

BMS Graduate Program Committee Meeting

November 14, 2018

9 to 10 a.m.

Meeting minutes

Present: Sheila Fleming, Liya Yin, Priya Raman, Lisa Cooper, Emily Plyler, Jesse Young, Nona Hose, and guests Steven Schmidt, Christian Ritter and Alex Galazyuk

Absent: Sam Crish

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
1. Potential conflict of interest regarding Dr. Sam Crish's role as chair of the BMS committee with guest Dr. Christian Ritter, Vice Dean of the COGS	<p>In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair, Dr. Lisa Cooper, opened the meeting with the potential conflict of interest topic regarding Dr. Sam Crish's role as Chair of the BMS committee. Emily Plyler stepped out for this discussion as Dr. Crish is her advisor.</p> <p>Dr. Crish's administrative roles are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Director of RFA for Neurodegenerative Diseases• Associate Dean of Research for the College of Pharmacy <p>Dr. Raman shared that she has discussed this topic with individuals, including the former Chair, and that given Dr. Crish's roles above, there could be a conflict of interest with him serving as Chair of this committee.</p> <p>Dr. Cooper stated that given the BMS program lacks a policy regarding Conflict of Interest, Drs. Ritter and Schmidt were asked to attend and provide insight.</p> <p>Dr. Schmidt began by stating in a small University like NEOMED, there are going to be opportunities for conflict of interests quite often. For example, Dr. Jesse Young is the Chair of the IACUC, so that, too, could present a conflict of interest for him serving on this committee. If there is a perceived or true conflict of interest, it needs to be declared and managed properly. In his administrative roles, Dr. Crish is privileged to information that could benefit this committee. Whomever is in conflict should recuse themselves from voting when there is a conflict.</p> <p>Dr. Raman stated that his role as the Associate Dean for Research for the COP presents the conflict of interest.</p> <p>Dr. Schmidt asked what about that role is a conflict?</p> <p>Dr. Galazyuk interjected that historically, before Ernie Freeman, Eric Mintz pushed for the committee to be faculty driven. Dr. Walt Horton started as faculty and moved up to Dean. This is when the COI began.</p> <p>Dr. Ritter shared that when money is authorized to be spent, it has to be approved by the Chair/Associate Chair and the Dean. Decisions need to be based on a framework that provides direction. It makes sense to have a statement in place to address these issues.</p> <p>Dr. Raman asked that given there are cohorts of faculty that feel this is a conflict of interest, is there any potential problem with trying to move forward to remove Sam?</p> <p>Dr. Galazyuk suggested the committee begin with developing the policy. Identify which position is viewed as a conflict and which is not.</p>	

	<p>Dr. Ritter stated the policy should drive the decision.</p> <p>Dr. Fleming stated she would not want Dr. Crish to leave since he best knows the history of the committee and program.</p> <p>Dr. Ritter suggested that the committee consider electing the new chair before the current Chair's term ends, so they can mentor them before they assume the role as Chair.</p>	
2. History of stipend support, stipend approval form and process with Dr. Alex Galazyuk	<p>Dr. Galazyuk gave the committee a history of the funds flow for the BMS program:</p> <p>Since the program was established, the State decided to support it. The state money goes to Kent State University, we do not get the money. Once time per year, there is a calculation that determines how much money we spent, how much money was received from the state, how much money for teaching and advising students, etc. if we underspent the money, we get money back. If we over spent, the money, we owe KSU. This transaction happens in July.</p> <p>One student costs approximately \$31,000 per year for five years. Over many years, we had under spent so we received money from KSU, plus we earned money for teaching and advising.</p> <p>Since the policy changed, the funds are extra. We owed KSU money this past year because we took on 3 first year students.</p> <p>Look at all students in BMS @ NEOMED. All students who came to the program since 2014 (when the policy was established). Years one and two are covered by the program because students are taking courses and doing rotations. Years 3-5 students should be supported by grant money (eligible grants that allow students).</p> <p>If the student is admitted in 2014 or later, they are eligible. Look at each faculty advisor to see if they have appropriate funding.</p> <p>Junior faculty have student support from the program for one student for five years, unless they get a grant within that timeframe.</p> <p>Look at each student and go to their faculty advisor with the form. If student is TA-ing a major course, 50% from the PI's grant; 50% coming from administration. Only four students may be eligible for this sometimes because these are students who are covered by grant money. If the student is TA-ing but the PI does not have a grant, the program supports the student – not administration.</p> <p>Dr. Galazyuk suggested we send the form to every faculty who advises BMS students and ask them to fill it out annually. The funds need to be encumbered at the beginning of the academic year and then taken the next year in July.</p>	Nona will send out the form to be completed by faculty who advise BMS students.
	The meeting was adjourned.	
Agenda items for discussion at future meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a policy regarding funding requests • Courses offered twice a year, TAs teach twice or have double TAs? 	
	The meeting was adjourned.	