

Research Council

December 6, 2016

Minutes

Voting members present: Kim Calvery, Loren Davis, Claudia Hase, Andy Houseman, Glenn Howe, Siva Kolluri, Katie Linder, Carlos Ochoa, Ron Reuter, Andy Ungerer

Voting members absent: Chris Akroyd, Jana Bouwma-Gearhart

Ex-officio members present: Roy Haggerty

Guest: Susan Emerson

Report/Discussion on eProcurement – Siva Kolluri

- Siva previously used a similar program, and found it to be very favorable.
- The program provides the ability to look up items to order; it will access multiple vendors and associated prices. Ordering can be tied to grants. The current 'system' is quite antiquated and cumbersome. There is a team of eProcurement managers involved in the creation of this system. Can track orders from previous years, as well as the order status.
- The goal is to implement by July 2017. The Council has an opportunity to provide feedback.
- There is a faculty advisory group assisting with implementation. There is no limit to the number of vendors. Siva obtained approval from Interim Provost Adams to have Research Council members either serve on the advisory group or suggest colleagues who would be appropriate to serve; different colleges have different needs and all needs must be taken into consideration. It was suggested that those with labs would be more valuable on the advisory group. Forward names of potential faculty to Siva and Andy.
 - Look for lab managers and PIs to serve.
 - Talk to units about potential members.

Revision of Incentives Program – Roy Haggerty

- [Small Grants \(SG\) Application Form](#)
- [RFP for Small Grants](#)
- [Large Program Development \(LPD\) Application Form](#)
- [RFP for Large Program Development](#)
- Concerns resolved: not covering range of projects and expanded budget
- The Division of International programs is supporting the effort with \$60.00.
- RFPs will go out later this week.
- SG consists of two funding categories: 1) \$15,000-\$25,000 projects – directed toward proposal development and must have an F&A fund component, and 2) similar to FRT, will have value to entire campus; \$3,000-\$7,000 per award; and not restricted to writing proposals that generate F&A (will reserve some funds that do generate F&A). Will also allocate some funds to OSU-Cascades, which will determine projects to fund, so the Research Council will not review those proposals.
- RFP for Small Grants document –
 - In response to an inquiry, co-investigators will be allowed. It was suggested to allow more than one individual. It was decided to strike the third paragraph under 'Eligibility': ~~Proposals should be submitted by an Investigator only; proposals with Co-Investigators will not be considered.~~
 - There should be no preferential treatment of new faculty, typically they are hired with start-up funding. Paragraph four – strike the first sentence and 'However,' in the second sentence: ~~"The Research Office is interested in supporting new faculty. However, new faculty with uncommitted Research Office start-up funds are not eligible for consideration."~~
- The RFPs are open to Extension professorial faculty, but are generally biased toward proposals that generate overhead.
- If professional faculty are conducting research, they're currently not allowed to submit RFPs. If one is a professional faculty with a research component, they should be eligible if they are a PI on a grant. Potential language could be 'Faculty eligible to serve as PIs are eligible to serve as investigators on grants.'

Action: Roy will discuss this issue with Cindy Sagers.

- LDP is for professorial faculty, rather than tenure-track, as it's currently written.
- Re: Category 2 – because it's not 47%, it excludes almost all affiliated with the Department of the Interior.
- SG RFP – Use of Funds – Budget Items ELIGIBLE for support – One Council member questioned the following sentence: “(Graduate students are required to submit a statement that this work is not a part of a thesis.)”

Action: Because the primary intent is not to support graduate students, the verbiage will be revised to state this.

- LPD Application Form #8 – limitation is five pages double-spaced, which may not be adequate.

Action: Revise verbiage to 'up to 10 pages double-spaced'.

- How to achieve review work without overtaxing the Council? Roy noted that it was suggested to him to review the proposals in two phases (depending on the number of proposals submitted); phase one would be cursory and phase two would be more in-depth.
- LPD – Should PIs be requested to provide more than three external reviewers?

Action: Revise verbiage to ask PIs to provide five reviewers.

- LPD – Document indicates that the final report be submitted 18 months following the end of the project.

Action: Roy will shorten submission of the final report from 18 months to 2 months.

- Review – Each Council member will receive three proposals and are responsible for approaching external reviewers – is there a better way to do this?

Action: Andy and Roy will discuss the review process and submit a proposal to the Research Council for consideration.

Discussion on Review of Incentive Program Proposals – Andy Houseman, Roy Haggerty

- Not discussed

Research Office Strategic Plan – Roy Haggerty

- [SWOT Analysis](#)
- The Research Office began working on a Strategic Plan several months ago and developed the attached SWOT analysis; Roy briefly reviewed the document. The SWOT document is organized into broad categories, and the Research Office is looking for missing items or those that may be 'off-base'. Roy noted that Research Council feedback is invaluable.

Action: Discussion on the SWOT document will occur during the next meeting.

Minutes prepared by Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate staff