

Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development

Approved Minutes

Date: October 16, 2002

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Place: Horvitz Building, President's Dining Room

Present: Ronald Chenail (Academic Affairs), Mary Collins (FGSEHS), Laurie Dringus (GSCIS), Leonard Levy (HPD/COM), David Loshin (HPD/OPT), Ron Needleman (Huizenga/IRB), Appu Rathinavelu (HPD/COP), Josephine Shallo-Hoffman (HPD/OPT), Kimberly Shaw (FAM. CTR.), Mahmood Shivji (OSC), and Barbara Sterry (OGC)

Absent: Nathan Azrin (CPS), Elizabeth Brennan (UNS), *Gary Gershman (FAR), Bill Hardigan (HPD/COP), *Marianne Janssen (HPD/CAH), J. Preston Jones (HUIZENGA), *Billie Jo Kaufman (LAW), *Ed Keith (OSC/IRB), Ed Lieblein (GSCIS), Fred Lippman (HPD/Exec. Offices), Peggy Loewy Wellisch (Student Financial Services), Andres Malave (HPD/COP), Harvey Mayrovitz (HPD/CMS), Barbara Packer (FGSEHS), Keith Sherwood (HPD/CDM), and Hamdesa Tusso (GSHSS)

* Emailed to report scheduling conflict

Committee Charge: The purpose of the Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development is to assist with the development of goals and expectations for scholarship and research and to define the policies and procedures needed to support these activities in a high-quality manner.

1. Approval of Minutes from September 18, 2002

The minutes were approved unanimously without revisions. They can be found online at <http://www.nova.edu/cwis/vpaa/facres/forms/facres091802.pdf>.

2. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Follow-up

As a follow-up to September's meeting, Ms. Barbara Sterry gave a presentation to clarify the question of whether IRB needs to review all research protocols or only those protocols that involve human subjects. Ms. Sterry said a section of the Institutional Review Board Policy and Procedure Manual for Research with Human Subjects entitled, "Research Covered by and Exempt from Review," was amended to read, "The center representative will be responsible for determining whether the research should be reviewed or is exempt." Originally, she reported that the policy stated that faculty, staff, and students were to contact their respective center/college representative for further information/clarification if they had any doubt whether research should be reviewed or exempt. Ms. Sterry said this section goes on to define research covered by review and research that is exempt from review. She said there appears to be little doubt of the type of research that should be reviewed and that

which is exempt from full review by the IRB, and further, the policy clearly states that it is the center representative who makes that determination.

Ms. Sterry's interpretation of this policy is thus: Research involving sea turtles, sharks, or coral reefs would not involve human subjects, and therefore, the center representative WOULD NOT be responsible for determining whether the research should be reviewed or is exempt from review. On the other hand, she said, research, for example at the Fischler Center, which is using survey or interview procedures where human subjects' identities are thoroughly protected and their answers do not subject them to criminal and civil liability would most likely be exempt from full IRB review, but WOULD NEED to be reviewed by the center representative to confirm that determination.

Ms. Sterry stated the manual is consistent in the use of the phrase "research involving human subjects". Moreover, she said, if one follows the guidelines provided to define research covered by review and research exempt from review, there should be no confusion on the IRB review process that is in place.

Committee members pointed out that the term, "exempt," can lead to confusion. For proposals that involved human subjects, the center representative would make the decision as to whether the proposal should receive full or expedited IRB review or whether the proposal would be exempt from any further review. In proposals where there is no involvement of human subjects, investigators would make the determination that the proposal is "exempt" from any IRB review. To address this confusion, the committee passed a motion to recommend to the NSU IRB that they compose a memo for deans and faculty that would clarify this point.

Committee members also raised some issues regarding the HPD Research Committee. They expressed concerns regarding the role of that committee. One area of concern was the relationship between the HPD Research Committee and the NSU IRB. Dr. Chenail said he would contact Vice Chancellor Lippman and inform him of these concerns. Dr. Chenail also suggested that it might be a good idea to have the HPD Research Committee come to one of the Committee on Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Professional Development meetings and present on the workings of the group.

3. United States Geologic Survey Update

The team from the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) will visit the NSU campus on November 14. There would also be a pre-session on the 13th. In addition, the university was pursuing the Florida Center of Excellence competition (http://www.myflorida.com/myflorida/etc/frc_report.html).

4. President's Faculty Scholarship Awards Update: Portal and Call to Reviewers

Dr. Chenail demonstrated the draft version of the Reviewer Proposal Rating Form (http://www.nova.edu/cwis/draft/melisa/proposal_rating.html) that had been developed by NSU Office of Information Technology (OIT). After reviewing the page, committee members suggested that the scores for the two double-weighted scales be changed to reflect their extra weight. They also suggested we work with OIT to make sure the "back office" part of the system could handle the traffic flow that would

result from this process.

Dr. Chenail also informed the group that a call for reviewers had been sent to the deans. He asked that committee members contact their respective deans about this call and to work on promoting participation in the awards among their fellow faculty members.

In a related matter, Dr. Loshin noted that the Research Committee was working on a policy that would create an expedited review process. This would be helpful for HPD-based winners of the PFSA in that it could speed up the approval process for their projects.

Committee members also suggested that a standardized cover sheet be developed for the PFSA submissions similar to the one used for federal grant submissions. An important feature of such a form would be the declaration of whether or not human subjects or animal were involved in the study. Ms. Sterry volunteered to draft the cover sheet. Dr. Chenail said he would have OIT post the documents as a downloadable Word file. He also said when the file is available for downloading that he would have a new notice sent to prospective faculty investigators alerting them to this new online resource.

5. Sub-committee on Best Practices and Benchmarking: Graduate Student Scholarship Program

Dr. Chenail reported that he had met with Dr. Keith and Dr. Shallo-Hoffman to discuss the findings of the recently completed survey regarding tuition waivers and graduate students scholarships availability across the university. Dr. Chenail reported that very few of the academic units were in the position to offer such waivers and/or scholarships. He noted that a number of units were not at a point developmentally with their research programs to make effective use of such incentives to attract graduate students interested in conducting research.

6. Other Items of Discussion: The Big Picture of Research at NSU

Some committee members observed that there appeared to be a disconnection between the mention of research and scholarship in the university's mission statement and the day-to-day reality in the various academic units. They noted the emphasis on the bottom line on the centers and how that focus could be a hurdle to be overcome in the development of research at NSU. Dr. Chenail noted that the purpose of the committee was "to assist with the development of goals and expectations for scholarship and research and to define the policies and procedures needed to support these activities in a high-quality manner." Along these lines, he suggested that the committee consider doing an annual report on the state of research at the university. Through such a report, the university could track its progress and measure its return on investment.

7. Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 19, 2002

8. Adjournment: With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 AM