UNDSMHS Research Committee
Tuesday, March 30, 2021
Virtual Zoom Meeting

The attendance roster is attached.

	Summary	Action/Follow-up
Call meeting to order/welcome new members	Meeting began at 2:00 pm via Zoom.	
Frank Low Research Day	The Call for Abstracts has already gone out and we are all set up with IT to upload the pre-recorded videos to the website. Brian has helped, along with IT with establishing a webpage for FLRD and it will all be housed by UND. We will putting out instructions for participants on how to create and download their Zoom videos. As of this morning, 15 people had registered. Dr. Basson inquired if FLRD had been publicized enough this year. Dr. Foster reported that it has been in Enews several times and a school wide email had been sent out. Dr. Foster and Heather me with Brandon from IT and Heather has the instructions on how to upload all the abstracts and videos to the mediasite.	Heather will send out another reminder about FLRD, including Allied Health. Heather did make a PDF flyer to send out to the residency program directors and also sent to the campuses to post.
Core Reports	Dr. Basson prefaced with the fact that the school has invested heavily in the Cores in the last couple of years. The Dean would like a better way to access how the Cores are performing and if it is money well spent. It is the hope that the Research Committee can use these core reports and user experience survey to identify best practices and also identify opportunities for improvement that can be provide to the core directors and then report back to the Dean the advantages of the Cores and where improvements will be made. Dr. Nechaev added that some of the metrics, assuming people respond evenly, are less then useful when one core gets 14-15 responses and another receives one. The question is how it correlate with the usage – is it because no one is utilizing the core or are people just not responding. Dr. Sens added that is was surprised how few faculty are actually using the microscopy core versus their students using the core. He added that he liked that the survey/reports gave a sense of transparency to the process. Dr. Sens also suggested adding a question on the grant transmittal form inquiring about the use of the Cores. Dr. Basson does not object to this idea and just ask that Dr. Sens reach out to Diane Hillebrand about the possibility of adding this given it is in Novelution. The question could read	Dr. Sens will talk to Diane about adding a question regarding Cores to the grant transmittal. Circle back to the core reports and user experience and read them carefully. Dr. Basson asked Dr. Sens to assign each person of this committee, one of the reports to present, not your own core if you are a core director. Dr. Sens will decided if the respective core directors should excuse themselves during these discussion at the next meeting.

	do you plan to use a Core, which one, and have you budgeted for it. Dr. Geiger found a particular part concerning from one core director that reported people had used their Core to publish papers but did not acknowledge the Core. Dr. Sens advised that on a past project from the indirect costs returns, anyone who acknowledged the Cores received $1,000 toward their publication costs. They started with the Flow Core as a test for this incentive. Some found it interesting that only 3 of the 7 cores were charging fees which makes it hard to determine if they have a mechanism for program income accounts, if they are planning on implementing a mechanism, or if this is something the Dean's office wants and expects as it related to a return on investment. Dr. Basson's opinion is that the return of investment can come from charging fees, but that it also comes from new grant income. The thought process is if our investigators are generating better data, then better grants will be submitted and the school will receive more and better F&A. There are some boundaries on charges for use of a Core, for example if equipment is purchased with NIH money, like with the DaCCoTA money, they stipulated that we not charge for use of the equipment. However, we can charge for the supplies. Some challenges also arise with people not being able to afford core fees, but are trying to work towards obtaining a grant and need to use the equipment. Dr. Nechaev added that in the Genomics Core they have two streams of services, one which is easy to charge for and the other doesn't have a clear path for charging fees. He is trying to navigate through the latter portion by asking people to put the core director or the staff at 5% or a set percent when submitting grants. Discussion continued about thinking in terms of we now have two COBRE's and when they come up for renewal and phase three which is pathways to independence, that we would not be competitive if we didn't charge for the use of the cores. They expended to see a business plan that showed exactly what the anticipation of expenses and revenue was. Dr. Golovko agreed and added that there are two ways of being financially independent. One is by charging the user fee and second is by support from the school. But that charging a user fee is important and also showing where the additional support comes from. Additionally, the amount of money that the core	

| | receive from the Dean's office is part of the sustainability. Dr. Basson summarized the ideas given by members of the committee: 1. Check off a box on the grant transmittal on which core will be used 2. Explain how you will contribute to the cores in your budget whether is be through charging fees or adding the technician or core director to the grant as a percentage of salary. Given that the cost savings would still follow the 1/3 to the Dean and 2/3 to the department process. Another possible solution is done with waivers and vouchers for fees. Dr. Geiger added that is you start charging, you should charge everyone. However, you don't have to charge everyone the same about, but everyone is charged. Those that couldn't afford the cost were able to justify their reasonings and how they plan to afford it in the future, but no one was ever turned away from using a core. Dr. Geiger asked if the Dean's office would like to see some kind of harmonization amongst the cores. Do you leave it up to the individual departments/core and should there be some harmonious qualities that the cores should abide by. Dr. Basson replied that there is value in some consistency; however, each core is different – different user bases, different behaviors, and he doesn't want to force cores in to counterproductive process and guidelines. He does not want to disenfranchise people or slow the progress of scholarly activity. Dr. Warne and Nicole brought up the different composition of the human subjects core that doesn't have equipment and if strictly personnel based. Dr. Mehedi brought up some points regarding user outcomes and how the data is perceived and if there's a better way to provide data, or analyze data to be better. Dr. Basson replied that these are points that the user survey is trying to capture. There was discussion on what the core are expected to do, the product they output versus a faculty's expertise of data analysis and that being their duty as a faculty and collaborating with colleagues – finding the clear line between the service and the collaboration.

If it is the consensus of this committee, by vote, to mandate or recommend the process, then it should go back to the relevant departments for feedback. As members of this committee, be ambassadors or the new policy proposed and take it back to your | |

	respective departments explaining the idea behind the proposed policy. Dr. Nechaev added that in his opinion going to a non-modular approach should be encouraged, but not mandated. However, as Dr. Basson stated, right not with faculty, we are strongly encouraging the some percentage of the PI salary be put on the grant and when it is not, he pushes back and asks the question of why not. If this committee wants the same approach for the cores, we should draft a document similar and distribute to faculty to review and for input. Dr. Sens made a point that he is not particularly worried about the money , as much as he is about wanting to know which grants are going out that use his core. Due to time, think about this topic and someone come prepared to make a motion at the next meeting.	
Other/Informational	Start to think about revising our rules on the meritorious grant award program.	
Announcements	No announcements were noted.	
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 3:11 pm.	

Submitted by Heather Jensen