RPC Meeting Minutes - 12/7/18

Attendees:

Lauren Sohet	CLAS	Humanities
Georg Theiner	CLAS	Humanities
Amy Way	CLAS	Social Science
Christopher Kilby	VSB	Social Science
Anthony Lagalante	CLAS	Science
Matt Matell	CLAS	Science
Jacob Elmer	COE	ChE
James Peyton Jones	COE	ECE
Melissa O'Connor	Nursing	
Lucy Chen	VSB	

Guests = Moira and Amanda

Discussion of *Amanda's feedback* on the RPC proposal with Amanda and Moira

- *The RPC document presumes that responsibility for research policy is specific to a particular office (AVPR or OG&C/ORP). While these specific offices are often the face of research admin policy and may provide oversight for compliance, they may not be the originator of a policy decision at the University. RPC will need to consider the roles of Research Accounting, the Controller, University Compliance, HR, etc. as 'Administrator' as well. We are making efforts to change the culture at Villanova so that the community understands that research administration is a very specific piece of a much larger pie.*
    - Conclusion: Broaden the language in the document to include all possible administrative entities that may be involved in policies.

- *With change in positions from VPAA office structure (A. Ortega) to Provost office structure (AVPR), responsibilities around day to day management of graduate students have shifted to the college level.*
    -

- *How will RPC interface with standing regulatory committees, constituted of faculty representatives?*
    - Outcome: The RPC can and should interact with IRB regularly.

    - The point was made that IRB interactions can feel somewhat “adversarial”.
    - The suggestion was made that the mission statement of IRB and other regulatory committees should explicitly mention that their goal is to:
        - “*help support faculty by (insert primary committee function here).*”

- *Financial audit requirements and federal regulations often necessitate the need for new policy development which leaves little latitude for voting on policy formulation.*
    - n/a

- *Regarding membership – the Associate Deans for Research (ADRs) do not report to the AVPR. ADRs represent the research needs and interests of faculty in their respective colleges and report to the college Dean. Quarterly meetings with the ADRs and AVPR are held to share information across these groups.*
    - Conclusion: Do not include ADRs in the membership of the RPC, but invite them as needed, perhaps on a regular basis (each semester)

Research Support Institute Proposal Discussion (with Amanda and Moira)

- Points raised:
    - Seems like the RSI would not provide many new functions that are not already available.
    - It may or may not be useful to have a resident statistician to help faculty and students with data analysis.
    - The RSI should provide some support for graduate students as well.
    - Perhaps make it clear that the creation of the RSI will not necessarily drain resources from other endeavours at the University (e.g., library expansion)
        - Ex: We are spending $X on the RSI, but $Y is being spent on new books.
- Amanda suggests that the RSI could serve as a central hub for research-related things that are relevant to multiple different colleges/departments (e.g., professional development, social media, etc.)

Post Meeting (James, Jacob, Matt, Anthony, & Moira + Amanda)

- RPC feedback on policy documents
    - Suggestion to merge procedures and policy into a single document
        - No response
    - Advance Account Policy - RPC feedback was good, but suggest more detail on how far PI’s can go in the recruiting/hiring process with the advance funds
        - Moira says there would be a 25% cap on how much could be spent on staff prior to the official award
    - Program Income Policy - We suggest that the policy be clarified to state that this only applies to specific funding opportunities that require that program income be returned.

        - Moira notes that in several cases, the policies are decided by the funding agencies, but the scope could be revised to clarify that this policy only applies to specific funding mechanisms that require return of program income.
    - Cost Share Policy - RPC notes that cost-share (a.k.a. Institutional commitment) can make some federal proposal more competitive (under specific circumstances), so it should not be banned outright
        - Moira/Amanda suggest that there might be a way to craft the language in proposals to replace the phrase “cost share” with some other verbage that is allowed by each specific funding agency.
        - We suggest delaying the implementation of this policy until further discussion can be had