

**COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES**

Office of the Associate Dean for Administrative Affairs and Graduate Education

**RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**April 19, 2010**

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Dale Cook, FLA; Pam Mitchell, HS; Greg Smith, LDES; Kelly Cichy, LDES; Tim Rasinski, TLC; Joanne Caniglia, TLC (by phone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nicholas Bellino, FLA; Eun-Jeong Ha, HS

GUESTS: None

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION TAKEN** |
|  | Meeting was called to order at 9:30. There was one correction to the minutes of the previous meeting. Last sentence of the first paragraph– More of an emphasis on establishing a research agenda. – (Greg Smith) |  |
| Class Project IRB | Joanne Caniglia, who is part of the IRB Committee, spoke to the group regarding issues with the Class Project IRB form. The form is older and the IRB committee would like to see the form revised. They felt that this would be best accomplished by EHHS. Joanne has an IRB meeting on 4/21/10. Paulette Washko is also involved. The issue arose because a faculty member did not follow the directions for the class project form. One committee member shared that the form does not distinguish or clearly limit itself to human subjects research-the form as is could refer to any class project. The form could actually confuse students about the nature of human subjects research. She has suggested adding the OHRP (HHS Office of Human Subjects Research Protections) definition of research on the form and an effort made to clarify when the form would be required. The other issue mentioned by an EHHS faculty member was with the number of changes in the IRB office - each person having a different interpretation. Paulette, Joanne and 2 faculty members from EHHS who have had problems, will be having a meeting. She shared that the difference between a class project and Action Research was some of the issue. If there is no intent to publish – do they still have to have the IRB? This is one of the issues. It was suggested that somewhere in the form the Human subject issue needs to be addressed in the description. There was discussion on the various scenarios i.e. intent to publish and the use of human subjects etc. Another concern with the IRB process is the slowness of the process.  Nancy asked Joanne what she wanted from the committee. Joanne indicated she would like the committee’s help in revising the form. She indicated that she would be glad to draft something for submittal to IRB. She will involve the Research Council along with other faculty members. Nancy asked Joanne to send the draft to the committee members for review. | Joanne will send the draft revision of the Class Project form within the next week and will report the results of the IRB meetings. |
| Grant Tracking | Tracking forms for developing a grant proposal will go into use Summer 2010. |  |
| Internal Research Grants | The Dean has not yet been able to develop a budget for AY2010-2011. He indicated to Nancy that at this point the committee could count on $10,000 for spring and $10,000 for fall. It will be up to the committee how they want to divide this amount. There were a number of questions which must be answered regarding these grants:   1. When to put the call for proposals. 2. What should be in the proposal? The focus or topic? 3. What criteria will be developed? (scholarship of engagement) 4. Should these be collaborative or individual? 5. Should it have seed potential? 6. Who will decide who is awarded the grants? 7. How will the person be accountable?   It was agreed that new and untenured track faculty should be focused on. The application should include a discussion of how the grant would help develop this person’s research agenda. Another criteria suggestion was that it leads to a grant application or publication. Adding a statement regarding the rationale along with intention of leading to publication or grant funding was suggested. It would be up to the submitter to explain the connection. Should also look at innovative or ground breaking ideas. It was suggested that perhaps the applicant could be given options. Impact of the research in the future should be included. It was suggested that the criteria be as broad as possible to give as many as possible an opportunity. If the university has a priority for scholarship of engagement perhaps EHHS should take that as a research priority. Nancy suggested the group take a look at the college strategic plan to help develop the criteria for these grants. It was felt that the bottom line should be impact. It was suggested that criteria for larger grants could be reviewed to see if there is a common denominator.  The group would like to get this started as soon as possible. The group felt it would be better to have four $5,000 grants so that more people could be helped. The application should be kept to perhaps a 10 page narrative. It was questioned how you could enforce the outcome? It was suggested that the result would be that they would not be eligible for further grant monies if they do not meet their expected outcomes.  Timeline:  Notification ready to go out by Summer I – June 1  Applications Due: end of Sept. or the first week of Oct.  Questions regarding the submission – contact Administrative Affairs office. | Nancy will work with Pam Mitchell to develop a draft of the RFP. |
| Research Bureau | Nancy shared that a decision regarding the Bureau has not yet been made. Therefore, we will continue status quo for next year. |  |

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 am.

Next meeting: **Monday, May 17, 2010, 9:30-10:30am, WH Rm 409**

Respectfully submitted

Luci Wymer, Recorder