External Advisory Committee and Internal Advisory Committee to help shape the center. The Internal Advisory Committee had about 5-7 members that included biologists, engineers, computer scientists, etc. to give specific recommendations. The External Advisory Committee consisted of world renowned people from all over the US who agreed to help Dr. Bose. He felt the fundamental issue was that the Center is a research center and the focus needed to be on research. He took advice from the Internal and External Advisory Boards and last year's evaluation from RSC which recommended that the Center be more like a service center. His intention was to create a high performance computer center, and it is ultimately a research service center. Engineering has decided to work with the new CACDS and to move their server so it can be centrally managed. There was also a conversation with Geosciences and IT (Maxwell RCC), which meant there were two separate computer centers. One of the Advisory Committees asked what the purpose was in having two Centers. So Maxwell merged with CACDS and employees were transferred. It has only been 1 year since the transition began. Dr. Bose feels the subcommittee's comments are accurate and will be followed up on by the Director. The Director for CACDS is highly productive, and we need to work with her and give her time and resources. It's very important that she addresses issues for the committee.

Dr. Harold made a motion for the subcommittee's recommendations to be approved. The motion passed.

Old Business

Dr. Harold introduced Joan Nelson, Executive Director for Human Resources to give an update on hiring practices for Post Docs and Research Associates.

Ms. Nelson greeted the committee and referenced the "Procedures for Hiring Postdoctoral Fellow Positions" draft that was distributed to committee members. She stated that the focus of the draft was on Post Doc positions. As promised, she looked at Post Doc hiring procedures at the University of Texas, Texas A&M, and Texas Tech. In the draft provided, the document proposes that Post Doc assignments can be up to 3 years (36 months), and if they work 20 or more hours per week for 4.5 months or longer in a fiscal year they are eligible for benefits. Ms. Nelson worked with legal on end assignments. They came up with the following:

- A.) Termination at the direction of the funding agency.
- B.) Termination due to loss of position funding.
- C.) Termination for violation of law or University of Houston policy.

Dr. Lee told Ms. Nelson he would like to see "lack of performance" added to the end assignments. Dr. Sharma was in agreement. Ms. Nelson agreed to add the suggestion to the proposal.

Dr. Harold told Ms. Nelson he appreciates the proposal and that it's a big improvement and meets all of the necessary criteria.

Ms. Nelson told the committee they can put the policy into effect next month (March 1) if the committee agrees. The committee expressed their agreement.

New Business

Dr. Harold introduced Kirstin Rochford, Director of Research Compliance to give an update on transitioning HIPPA review to UH IRB and the Gulf Coast Consortium (GCC) Reciprocity Agreement.

Ms. Rochford greeted the committee and introduced Ruth Shapiro, Senior Assistant with General Counsel. Ms. Shapiro was standing in for Donna Cornell. Ms. Shapiro told the committee she deals a lot with HIPPA. In reviewing compliance and research, she stated it would be more productive if we had IRB and HIPPA more centralized. Ms. Rochford followed up on Ms. Shapiro's comments by telling the committee she is getting forms ready for IRB.

Ms. Rochford continued her report by saying she is working closely with the Gulf Coast Consortium. They are close to having a final document to allow reciprocity between member IRB's for the review of human subject research.

Subcommittee Reports Continued

Resources & Core Facilities: Dr. Burns told the committee there was nothing new to report at this time. Dr. Ottinger is resolving some modifications to the guidelines and will provide those changes to Dr. Burns and his subcommittee.

Conflict of Interest & Compliance: Dr. Burns reported that it's an evolving process and that they have good discussions. They pay particular attention to getting information to faculty about what they should be reporting. It's a very organized meeting held each month. Dr. Harold told Dr. Burns he appreciates his role on the committee.

Intellectual Property Committee: Dr. Dryer and Dr. Clarke were not present. An update was tabled for the next meeting.

Old & New Business Continued

Research Faculty Roles: Due to lack of time, Research Faculty Roles was tabled for the next meeting.

Research Grant Matching Policy: Research Grant Matching Policy was tabled for the next meeting.

Indirect Cost Policy: Dr. Harold gave a brief overview on the flow of Indirect Costs (IDC). Drs. Sharma, Jacobson and Fletcher serve on Dr. Carlucci's IDC task force. Dr. Harold would like for the committee to give suggestions to Drs. Sharma, Jacobson and Fletcher. Dr. Harold encouraged everyone to visit the IDC website which gives background information: <http://www.uh.edu/af/committees/idc.htm>.

The on-campus IDC rate is currently 50.5% of total indirect costs which usually excludes equipment. The off-campus rate is 26%. Some sponsors will not allow, per agreement, the full IDC rate. The state of Texas, for example, maxes out at 15%. Others, such as some companies, will not support research unless the IDC rate is reduced or zero in some cases, but it has to be negotiated.

In order to provide an overview of how IDC is distributed, Dr. Harold showed an IDC flow chart from FY 2010 as an example of how the funds were distributed during that fiscal year. Once funds end up at a department level, the department chair can determine distribution to the faculty members. Dr. Harold said the committee voted (checked with Dr. Lee) around 2010 to recommend that 5% of total IDC generated go back to the PI. Unless the committee feels differently about what was voted on several years ago, it's on the record that the committee recommends 5%.

The IDC Distribution Policy Committee has been considering these issues and the RSC has four members on the committee (for minutes of meetings, see http://www.uh.edu/af/committees/idc_meeting.htm). Dr. Harold raised the issue of the IDC return to the colleges and if the RSC wishes to provide input. He pointed out that there are two extremes to consider:

- Reduced IDC return to colleges – centralization of resources
- Increased IDC return to colleges/centers – decentralization of resources

Dr. Harold pointed out several viewpoints about IDC:

- PI's accumulate IDC return to create "rainy day fund"
- Dept. Chairs use IDC return as investment to grow research & scholarship
- PI's are entitled to increased share because they did the work
- Administration needs the resources because the research enterprise is expensive (start-up funds, etc.)

Dr. Bose responded to Dr. Harold's report by saying he captured a lot of things correctly but some items need clarification. In general, with a Department of Education grant, it's very difficult to get more than 8% in IDC. The salaries and benefits for DOR employees largely come from IDC. Dr. Bose went on to clarify several items on the flow chart and mentioned that last year he had made some progress. We gained some, although total research external funding did not increase. Dr. Bose stopped making exceptions for IDC rate unless it was needed. So they gained an additional \$2 million in IDC. There is a policy, \$1.238 million (Institutional General Support on flow chart), that goes to facilities (Dr. Carlucci's office). He negotiated with Dr. Carlucci for a fixed amount from the IDC. So even with total IDC going from \$12.5 million to \$16 million, Dr. Carlucci will have \$1.238 million. The \$861,480 for Core Facilities was reduced in 2013 by about \$500,000. Dr. Bose is trying to return more money to colleges. However, it does not solve the question that Dr. Harold raised, which is whether PI's should have a portion of IDC. Dr. Bose said they have given Dr. Carlucci information from 94 institutions (University of Chicago, Stanford, etc). There is no systematic formula, and there are institutions that do not give anything to faculty. The institution Dr. Harold mentioned (Georgia Tech) and the University of Chicago are examples. However, there are many institutions where the VPR office, facilities, department chairs, and faculty receive a portion. Dr. Bose told the RSC that the concern he hears is the lack of a uniform approach within the college and departments. Dr. Bose stated that there needs to be a uniform policy by the University.

Due to the time, Dr. Harold told the committee they will continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Dr. Harold asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Palmer made the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 3:08 pm.

The next meeting will be on Friday, March 21, same location from 1:30 – 3:00 pm.