Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chair Wybourne at 12:11 p.m. A quorum was present.

Members Present: Joyce DeLeo, Robert Donin, Robert Hansen, William Hickey, Adam Keller, C. Robert McClung, Jeffrey Taube, Peter Winkler (late), Nancy Wray, and Martin Wybourne.

Members Absent: Lee Lynd and Tillman Gerngross.

Guests: Liz Bankert.

Approval of the October 4, 2006 Meeting Minutes: The following correction was made: Under Council Website, “that they are” should be changed to “the Provost Office is”, and later in the same sentence “them” should be changed to “it”. DeLeo moved and Hickey seconded to approve the minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

Follow-up from October 4, 2006 Meeting: Wybourne mentioned that the Research Compliance website is available at: http://www.dartmouth.edu/~comply/. The CSA membership, Annual Report and Membership list is available on the web site. Future CSA meeting minutes will be added when final approval is obtained. Regarding the Clinical and Translational Science Award (CTSA), Hickey commented that each institution vying for a center must prepare a proposal. The Dean of the Medical School will probably be named as the principle investigator. The proposal will be written by multiple individuals at the institution and is likely to be between 200 and 500 pages. Currently DMS has been awarded a planning grant of $150,000. The full proposal target submission date is October 2007. The National Institute of Health’s goal is to set up 60 centers over the next five to seven years. One institution can only receive one grant. Fourteen full grants have been awarded thus far.

Authorship Guidelines: Wybourne stated that there have been only two authorship disputes that needed mediation in the two years he has been Vice Provost for Research. The latest one brought to his attention that Dartmouth has no formal authorship guidance. Authorship Guidelines were presented and discussed at the meeting:

Discussion ensued concerning authorship when undergraduates or research technicians were involved and what criteria should be met for authorship. It was suggested that there should be a clear judicial process and that standard practices should be considered.
Wybourne said he would revise the authorship guideline language and bring it back to the council.

**Request from CSA COI Subcommittee to make minor changes to COI policy:**
Bankert provided a handout of proposed changes to Dartmouth's current COI policy, which includes the incorporation of some Federal regulatory wording.

Discussion ensued on the issue of COI policy. DeLeo commented that the process for faculty members was unclear to who they should go to for review. Donin responded that the COI policy was a generic policy which set forth general principles, rather than specific details, and that he thought an individual should consult an individual such as the Dean of their department for guidance. They could seek guidance from the CSA, but are not required to do so. McClung suggested that investigators should be informed that they should adhere to the general principles of the COI policy even if their research is not sponsored. Hansen added that “expectation” in the first paragraph of the revised language of the first page should read “risk.” Discussion also involved concern regarding the clarity of the current policy because it includes all conflicts of interests (procurement, Trustees, non research, research, etc). Donin proposed that at some point the COI policy should be rewritten. Wray suggested that for the moment they should revise the policy to reflect what is happening logistically and on the national scene, and that once the federal-wide COI policy is published, an overhaul of the policy should be undertaken. Wybourne agreed and added that new COI policies might need approval by the Board of Trustees. Donin suggested that eventually we should produce a general COI policy that would also include separate policies for NIH and NSF, human subjects, and sponsored and non-sponsored research.

**Association for the Accreditation of our Human Subjects Research Protection Program (AAHRPP):**

Bankert explained that the Institution was applying for accreditation for the human subject protections program. Reasons for applying at this point include the requirement for the White River Junction VA to become accredited prior to the end of ’08. The Dartmouth IRB is the IRB of Record for the WRJ VA. In addition the CTSA grant signifies a general commitment to research and an accredited human subjects program is one step in that overall goal. There are five domains that will be reviewed. Bankert provided a handout explaining the domains (Organization, IRB, Investigator, Sponsored Projects, and Research Participants).

DeLeo’s asked if other institutions receiving CTSA grants were accredited. Liz responded that some institutions were accredited and others were moving in that direction.

**Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.