

Research Council

January 25, 2018

Minutes

Voting members present: Chris Akroyd, Gloria Crisp, Shan de Silva, Glenn Howe, Siva Kolluri, Katie Linder, Carlos Ochoa

Voting members absent: Loren Davis, Colin Johnson, Andriy Morgun, Ron Reuter

Ex-Officio member present: Staci Simonich – Research Office

Guest: Susan Emerson

Research Office Work Plan – 2018-2023

- Provost Feser is setting aside \$5M per year to result in \$45M to improve infrastructure.
- Is it possible to get the College of Business on board to get industry funding?

New Finance and Administration Brochure – Staci Simonich

- The Research Office (RO) is critically reviewing the existing Centers and Institutes; those on the website report to the RO, with varying support from colleges. It may be possible for Centers and Institutes to return to reporting to the colleges.
- The federal request to increase facilities and administrative costs was submitted in December.

Research Office Budget and Impact on Incentive Programs – Staci Simonich

- The Research Office (RO) experienced an 8% cut in their budget (about \$750,000). RO cuts were not passed on to Centers and Institutes because they need to be strong and supported well. Large and small grants were suspended for this year, but RERF will continue this year. Vice President for Research Cindy Sagers will present the 2018-2019 budget to the Provost in February; she made the decision to not cut staff. The Council played no role in the cuts.
- It's up to the Council to determine whether it wishes to convey concerns to upper administration. Faculty have shared concerns with Siva related to the cuts.

New Research Office Policies – Staci Simonich

- Establishment of Research Centers and Institutes
- New center proposals are submitted to the Research Office (RO) to determine whether it meets the criteria, then presented to the OSU Board of Trustees after input and approval from the Research Council. A financial model must also be submitted indicating how returned overhead will be distributed and a discussion of where the returned overhead goes must occur.
- Centers will now be reviewed by the Research Council and RO. There is also a process to sunset a Center.
- Pilot for Fast-Tracking Sponsored Project Award
- Staci thought there were no changes to this process, but wanted the Council to be aware of the process.

New Research Office Risk Committee – Staci Simonich

- This new risk committee resulted from a review of the Office for Sponsored Research and Award Administration (OSRAA); this committee would help the RO about risk assessment. The purpose of the committee is to look at large projects that may also have a large financial risk. The committee is meeting monthly through the end of summer 2018, and then will meet quarterly. A Research Council representative has been requested; ideally, it would be a first-year Council member who could serve for three years.

Action: Advise Staci of the member.

Research Office "Office Hours" and Upcoming College/Department Tours – Staci Simonich

- Staci Simonich, Pat Hawk and Anita Eisenstadt want to go on tour to key research units. Advise Staci if you'd like them to visit your unit.

Review of Centers & Institutes – Staci Simonich

- Staci is restarting the [process of centers and institutes reviews](#).
- The software to help review internal proposals (\$12,000/year) that was discussed last year will not be purchased at this time.
- If the recent email advising of cuts to incentive programs had contained specifics, it may have been better received. How does/should the Research Office (RO) communicate with faculty?
 - How can the Research Council assist the Research Office?
- From a research stand point, the flow of funding to colleges can benefit research within the college. Funding distribution occurs differently among colleges.
 - The Council could help if it had the full picture.
- Invite Provost Feser to a Research Council meeting to hear his thinking and to make a case for the University research enterprise. The structure for the Council is to liaise with the RO, does the Council structure need to change?
- F&A supports things other than the RO. Sherm Bloomer could be invited to the Council to outline how the F&A funding is distributed.
- Concern was expressed that the Council is considered as a review panel; members are not invited to F&A discussions. Need upper administration to partner with the Research Council in a constructive partnership for the benefit of the research faculty.
- Regarding invitation to Sherm Bloomer – The Council wants to know where F&A dollars are going, what is the budget in relation to research – draft 4-5 questions prior to the meeting. Given the future strategy, and if funding is decentralized, what is the role of the Research Council?
 - Make arrangements to meet with Faculty Senate President Jon Dorbolo to determine a clear role for the Research Council within the Faculty Senate. When Siva met earlier with Bob Mason, now Immediate Past Faculty Senate President, he was told there is no limit on what the Council can do, including changing their mission in the Standing Rules.

Matters Arising

- RERF proposals are due February 28 – approximately three from each college may be submitted – the third proposal must be cross-collaborative among multiple colleges. The Council requested to be advised of which proposals are funded.
 - Before December 2018 – Keep in mind for future RERF submissions to possibly consider proportional representation of submissions from colleges, i.e., allow more submissions from very large colleges.

Action: Siva moved that the Research Council coordinate review of RERF proposals and propose recommendations for future funding, as well as how proposals will be structured; motion seconded and passed.
- Attendance – If Research Council members do not attend four consecutive meetings, a request will be made to the Faculty Senate to appoint new members.

Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff