Research Committee Meeting Minutes

WEDNESDAY – October 11, 2023, 8:30-9:30 a.m.

Attendees: Masako Fujita (ANP), Jeremy Wilson (CJ), Susan Zhu (EC), Jiquan Chen (GEO), Ahnalee Brincks (HDFS), Mevan Jayasinghe (HRLR), Emine Evered (HST), Cristina Bodea (PLS), Jason Moser (PSY/Chair), Angie Kennedy (SSW), Stephen Gasteyer (SOC), Zeenat Kotval-Karamchandani (URP), Nidhi Kalani (Graduate Student Rep), Avery Underwood (Undergraduate Student Rep),
Barbara Cernadas (CSS Dean's Office), Anna Maria Santiago (CSS Dean's Office).

Meeting called to order at 8:32 am.

1. **Approval of the agenda**
   Motion by Ahnalee Brincks; seconded by Emine Evered. Approved.

2. **Approval of the September minutes**
   Motion by Zeenat Kotval-K; seconded Masako Fujita; abstention Jeremy Wilson. Approved.

3. **Current RFPs – FIF and SPG funding opportunities**

   Santiago provided clarifications about the cost share requirements for both the FIF and SPG funding opportunities.

   o The Faculty Initiative Fund (FIF) is an internal fund for tenured faculty only in the College of Social Science. The grant is up to $10,000 with a required minimum cost share of $1,000 by the PI's department even if there are multiple Co-PIs. The cost share can exceed that amount if desired.

   o The Strategic Partnership Grant (SPG) is a grant related to Generative AI of up to $25,000 with a total of $5,000 cost share from the PI's or Co-PI's department or from external partners. The College of Social Science will not cost share on this funding opportunity. The PI does not have to be in the College but there has to be at least one team member who is a part of the College. The goal of the SPG funding opportunity is to foster interdisciplinary research on generative AI.

   • Fixed term faculty can also apply but they must be on a continuing appointment to be eligible.

   • Graduate students can be a part of the research team for these funding opportunities but cannot serve as a PI.

- Deadlines for the FIF (November 17,2023) and SPG (November 20, 2023) are very close to one another.

- November 19th there will be a poster session on Generative AI. Dr. Santiago will forward information about this session.

Questions on FIF or SPG – None

4. IRB issues – update

Santiago noted that the College is continuing to work with the IRB to resolve issues previously discussed.

- o Social & Behavioral IRB: Robin Miller and Katie Gregory are two members of this IRB who represent social science.

- o Santiago, Cernadas and/or Department Chairs provide ancillary reviews to HRPP when requested by HRPP to provide guidance on specific protocols.

- When asked by PIs, the College has been successful in getting some protocols approved that may have been stuck in the review process.

- The extended time for IRB review, response, and approval is an ongoing issue facing multiple colleges. The College is continuing to push for improved communication and protocols.

- If you're running into issues, please reach out to Dr. Santiago so she can assist.

Questions about IRB –

- [Ahnalee Brincks] Is anyone collecting data on IRB approval times and response rates?

  - o Santiago noted that HRPP should be tracking these data in CLICK. The College is only able to see proposals in CLICK when invited to perform ancillary reviews. We will ask about these data HRPP presents at CORD.

- [Masako Fujita] I've had problems getting quick questions answered. I've tried calling and leaving voicemails, but I didn't hear for a long time. I wish the HRPP was available to speak with faculty over Teams/Zoom on a regular basis. Communication has been a challenge with HRPP.

- [Anna Maria Santiago] I wonder if we could develop a FAQ to answer some of these questions that may be easier to address. We have done a webinar in

the past, but the college could develop this and post it to our website. What are committee members thoughts about this?

- [Masako Fujita] This may be helpful, but it would be more helpful for HRPP to post a FAQ sheet. They might have one already but their website is difficult to navigate.

- [Stephen Gasteyer] When I can get in touch with HRPP, they are really helpful, but when actively applying for grants and trying to clarify questions with HRPP, the response time is quite long, and grants have tight deadlines, so this is problematic. If we could find a way to address this, that would be very helpful.

- [Stephen Gasteyer] In CLICK, it looks like there is no spot for a funding source when it's not an external grant. It would be beneficial to be able to track research efforts even if it is being funded internally. I cannot figure out how to enter in CLICK what the funding source is. This is problematic when putting in an IRB proposal connected to another proposal that I am planning to submit. There is no way to indicate this in CLICK. This could be a helpful point to clarify in a FAQ.

- [Masako Fujita] I had a similar issue with an internal grant. IRB provisionally approved the study, but IRB did not approve the consent form with the stamp or watermark until an external grant was identified. In writing, it says consent forms will be approved later, but verbally, IRB said data collection can start without the external grant and stamp or watermark on the consent form.

- [Angie Kennedy] I want to support the idea of IRB sharing their data metrics. More generally, the IRB website and all of the information provided is overwhelming and it is not always clear if IRB needs to be involved, so a decision tree or flow chart could be helpful.

- [Zeenat Kotval-Karamchandani] Could IRB develop a timeline like in ORSI? Such as "it takes X number of days to do Y or we aim to do this review within X number of days" and so on to know when and by who IRB proposals are being reviewed by.

- [Anhalee] Does the IRB ever go through an external review?

- [Anna Maria Santiago] HRPP is accredited and goes through a regular external review. HRPP recently completed reaccreditation.

5. **Research priorities for the 2023-24 academic year**

- [Anna Maria Santiago] Improving communication and approval times with the HRPP looks like one of the priorities for this 2023-24 academic year. The

College is also willing to advocate for additional social science members to be added to IRB reviews and advocate for the College to perform pre-reviews for the IRB to address protocols specific to social science. This affects not only researchers in the College, but students who are working on their thesis or dissertation proposals as well.

- o [Angie Kennedy] IRB transparency and overreach are my two main concerns. IRB staff and the SIRB Chair seem to respond to the same federal guidelines differently.

6. Matters arising

- ORSI has hosted several webinars recently including how to navigate proposal writing services and the WT Grant Foundation opportunities. Dr. Santiago will send out the link to this webinar – only an internal link, must sign in with MSU credentials.

Meeting adjourned at 9:32 am