Research Council
February 22, 2018
Minutes

Voting members present: Shan de Silva, Colin Johnson, Siva Kolluri, Katie Linder, Andriy Morgun
Voting members absent: Chris Akroyd, Gloria Crisp, Loren Davis, Glenn Howe, Carlos Ochoa, Ron Reuter, Rob Stone
Ex-officio member present: Research Office – Staci Simonich
Guest: Sherm Bloomer

Budget Models – Sherm Bloomer, Director, Budget & Fiscal Planning
- An Indirect Cost Primer – Background Material for the Indirect Cost Recovery Task Force
- Education and General Budget Allocations – FY 2016-2018
- Draft F&A Distribution Planning

- Sherm noted that there is not enough funding to accomplish the things needed. When dollars increase, that doesn't mean that there are additional dollars available since costs also increase. All units will make budget requests to the Provost in March; Sherm suggested coordinating research requests with Cindy Sagers. Need to determine what should be handled centrally or at the college level.
- One questioned whether research should be centered across colleges.
- Sherm suggested that the Council discuss how the F&A are distributed.
- The budget will include $6-7M in institutional support to Centers & Institutes, in addition to F&A recovery.

Budget Model
If F&A recovery is eliminated, tuition and fees are left; everything that supports research comes from Education and General (E&G) funds (about 70% tuition). The budget model is only a piece of the budget, but it's the part that can be controlled. Sherm welcomes advice regarding how to talk about the budget.
- Where does quality enter the equation and how is it measured?
- One questioned how the $5M counts toward F&A? After saving $5M per year for nine years, the balance will be $45M and counts as repair and maintenance dollars. OSU could sell revenue bonds or borrow based on the debt rating – the limiting factor is paying back the borrowed funds every year. F&A may contribute to the payback, but it's a small part. Need to budget enough annually to keep up with deferred maintenance.
- Can you draw a straight line from $5M to the Research Office? Sherm stated that there is a direct relationship since incremental investments were made at the same time – if incremental investments had not occurred, no cuts would have been necessary.
- Are enrollment increases included? Sherm noted that tuition, state funding and F&A recovery are, in descending order, the major funding sources. Private fundraising helps, but typically has constraints.
- OSU is low on tuition and state funding per student, but looks similar to a lot of other land grant institutions. OSU is also under the median for land grant tuition and underperforming in industrial and business funding. Sherm doesn't see anything obvious that OSU is missing. OSU's enrollment is also less than many other land grant institutions.
- Every budget allocation takes funding out of the pot and can't be used for other things.
- One questioned whether it is possible to separate positions from state funding from grant funding when the fringe rate for personnel is about 25% for many institutions? University Legal officers don't see a way around – about the only way to reduce funds is to perhaps subsidize staff on research grants, but then the funds are taken out of the E&G. Sherm noted that, for some staff, the benefit rate is more than their pay. Lots of enrollment conversations are occurring related to growth and tuition increases.
- Is there an argument to stop growing and concentrate on quality? When growth stops, one needs to find a way to generate revenue.
- Per Staci – need to ask Vice President Cindy Sagers if there is a role for the Council in the Research Office budgeting.

Upcoming RERF Reviews and Conflict of Interest Discussion
- RERF Review Criteria Guidelines
- RERF 2017 Application Score Sheet

- RERF Selection Process:
  - Collect applications via the incentive.programs@oregonstate.edu email – Susan Emerson
  - Place applications in a Shared Google Document that Research Council members can access – Susan Emerson
  - Manage reviewer assignments and resolve any Conflict of Interest issues – Research Council
  - Develop a distribution method to allow assigned reviewers access to the score sheets and RERF applications – Susan Emerson, Faculty Senate Office
  - Collect score sheets and compile information – Susan Emerson
  - Discussion and Scoring of proposals – Research Council

Expanding the Scope of RERF
- Inclusion of major software packages and computer infrastructure as eligible for funding?
  - Prior to the next cycle, discuss whether the above should be eligible for funding.

- Revisit the number of applications per college.
  - Prior to the next cycle, discuss the number of applications allowed per college – perhaps determine the number per college by the amount of funding generated or no of FTEs?

- Siva noted that past RERF criteria was linked for review. He suggested moving the Conflict of Interest section to the beginning. If a Council member submits a grant proposal, they must recuse themselves from reviewing any proposals. If listed as a user on a proposal, that Council member could not participate in the review of that particular proposal.
  - Specifically indicate that Research Council members are allowed to submit proposals.
  - Council members should advise Susan Emerson if they see that revisions are needed to the review or scoring sheet.
  - Replace "… NIH, NSF or DOE…" with "significant extramural funding with full indirect costs" in #3.
- Revisions: underlined text indicates proposed additions; strike-through indicates proposed deletions:
  - "Proposals will be reviewed ~~both~~ by at least one ~~a~~ member of the Faculty Senate Research Council and the Chair will assign a primary reviewer for each proposal, ~~and by two non-Research Council reviewers~~."
  - It is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate Research Council primary reviewer to determine the two most qualified non-Research Council reviewers in consultation with the chair ~~from the list provided by the PI and contact those faculty members~~.
  - If any of the Research Council members is a lead PI, the member will have to be recuse from the entire review. If a Research Council member is a user and/or provided a support letter for a proposal, they are not allowed to participate in review or voting of that proposal, but can review other proposals.

- Siva noted that Brian Wall wanted to purchase a software system to assist with the RERF proposal review, but it wasn't funded due to budget cuts. Susan will collect the proposals and will work with the Faculty Senate Office to fast track the review process.
- Research Council members will be informed of which proposals are funded when the selection process is completed.

New Initiatives from Research Office – Staci Simonich
- Pilot for Fast-Tracking Sponsored Project Award Set-up

- o There are some colleges with NSF grants that fall under the pilot. Staci asked Council members to share the document with colleagues.

- Risk Committee – Research Council representative needed (see the January minutes for the purpose and anticipated time commitment).
  - o Discussing how to manage risks in the field and manage large projects – Staci could not yet share the charter yet.

- Based on comments from Research Council members, Staci has updated the brochure that she discussed at the last meeting.

Report from the Research Council Chair
No report

Approval of Minutes
- January 4, 2018
- January 25, 2018

Action: Neither were approved; postponed to the next meeting.

Information Items
- Spring Meeting Scheduling – By Noon on February 23, please complete the scheduling form distributed by Caitlin Caliscibetta on February 19 at 1:18 PM so that Spring meetings can be determined.
- Next Scheduled Meeting – March 8, 2018 – 1:30-3:00 – 109 Gilkey Hall

Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff