

Research Advisory Board
March 18, 2009
Music 313
3:30 PM

Minutes

In attendance: Professor Marilyn Aguirre-Molina, Professor Eugene Chudnovsky, Ms. Stephanie Endy, Mr. Dominic Esposito, Associate Dean Marzie Jafari, Professor Alan Kluger, Professor Dina Le Gall, Ms. Lois Levy, Professor Herminio Martinez, Professor Janet Munch, Provost Mary Papazian, Professor Anne Rothstein, Assistant Vice President Rene Rotolo, Professor Katherine St. John, Associate Provost Robert Troy, Vice President Derek Wheeler, Ms. Marcie Wolfe

1. **Welcome & Overview – Provost Mary Papazian:** The Provost opened the meeting stating that the process of creating a Research Advisory Board has been ongoing for some time and she was very grateful to all participants who worked towards establishing the board. Introductions were then made all around. The Provost continued by saying that all parts of the College are represented at the meeting and one of the purposes of the board is to receive input from this diverse group so that it could recommend policies that will develop, encourage and ensure successful research projects across the Institution. Additionally, the board will ensure that research projects adhere to all regulations including Federal and internal among others. The board will be an ongoing part of Lehman College and the group will foster and support research sustainability into the future. The newly established Recovery Act is one example of funding opportunities for the future.
2. **The Charge of the RAB – Provost Mary Papazian:** The charge of the board is to establish the best protocols, policies, and procedures across Lehman to support and enhance the research mission, one that will create a strong research culture at the college. Every topic is on the table for discussion.
3. **Introduction to Compliance Areas – Ms. Stephanie Endy:** There are four compliance areas that are of interest a. Institutional Review Board (IRB), Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) b. Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) c. Conflict of Interest (COI) and d. Pre-Award and Post-Award Compliance.
 - *IRB, IACUC, IBC – Ms. Lois Levy:* The IRB protects human subjects in research. Ms. Levy reviewed the focus of the IRB and indicated that her office attempts to make the IRB process as pleasant as possible. IRB approval is extremely important because CUNY research was suspended ten years ago after being cited for non-compliance. IACUC is the committee that protects animals in research. Currently there are two species in the Animal Care Facility. IBC reviews and approves the use of hazardous materials in research. Initially this committee only

evaluated projects that used recombinant DNA, but now all biomedical issues are discussed.

- *Responsible Conduct of Research – Professor Alan Kluger:* Professor Kluger included a presentation in the handout and stated that two years ago, CUNY implemented a research misconduct policy. Professor Kluger reviewed the current state and goals of the policy. Professor Kluger stated that he will expand on the details of the policy in the future and the Lehman website should have links to the Responsible Conduct of Research policy.
 - *Conflict of Interest – Associate Provost Robert Troy:* Associate Provost Troy stated that CUNY has a conflict of interest policy and the Research Advisory Board can be used to direct how the information should be disseminated. All researchers are required to disclose if there is a potential conflict of interest. Proposals should be reviewed to identify potential conflicts of interest. Once the board decides how the information on these requirements should be available, it should be disseminated. Ms. Stephanie Endy added that there are both internal and Federal regulations regarding conflict of interest. National Institutes of Health has a policy that must be viewed and understood prior to an award being made. Institutions can be fined for non-compliance.
 - *Pre-Award and Post-Award – Ms. Stephanie Endy:* During the post-award period, we, as an institution, know what the sponsor requires and we adhere to those policies. In conjunction with the sponsor policies, we must adhere to Federal, CUNY and Lehman College regulations. Pre-award requirements can be a little less clear. Lehman currently has pre-award policies, but they are not always clearly communicated or documented. Research at Lehman is strong but more communication is necessary and the board should discuss any areas of research.
4. **Open Discussion:** The floor was opened for comments by the members of the board. Vice President Derek Wheeler stated that while faculty is aggressive and eager to bring in programs, there is not an institutional perspective regarding the impact of those programs on the College. For example, some projects impact the Information Technology department and there was not enough prior planning to implement the technology associated with the project. Also, space considerations and matching funds have not adequately been addressed. Mr. Wheeler will work with the group to help address those issues. Professor Eugene Chudnovsky stated that at the start of a proposal, faculty members were always aware what could not be done. He noticed that some of these issues were chronicled by faculty testimony that was included in the meeting packet. He would like to see the board encourage interest in research and make the process easier. Some issues raised were: additional faculty released time would help foster the process, teaching schedules are not always accommodating to conducting research, and more

- support for graduate students from sponsored programs is needed. A discussion of how to pay graduate students through stipends rather than as employees ensued. Professor Katherine St. John agreed with Professor Chudnovsky. She added to the conversation concerning paying students with stipends and raised additional issues around the hidden costs associated with doing research at Lehman such as internet connection fees) and the difficulty faced by Principal Investigators in achieving reasonable solutions for issues that might cost the college F&A income. Prof. St. John suggested that a packet for incoming faculty should be made available with guidelines for grant management inclusive of personnel and other than personnel services and a book on how to use the Research Foundation should exist as well. She would like to see transparent rules and regulations. There was general support for all of these issues and ideas. Many members of the board have experienced similar frustrations and hurdles on campus and would like to see better materials available, especially for new faculty as these hurdles make it difficult for people to get funding and Professor St. John felt that she received negative feedback for conducting research. Professor Kluger stated that there are some areas that present challenges for researchers including the IRB. Oftentimes, clinical research is delayed by researchers trying to receive IRB approval from multiple schools. He would like to see the board formulate a way to work with other institutions to help streamline this process.
5. **Conclusion:** Ms. Endy added that there are cultural issues as well as compliance and administrative issues and the board will need to prioritize and decide upon the best approach. All members of the board should make a list and bring it to the next meeting so the issues can be addressed and the board can decide how to take appropriate action. The meetings will take place every other week and be two hours each. Email will be sent out to vote on the best meeting dates and times. The announcements from the agenda were then mentioned and the board was asked to email all possible agenda items to Ms. Endy prior to the next meeting.