

RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

Date: March 30, 2017

Time: 11:00am – 12:00pm

Place: Conference Room A324

Members present: Jeff Burgess (Associate Dean for Research (ADR)), Cyndi Thomson, Scott Carvajal, David Marrero (via phone), Zhao Chen; Admin: Suzanna Trejo-Robinson; Guest: Nate Stupiansky

Absent: Doug Taren

Note from the ADR:

This is the initial planning meeting for the revised Research Advisory Committee (RAC). Based on discussions with faculty and staff in each of our three departments and one division, the RAC was revised to better support research proposal development. This will initially include review of: 1) specific aims pages; and 2) scored but unfunded grant proposals. The initial membership criterion for the revised RAC committee membership is substantial external grant funding over the past three years. Additional changes in RAC membership will be made as needed.

Discussion:

- a. Initial focus of revised RAC to include specific aims pages and scored but not funded proposals
- b. Current members present will be the “Core” group – additional members will be invited as needed including ad hoc members
- c. Question: Does the ADR office have successful models to review?
 - i. Pre-Award will share successful grants with principal investigators (PIs) applying for similar grants and they will also help to connect the PI with other PIs who have current similar grants
- d. The revised RAC will incorporate approaches successfully employed in Indiana. They established Project Development Teams that met once a month to discuss projects.
- e. Determination of process
 - i. For specific aims reviews:
 1. Submit aims page, brief methods summary, key personnel and FOA.
 2. Five minute presentation by PI focusing on NIH-style criteria (significance, innovation, etc.)
 3. 10-15 minute RAC discussion
 - ii. For scored grants reviews:
 1. Submit grant proposal, summary sheet and FOA
 2. Five minute presentation by PI summarizing reviewer comments (grouped together across reviewers by criteria to reduce repetition)
 3. 15-20 minute RAC discussion
 - iii. Other process comments
 1. For junior faculty specific aims, her or his faculty mentor has to approve before the aims are submitted to the RAC
 2. RAC admin to schedule 2-3 aims and/or grant reviews for each meeting
- f. Metrics for evaluation of revised RAC process/aims and scored grant reviews

RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- i. # submissions, # grants approved, # grants approved on first revision
- g. Invite RDS and UAHS representatives to next meeting
- h. Ad hoc faculty should include faculty with specific study section experience
 - i. ADR office to identify faculty with study section expertise, consider adding this to annual performance review data
- i. ADR office to provide successful aims pages examples obtained from UAHS Pre-Award

Action items (for ADR office):

1. Reach out to RDS and UAHS about joining the committee
2. Send out possible dates for regular monthly meeting time and dates
 - a. Consider last Thursday of the month, 11 AM-noon, starting April 27
3. Post process description on ADR website and notify faculty
4. Request successful specific aims page for ADR website
5. Gather historical data for baseline grant success metrics