

August 20, 2003

Dear C&FM Faculty and Principal Investigators,

As you are probably aware, the Institutions of both the College and the Medical Center are now requiring more rigorous review of grant proposals prior to review is a reflection of changes in the IRB review process and efforts to protect privacy, the growth of clinical trials and the need to delineate and balance research activities from clinical activities.

Departmental responses have ranged from establishing new deadlines for department review (often several weeks before a grant is due), to creating complex departmental committees (made up of Senior Faculty) to review each and every new proposal.

The administrators in C&FM and I have been working together hard to respond to these Institutional requirements, without creating undue burdens particularly on you the faculty, or moving up deadlines significantly for everyone. After much discussion, it seems to be least intrusive to our faculty if we establish the following authorization process for ALL new proposals going through C&FM.

- 1) For Senior Faculty (Associate and Full Professors) 48 hours prior to routing through the fiscal and OSP office - please blitz me (with cc's to Merilee, Mimi AND YOUR GRANT ADMINISTRATOR - Donna, Phil, Alan, etc.) your abstract and draft proposal for my review. Do not include CVs, letters of support or face pages. I will review every new proposal, and email (via reply to recipients) my approval or list of concerns. This email approval should be attached to the OSP routing package as verification of authorization, which will allow Mimi or Merilee to stamp and send on for processing. Mimi or her designee will continue to review budgets as she has done in the past.
- 2) For Junior Faculty (Research Associates through Assistant Professors) I will seek the same information 72 - 96 hours before routing to allow for a more thorough review. I am also encouraging those of you as Research Associates through Assistant Professor to work closely with your mentors – including sharing drafts of your proposals as they are developed, and identify mentors by name in your email to me. Once I review these, the same process will apply with the email authorization. Again, a printed copy of the authorization should be attached in the routing package prior to signature.
- 3) Resubmissions of the same grant (assuming no significant changes) and non-competing renewals will not require submission of the Abstract/Proposal, since I will already have reviewed it the first time around. My email authorization should be xeroxed and attached for these purposes, prior to signature/stamp.

As you can imagine, the development of this kind of process goes against my overall philosophy and management style, particularly given your highly successful track

records. However, given the alternatives that we have observed in other departments, I think this is a reasonable compromise that will burden you the least.

We will review this policy and its success/failure at our next faculty meeting in the fall. In the meantime, if you have questions, don't hesitate to contact your grant administrator for clarification. Thanks for your support.

Mike