Absent: Margo Brinton, Kris Byron, Sabrina Freeney, Candace Kemp, Chunying Li, Elizabeth Lim, Yuan Liu, Joseph Magliano, Hongyu Qiu, William Robinson, Vjolca Sadiraj, Volcan Topalli, Aleksandr Zelikovsky

1. The September meeting minutes were approved.

2. Election representatives to GSURF Board:
   a. Three members of the SRC are part of that Board along with the SRC Chair. The three Board members from the previous year Candace Kemp, Margo Brinton, Jack Williams, all agreed to be put forth for re-election to the Board.
   b. The floor was opened for nominations; no further nominations being forthcoming, the existing three Board members were put to a vote and the committee voted to approve these three, Kemp, Brinton, and Williams, to remain on the GSURF Board for the coming year.

3. Kelly Stout provided an overview of the pool of recent Dissertation proposals submitted for review
   a. 38 dissertation proposals received: 25 from A&S; 5 from AYSPS; 1 from BSNHP, 3 from CEHD, 3 from RCB, 1 from SPH
   b. We will work with the Associate Deans for Research to identify potential new internal grant reviewers needed to replace those that have recently rolled off.
   c. Contact Kelly if you have questions about how reviewers are chosen, etc.

4. Kelly Stout provided information about a new Core Task Force recently convened by the VPRED. This small group of investigators have been charged to do a formal and thorough assessment of our current research cores. The task force has been charged as follows:
   a. Review existing core facilities at Georgia State University to understand how they are structured, how they operate, and how they are supported both financially and in other ways (administratively, etc.).
   b. Review examples of research core structure at other R1 institutions to understand potential best practices in the management and sustaining of research core facilities.
   c. Recommend principles for the structure and maintenance of core facilities, including staffing, financial sustainability, support, etc., with flexibility for differences among the cores.
   d. Provide any additional recommendations related to core facilities that come from the assessment and deliberations and identified by the task force as important to the health and sustainability of the research cores at Georgia State.
   e. Prepare and submit a final report with recommendations to the Vice President for Research & Economic development, if possible, by the end of the current fiscal year.
   Other suggestions presented by the SRC will be considered as part of the assessment process or will be addressed, as appropriate, as GSU considers the addition of new cores in the future.

5. Tim Denning provided an update about the issues related to purchases and legal reviews: A meeting
with Purchasing and Legal Affairs resulted in some very helpful progress.

a. The following types of orders will generally not require Legal review:
   - An individual order totaling less than $2500 (either a single item or more than 1 item), will not generally require legal review, regardless of whether the vendor is in Pantermart or not, and regardless of whether T&C are included or not. Exceptions listed in point 2 below.
   - An individual order totaling equal to or greater than $2500 but less than $25,000 (either a single item or more than 1 item), will not generally require legal review, unless substantial terms are included with the quote or invoice. Also, purchases of $10,001 - $24,999.99 being paid from federal funds are required to follow Uniform Guidance (see attached document);
   - An individual order totaling equal to or greater than $25,000 (either a single item or more than 1 item), will follow the state of Georgia procurement rules for competitive bidding, with the exception of statewide contract orders or exempt items. If the vendor does not accept GSU’s terms or has exceptions to our terms, this will require legal review.

b. The following orders will be routed to Legal Affairs for review:
   - purchases of more than $2500 per single item, or purchases totaling more than $25,000 for a single or multiple items;
   - purchases that include a service component with the purchase (installation services, consultant services, etc.);
   - purchases related to a Material Transfer Agreement;
   - purchases that have other circumstances that indicate a need for legal review (as determined by Purchasing).

c. When Purchasing determines that a quote or invoice includes terms that must be routed to Legal for review, the individual who submitted the requisition will be sent a comment on the requisition advising them that the terms must be routed for Legal review. When the end user sends the contract routing package to Purchasing, the individual who submits the routing form will be copied on the email forwarding the terms to Legal for review.

d. This information will be posted on Purchasing and URSA websites and sent out as a communication to the GSU research community once we get a few more clarifications and the Tim, Purchasing and Legal Affairs all sign off on the wording of the information.

e. Formal training about this process is not planned, but the plan is to provide all of this information on the websites mentioned above, as part of a broad communication, and also in a 1-pager reference document that is easy to follow and that includes contact information.

f. Other issues related to this were put forth that require clarification as part of this initiative (who routs the purchase to Legal Affairs for review when needed, process for time-sensitive orders, purchases that cost more from a vendor with a state contract vs. a vendor that is not, etc.)

6. Tim Denning provided a brief update on the process to revise the F&A Waiver Policy: Due to the many complexities that have arisen in the discussions about a revised F&A Waiver policy, we are continuing to have some discussions to determine the path forward. Some of the remaining issues include the question about who covers the real costs that are incurred when F&A is waived, how to handle proposal submissions when the total costs are capped by the sponsor and both direct and indirect have to be part of that total, etc.

7. Overview F&A Distribution breakdown: Appended to the meeting minutes are two slides that were shared at the meeting. Transparency in this is critical for us to make informed decisions about how to use F&A to better support research at GSU. It remains unclear whether all of the F&A going back to the colleges/departments is being used for research in total and, if not, how to address that. Financial underwriting of infrastructure for research by administrative offices and individual investigator
incentives need to both be considered in this discussion. Moreover, the original decision to move to a 20%/80% split was for the purpose of building three buildings after which the distribution split was to be revisited.

a. **F&A Revenue Breakdown slide** shows how the F&A coming into the university is distributed using a fraction that includes 46 units based on some historical BOR decision on F&A; **Blue boxes** show what goes to GSURF (VPRD’ s office) – ~10% of total F&A revenue; **Red boxes** show what is kept by the University – ~40% of total F&A revenue; and **Grey boxes** show what is distributed to the colleges/departments – around 50% of total F&A revenue (~10% from GSURF as FC20, ~16% as FC15 and ~24% as FC10 both from the University); **NOTE**: The 50% going back to colleges is among the highest % of F&A among R1 institutions that is shared with colleges

b. **FY20 F&A revenue slide** shows the actual dollar amount of F&A returned to the university in FY20 ($20.9 million) and how that amount was distributed; The VPRED’s office was able to retain just $2.25 million in F&A in FY20 to provide any support for all research infrastructure, faculty hires in research, upkeep for research equipment and cores, etc. Well over half of the $2.25 million that stays in the VPRED’s office is used for research operations within the office, leaving only around $500,000 for addressing other research requests each year.

8. **Other Business**
   a. In September, the President and Provost hosted an event to recognize faculty: Dr. Andrew Gewirtz and Dr. Xiaochun He were named Regents Professors; Dr. Tim Denning and Dr. Glenn Harrison were named Distinguished University Professors; Dr. Anne Murphy earned the University Exceptional Service Award.
   b. Glenn Harrison provided information regarding what he considers a serious IRB issue related to mask mandating for human research: He posits that investigators who conduct face-to-face research, completely separate from instruction at the university, should have the ability to follow federal policy to mandate that their subjects wear masks for the face-to-face aspects of the research. However, he has been told that he cannot do more than what USG and state of Georgia policy allows which is to encourage, but not to mandate, that subjects wear masks. As IRB typically seems to defer to federal policy for their decisions, in this case it seems that IRB is deferring to the state of Georgia rather than the federal policy.

   The next meeting will be held virtually on Monday, November 15th at 3:00 PM.
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