

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 5, 2018
NCB 160, 2:30 - 3:45

Attendance: Unavailable

1. Agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Minutes

Minutes from the last meeting will be approved next time. Secretary M. Paretti was unable to attend the 10/5 meeting.

3. Discussion with Teresa Mayer, Vice President for Research and Innovation, and Lisa Lee, Associate VP Scholarly Integrity Research Compliance

Teresa Mayer

- Mayer received five core questions ahead of time from the Senate.
- The OVPR just finished the search process for a new VP of Sponsored Programs. Five candidates were brought in for on-campus interviews.
- Mayer presented the Research and Innovation Functional Structure chart.
- VT FAST has been created for large proposals to help with developing boilerplate language based on reviewer feedback.
- OVPR has created a “front door” to the university through the Center for Advancing Industry Partnership.
- OSP is currently recruiting a new Associate VP.
 - Faculty need assistance in understanding contract language to be able to meet all terms and conditions successfully.
 - Faculty need help identifying potential bottlenecks (history with funder, faculty engagement).
- Research Compliance now brings many different functions together under one umbrella (e.g., COI, Research integrity).
 - We are one of 10 institutions that have all of the following: Agriculture and Extension, Veterinary Medicine, Biomedical Sciences, Medicine, and Life Sciences. The range of research domains increases the complexity of compliance issues, so this position has been elevated to Associate VP to accommodate this responsibility. The position has a direct channel to the VPRI, the Provost, and the President.
- Investment versus thematic institutes
 - Fralin, ICAT, ISCE, ICTAS are investment institutes will have sustained support from the University.
 - BI, Hume, VTCRI, VTTI, VT-ARC are the thematic institutes, and they are 501c3 organizations.
 - Investment institutes align programs and have themes that span colleges.
 - Some have shared facilities.
 - Thematic institutes have faculty that sit in them and have deep sponsor relationships, as well as opportunities for experiential learning.

- We have not had additional support for institutes with additional programs; the University needs to take a longer term view to identify opportunities where we can be competitive.
- These different structures for funding differentiate VT from other universities and increase our competitiveness.
- We need to align faculty interests with proper structure.
- VT-ARC is self-sustaining with no financial support from VT.
- Progress has been made regarding distribution of indirect between VT-ARC and VT.
 - Over \$3 million in direct or flowthrough money, with more than half resulting from collaborative efforts.
- VITI is perceived as a competitor rather than a collaborator.
 - We need to take a look at service versus research projects.
- Faculty do consider institutes as competitors (i.e., for funding), and the OVPR needs to talk with faculty, not just institute directors about this issue. Institutes have different financial models and can suck up resources to pay their people.
 - Mayer noted that this model is a strategic decision in terms of research vs tenure track positions.
- Scholarly integrity and research compliance are now under one umbrella.
- We have a new director for Electronic Research Administration.
- We are severely understaffed relative to our portfolio, and it will take years to serve our current and growing portfolio.

Lisa Lee

- Where are we university wide with research regulation?
- The Board of Visitors is involved in trying to prepare us for this work. Key issues include:
 - Managing risk
 - Compliance Advisory Committee
 - Note that getting money, spending money, and doing research are all parts of the process, with regulatory issues in each area.
- Lee presented the organizational chart for VT for Scholarly Integrity and Research Compliance.
 - IRB is now called Human Research Protection Program.
 - The IRB subset is now a group of peers.
 - The IRB performs scientific review in addition to human subjects protection reviews.
 - WIRB
 - Time depends on level of review required.
 - Investigator decides whether to go with WIRB.
 - VT currently has a ~4-6 week turnaround if the protocol is of good quality and everything is in order.
 - We need to use VT for small projects to save cost.
 - We can't teach 4,000 faculty every year how to write appropriate research protocols.
 - Department support could really help to streamline the process.
 - Many university stakeholder groups need training.
 - Faculty service on the IRB board will build capacity.
 - Why not a triage process now?
 - We need a trained person to make decisions.

- Regulations require a human eye and human judgment.
- We are currently searching for people to fill three positions (two currently in the interview stage):
 - Director of Human Research Protection Program
 - Two protocol reviewers
 - Research Integrity and Consultation Director
- WIRB was hired to get us through the transition period.
- We need faculty to serve on IRB board; the board must have a quorum each month to act.
 - We need multidisciplinary teams and have many openings.
 - Service on the board is a three year term.

Note that the Senate ran out of time before the discussion was fully concluded. We will ask Theresa Mayer and Lisa Lee to come back in a few months.

4. Senate Comments:

- Faculty would like to see presentations about how to solve issues, with a realistic timeline.
- We need a forum to collect comments about the Institutes.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.