CATALYZING TEAM SCIENCE: INTERAGENCY ASPECTS

Daniel C. Sullivan – NIH/NCI Chair, BECON

BECON CHARTER:

• "Interagency collaboration in bioengineering may be encouraged by inviting representatives of other federal agencies to serve as exofficio members."

NIH BECON SYMPOSIA (Bioengineering Consortium)

- 1. BIOENGINEERING: BUILDING THE FUTURE OF BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE FEBRUARY 27 28, 1998
- 2. BIOMEDICAL IMAGING JUNE 25-26, 1999
- 3. NANOSCIENCE AND NANOTECHNOLOGY JUNE 25-26, 2000
- 4. REPARATIVE MEDICINE: GROWING TISSUES AND ORGANS JUNE 25-26, 2001
- 5. SENSORS FOR BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND MEDICINE JUNE 24-25, 2002
- 6. CATALYZING TEAM SCIENCE JUNE 23-24, 2003

CATALYZING TEAM SCIENCE: INTERAGENCY ASPECTS

 Agencies – Symposium Participants: NIH, NSF, DOE, NIST

 Description – Premise for Symposium: Inadequate rewards for members of research teams is a systems problem

Issues/Recommendations

- Change is needed in 3 key spheres:
 - -Funders
 - Academic institutions
 - -Journals

Recommendations to Funders

- Allow more than one Principal Investigator (PI) on individual grants
- Allow multiple performance sites to receive appropriate indirect cost recovery
- Develop improved funding mechanisms for team science
- Give more attention to the special review needs of team science

BECON Follow-up Plans:

- Subcommittee on Interdisciplinary Research and Team Science
- Communicate with NIH Roadmap Implementation Committee
- Incorporate recommendations into BRP PA
- Work with RBM and NIH Co-PI Committees

Co-PI Issue

- Research Business Models (RBM) Subcommittee of Committee on Science (http://rbm.nih.gov)
 - FS-1: Acknowledgement of CO-PIs in proposals and agency information systems
 - BECON will canvass other agencies (including today's participants); make trans-agency, conceptual proposal on definitions, etc.
- NIH Co-PI Implementation Committee
 - In conformity with RBM guidelines, develop implementation plan specific for NIH

Co-PI Questionaire

- 1. Does your agency use the designation "co-principal investigator" (or comparable terminology) in awarding grants?
- 2. What definitions do you use for "co-principal investigators" (or for your comparable terminology)?
- 3. What are the legal and/or financial responsibilities or obligations of the co-principal investigators?
- 4. How well has this system worked in your agency? Have there been problems with this shared designation? Would you recommend any changes to your current procedures or policies? Who is the best contact person for information about your agency's policies and procedures with respect to co-principal investigators?
- 5. If your answer to question 1 is no, is this an issue of interest to your agency? That is, would your agency be interested in using the "co-principal investigator" designation in awarding grants? Is there a staff person or committee studying this issue with respect to your agency?