

**RESEARCH  
LEADERSHIP COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday, July 19, 2018  
3:00 to 4:00 pm  
CINJ Boardroom 2003

**Attendees**

Eileen White, Howard Hochster, Edmund Lattime (called in), Linda Tanzer, Wei-Xing Zong, Estela Jacinto, Zhiyuan Shen, Chang Chan, XF Steven Zheng, Janice Mehnert, Cristine Delnevo, Elisa Bandera, David Foran, Paul Novembre, Gina Londino

**Agenda**

1. Deputy Director's Report

- The RLC was informed that the parent committee for the CCSG competing renewal application would be meeting soon to provide the final report and score. Dr. White noted that there was likely no reason for concern.
- A retreat is being planned (likely for some time in October), in which the CCSG will be discussed. Leaders are instructed to make a list of agenda items and feedback relating to the process, preparations, and the site visit, especially as it relates to how things could be done differently in this current CCSG cycle.
  - o The RLC should also think creatively on ways to promote getting multi-investigator grants.

2. Membership Refinement Process

- It will be essential to refine the membership of the Research Programs throughout this CCSG cycle.
- All of the Program Leaders were assigned to review their membership lists, along with the membership criteria and additional information that Paul Novembre will provide about the current members. They should come to the next RLC meeting with recommendations on how to proceed regarding various members highlighted by Paul Novembre.
- Paul Novembre explained specific unique circumstances that were applied to the membership criteria in the past CCSG cycle. For example, training awards were allowed to qualify certain faculty for membership when they otherwise would not have qualified, so as to promote the CRCERA section. He could adjust the status of these members, if necessary.
- The matter of whether to grant Full membership to faculty who are PIs on clinical trials but without funding was discussed. While this practice had been somewhat criticized in the CCSG competing renewal application and site visit, it was not deemed so serious an issue as to require change.

- It was noted that the Program Leaders will need to continue to determine the overall cancer relevance of their members' funding. CINJ will need to identify how it will categorize funding according to cancer relevance for this new CCSG cycle.
- The RLC next discussed how to best classify members who hold leadership positions but are without funding or who fall under other unique scenarios. Other cancer centers use the term "adjunct" for such individuals. CINJ might need to adopt a new category, as it cannot continue to have more Associate II members than Full members.
  - o Suggestions were made to create the term "Honorary" members and to perhaps have a "Postdoctoral" category. Currently, some members are receiving credit for their students' funding (e.g., Joshua Rabinowitz's funding list includes an award belonging to a student in his lab).
  - o Other categories of members might also need to be created. It was agreed that the term "Associate II" sounded somewhat insulting and that better terminology (e.g. "Advisory") is needed.
- The question was raised as to whether the Program Leaders needed to reduce their number of Associate II members. Because the Associate II members are only kept in a database (in case they might need to have their status raised due to funding or other circumstance) and not reported in the CCSG, there was not a specific need to eliminate any Associate II members.
- It was agreed that in advance of the August RLC meeting, the Program Leaders will have reviewed the information about their members that Research Administration would provide them. Their recommendations for membership changes would be discussed at the August RLC meeting.
- The Program Leaders will also provide the Research Administration Department with some verbiage that will be used as justification of the cancer relevance of some of the members' funding. Doing so is necessary in order to comply with CINJ's policy on assignment of cancer relevance to non-NCI funding.
  - o It was suggested that for the CCSG, CINJ might no longer want to include funding that had less than 25% cancer relevance, so as to avoid unnecessary scrutiny from reviewers.

### 3. Newsletters/Collection of Programmatic Achievements and Activities

- Program Leaders were informed that, now that the CCSG competing renewal application is finished, that the Basic/Clinical Research Newsletters will begin again. They will ideally be distributed quarterly and will be a means of tracking accomplishments that can be used in the Progress Reports.

### 4. CINJ Division of Grant Support Services - SOPs and Intake Process

- CINJ intends to introduce a process in which every PI must utilize the DGSS intake form, have a mentor/mentorship team member sign off on the form, and submit it at least 30 days prior to the due date of an award/funding mechanism. The goal of this new process is to stop PIs from submitting grant applications in a rushed or premature manner.

- It was noted that DGSS services are only available for resident CINJ faculty. However, there are some unique circumstances in which non-resident faculty (e.g. Chen Liu, Xiaoyang Su) could receive DGSS assistance. It was agreed that if the award would benefit CINJ from a CCSG perspective, then these outside faculty could utilize DGSS's services.
  - o As for when the award would utilize CINJ's DUNS number rather than that of another school, those decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis.

5. "Job Descriptions" - Program Leaders and Associate Directors

- The job descriptions for Research Program Leaders, Associate Directors, and Shared Resource Directors were briefly reviewed and discussed. Gina Londino will distribute these descriptions to those in the respective roles.

6. SRB review of SPH studies with NIH funding – expedited

- The RLC discussed the possibility of having expedited SRB review for research studies originating from the School of Public Health that already received approval from an NIH study section.
- Dr. Hochster stated that only an administrative review would be needed by the SRB, and then the study could be sent along to the IRB.
- Dr. Lattime added that there should be a 1-page application for these situations.
- Paul Novembre noted that the role of the SRB has evolved from being a CCSG requirement to a Rutgers-wide policy, due to Dr. Libutti's role as Vice Chancellor for Cancer Programs of RBHS. The question is now how to implement the policy of SRB review as simply as possible.
- It was agreed that the current policy needs to be reworded to explain that the policy of requiring SRB review for all cancer-related studies comes from that of Dr. Libutti, Vice Chancellor for Cancer Programs of RBHS (which does apply to SPH), rather than from the "Dean of Robert Wood Johnson Medical School" (the former verbiage, which would not apply to SPH).

**Next Meeting**

Thursday, August 23, 2018 (3:00 pm to 4:00 pm, CINJ Boardroom 2003)