Meeting began 11:40 am

1. Approval of minutes – The February minutes were approved.

2. Reducing administrative burden
   a. Grant Calhoun, Export Control Administrator, Office of the Vice President for Research, attended the meeting to obtain feedback from the committee regarding what can be done to reduce the administrative burden of faculty. Grant welcomed suggestions regarding any university processes that can be streamlined to save time for faculty and staff.
      i. The following processes that have already been identified for streamlining:
         1. Disposition of hazardous materials
         2. Animal purchasing/management
         3. Conflict of interest forms
   b. Suggestions from committee
      i. Time/Effort reporting – quarterly certification reports
      ii. Biosafety regulations/reporting
      iii. IACUC reporting
      iv. Radioactivity safety – Currently too much paperwork for ordering and receiving radioactive items, how it is used and disposed.
         1. There was a suggestion to track only what is ordered because PIs can only use the radioactivity that is ordered.
      v. KFS – Improvements should be made to the purchasing system.
      vi. Equipment purchases and startup fund distribution through the VPR Office lease system. New faculty find it difficult to purchase equipment efficiently with the current lease system (i.e. quotes expire before the purchase is approved by the university).
      vii. Travel paperwork – signature routing is time intensive and excessive.
      viii. PCARD – requirements for signatures on monthly statements and retention of hard copy statements and receipts.
      ix. Background checks – the process is excessive, especially since background checks are required when changing from one appointment to another.
      x. General guidelines regarding streamlined processes:
         1. Anything that is done on paper could be done electronically
         2. There should be proven value for all approvals in order to cut back on the list of approvals for all processes.
   c. Dr. Dean will compile input from faculty and staff and send the information to Grant.

3. Update on DMIP Development position
   a. Dr. Dean provided an update on the position and indicated the next actions that will be taken.
      i. The position description will be finalized and sent to Pam Jones and Coleman Cornelius.
         1. Cooperation and division of responsibilities with the CVMBS Communications and Development Groups are essential.
2. The DMIP needs to develop a strategy for hire, determine minimum qualifications and scope of work.
   i. The search committee will be assembled (possibly, Edit-chair, Mary Jackson, Glenn Telling and Greg Ebel)

4. New special faculty policy
   a. Dr. Dean asked for feedback regarding the special appointment faculty subcommittee report that was recently distributed.
      i. Dr. Telling provided more detail from the discussion of the subcommittee.
      ii. The Advisory Committee discussed the suggestion to require a national search for all special appointment faculty either upon hire or at the time of conversion.
         1. Conversion is the better option when startup funds and lab space are not available.
         2. Requiring a national search sends the wrong message to special faculty who are being considered for conversion. It can seem unsupportive.
         3. The committee felt that a national search should not be required.
      iii. The committee was in favor of the following suggestions from the subcommittee:
         1. An Ad hoc committee should review and make recommendations for nominations for special faculty appointments.
         2. Nominations/applications should include 6 external letters of reference.
         3. The requirements and commitments of the nominating faculty member should be outlined in the nomination packet including:
            a. Space commitments of nominator (lab/office allocation)
            b. Mentorship plan for nominator including a career development plan for nominee.

5. Postdoc policy
   a. There is concern from DMIP HR that the department doesn’t always adhere to university guidelines regarding term limits of postdoc appointments, which is 3 years. There is inequity in benefits, and annual and sick leave between postdoc appointments and others (i.e. Research Scientist).
   b. It was suggested that the DMIP provide a policy regarding the term limit for postdoc appointments and a recommendation regarding time off. The committee was supportive of this action.

6. Department review
   a. The DMIP will be completing a review of its programs and activities by 2015. A timeline for the review will be determined; a plan will be set to meet the deadlines and the review will need to be entered into the website by the beginning of 2015.
   b. Dr. Dean was able to preview the department review website and would like to make the department review as meaningful and beneficial as possible.

7. Space requests
   a. Dr. Jeff Wilusz, Micro A103 for the MS-B program
      i. The committee recommended approval.

8. Travel grants
   a. Dr. Richard Bessen for Lindsay Parrie, postdoc
      i. The committee recommended approval for half of the requested expenses (international travel).

Meeting ended 1:01 pm