

2014-2015 ANNUAL REPORT

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Anne Nolin and Mark Leid
SUBJECT: Research Council Activities 2014-2015
DATE: October 21, 2015
CC: Rich Holdren

2014-2015 Research Council Membership

David Finch, Mathematics, 2013-2015
Denise Lach, Sociology, 2013-2015
Kreg Lindberg, OSU-Cascades – College of Forestry, 2012-2015
Gary Merrill, Biochemistry & Biophysics, 2012-2015
John Simonson, College of Wood Science & Engineering, 2012-2015
Mark Leid (Co-Chair), College of Pharmacy, 2013-2016
Jessica Miller, COMES, 2013-2016
Anne Nolin, (Co-Chair), College of Earth, Ocean & Atmospheric Sciences, 2013-2016
Inara Scott, College of Business, 2013-2016
Eugene Zhang, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, 2013-2016
Jana Bouwma-Gearhart, College of Education, 2014-2017
Kim Calvery, OPAA, 2014-2017
Julie Gess-Newsome, OSU-Cascades – College of Education 2014-2017
Claudia Hase, College of Veterinary Medicine, 2014-2017
Andres Houseman, College of Public Health & Human Sciences, 2014-2017
David Myrøld, Crop & Soil Science, 2014-2017
Jocelyn Warren, College of Public Health & Human Sciences, 2014-2017

Ex-officio: Rich Holdren, Research Office

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison: Karen Hooker

Major Activities and Accomplishments

The Research Council revised and implemented new guidelines for the Research Equipment Reserve Fund (RERF). The RERF has two calls for proposals each year.

There were four key changes to the RERF guidelines:

- a. The call for proposals now indicates: "Preference to equipment that provides new or significantly expanded capabilities" for the Fall solicitation and "Preference to replacing obsolete or heavily worn equipment" for the Spring solicitation.
- b. The Research Office will now accept a maximum of three proposals from any college, provided that at least one of the three proposals lists Co-Is from multiple colleges. Individual colleges can select their own criteria for how they vet their proposals. However, if more than two (or three if one or more are multi-college) proposals are received; they will be returned to the Associate Dean(s) of Research for further vetting. Proposals returned for further vetting will be given only a very narrow window for that process, so it is strongly recommended that applicants work with and through their Associate Deans to obtain prior approval for their submissions.
- c. PIs and Co-Is may receive an award from the RERF program only one time in a 24-month period as the PI.

- d. The review process has been changed so that each proposal is handled by a Research Council (RC) member who is charged with obtaining two outside reviews from OSU faculty who are qualified to comment on the proposal. The RC member then writes a summary of the proposal and review and offers a ranking of the proposal. The proposals are then discussed among all RC members, ranked, and the rankings are submitted to the Research Office for final decisions on support. Each RC member who handles a proposal is charged with providing thorough feedback to the investigator.

Proposal resubmittal requirements, letters of support, and evaluation criteria were also clarified with additional text. The 2014-2015 RERF Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria are available at <http://research.oregonstate.edu/incentive-programs/research-equipment-reserve-fund>.

- 2) The Research Council revised guidelines for the General Research Fund (GRF).
- Aligned the submittal policy with that of the RERF program (see 1c above)
 - Clarified the evaluation criteria
 - Modified the review process to align with that of the RERF program (see 1d above)

The 2014-2015 GRF Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria are available at <http://research.oregonstate.edu/incentive/generalresearchfund>.

- 3) Nolin and Leid represented the Research Council on the search committee for the Vice President for Research. Three VPR candidates met with RC members during their on-campus interviews.
- 4) Nolin represented the Research Council on the Grant Initiative Task Force.
- 5) The Research Council discussed strategic priorities:
- improving proposal development opportunities for faculty
 - enhancing research incentive programs
 - providing support for mid-career faculty
 - developing/enhancing core facilities
 - measuring impacts of funded research
- The Research Council developed a faculty survey to gather opinions and ideas on these topics. The survey was forwarded to the Faculty Senate and we are still awaiting approval of this.
- 6) In June, the Research Office learned that central administration is “sweeping” 40% of the FY16 RERF and BUC funds. The Research Office asked the Research Council for their input on four options:

Capital Pool Bins	Pre-Sweep Budget Plan	Option 1 Reduce All @ 60%	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Start-up \$\$	2,000,100	1,200,100	2,000,100	1,800,100	1,750,000
Competitive RERF	800,000	480,000	0	250,000	400,100
Matching	500,000	300,000	250,000	200,000	100,000
RO-BUC	583,325	350,000	0	0	0
Totals	3,883,425	2,250,100	2,250,100	2,250,100	2,250,100

The consensus of the Research Council was Option 3. The Research Council would like to keep some level of RERF so that the funds do not disappear in the future. There would have to be changes made to the RERF guidelines and probably only one solicitation per year.

Research Council meeting minutes have been provided to the Research Office and Faculty Senate.

We would like to express our gratitude to Rich Holdren and Debbie Delmore for their invaluable intellectual and logistical support to the Research Council.