

Research Council 2005-2006 Annual Report

Prepared by Mark Leid, Chair

Membership

Mark Leid, Chair '06	Pharmaceutical Sciences
Alan Bakalinsky '06	Food Science & Technology
Jeff Morrell '06	Wood Science & Engineering
Bill Husband '07	History
Lew Semprini '07	Civil, Construction & Environmental Engineering
Staci Simonich '07	Environmental & Molecular Toxicology
Adam Schultz '08	Oceanography
Claudia Maier '08	Chemistry
Sunil Khanna '08	Anthropology

Ex-Officio: Jack Higginbotham Research Office

Alternates:

Hillary Egna '06	Aquaculture CRSP
Elisar Barbar '06	Biochemistry and Biophysics
Fred Stevens '06	Pharmaceutical Sciences
Joe Kerkvliet '06	Economics

The core duties of the council have traditionally been the evaluation of proposals submitted by faculty to the Research Equipment Reserve Fund (RERF), General Research Fund (GRF), as well as pre-proposals for limited submission funding opportunities, most commonly in response to calls by NSF. In addition, the Research Council is charged with the task of providing advice to the VP for Research on Centers, Institutes, and Research Programs. The activities of the Research Council in each area are summarized below.

Proposal review. This past academic year, the Research Council evaluated 45 GRF and 70 RERF proposals. Each program was evaluated in two panels over the past academic year, with a total of 12 successful GRF proposals (\$110,310; 27% of proposals reviewed) and 18 successful RERF proposals (\$455,669; 26% of proposals reviewed). A sub-committee of the Research Council also considered 12 pre-proposals for the NSF Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) mechanism, of which three (25%) were selected to move forward to the submission phase. Considered together, the Research Council deliberated on a total of 127 proposals and pre-proposals during the 2005-06 academic year.

Review of Centers, Institutes, and Programs (CIPs). The Research Council considered two category 1 CIP proposals during the 2005-06 academic year. First, the council approved the renaming of Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology to *Center for Genome Research and Biocomputing*. Second, the Council approved the establishment of the *Oregon Wood Innovation Center*, reporting through the College of Forestry.

The Research Council did not review other CIPs this year, and this most likely stems from the fact that the University's policy on CIPs was under review by a task force, on which Leid served as the representative for the Research Council. This task force has completed its work and submitted a report to the President and Provost in May 2006.

Other Issues

1. **Efficiency of the Research Council.** As indicated in the annual report of the Research Council for the previous academic year (R. Nielsen, Chair), the council had been under increasing pressure over the past few years with respect to both the number of issues/programs with which it has dealt, and the

timelines under which it has been placed. This problem was largely solved this year by the implementation of three simple procedures, all of which were recommended in the previous annual report. First, the Research Council set up regularly scheduled, monthly meetings for the entire year that removed the guesswork regarding the meeting dates of the Council. Second, the Research Council formed three "rapid review" sub-committees that, in a timely manner, reviewed pre-proposals for limited submission funding opportunities, such as the NSF MRI program. The Council formed sub-committees in the physical, biological and social sciences, and populated these sub-committees with members having expertise in appropriate areas. Third, the Research Council alternates participated fully in the review of all GRF, RERF, and limited submission, pre-proposals. This move effectively increased the number of reviewers from nine to thirteen, and lightened the load of the individual reviewers. We have no hard data, but it is strongly suspected that this resulted in improved reviews and feedback to the PIs. All of these mechanisms worked well to improve the efficiency with which the Council functioned, and it is recommended that all be continued on a permanent basis.

2. **OPE rates.** The Research Council discussed OPE rates at the University, which are widely believed by faculty to be excessive. The Council considered comparable rates at UO, PSU, and OHSU and came to the conclusion that OSU faculty concerns are valid: the OPE rates at OSU are excessive relative to our sister institutions. This is most clearly evident at entrylevel and/or part-time positions, and particularly when comparing OSU to UO (see shaded area of table on next page).

The chair was instructed by the Council to discuss these findings with John Cassady, VPR, which has been done verbally and by letter. The Research Council for the 2006-07 academic year is strongly encouraged to continue these efforts toward the goal of reduced OPE rates for OSU. Dr. Cassady has subsequently instructed the Chair to discuss these findings with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

OPE RATE (% of salary)

Annual Salary	OSU	PSU	UO	OHSU
\$72000 or more	44%	44-36%	41%	25%
\$71999 - \$66000	46%	na	41%	31%
\$65999 - \$60000	47%	46%	41%	31%
\$59999 - \$54000	49%	51.5-47.7%	41%	35%
\$53999 - \$48000	52%	51.5%	41%	35%
\$47999 - \$42000	53%	57.1-53.9%	51%	35%
\$41999 - \$36000	59%	61.1%	51%	35%
\$35999 - \$30000	65%	66.4%	51%	40%
\$29999 - \$24000	73%	66.4%	51%	40%
\$23999 - \$20400	81%	73.9%	51%	45%
\$20399 - \$16800	92%	na	51%	50%
\$16799 - \$13200	109%	na	51%	55%
\$13199 or less	109%	na	na	60%

*na = not available

3. **Duties of Research Council.** If the recommendations of the task force on CIPs are implemented, it is conceivable that the Council's volume of work related to the review of new and existing CIPs will increase dramatically, and the regular membership of the Council will be overwhelmed with this increased work load. Thus, it is recommended that the regular membership and the number of alternate members be increased by at least 50% and maintained at this number for the foreseeable future.
4. **Conflict of Interest statement.** The Research Council developed an encompassing conflict of interest statement for the Council membership, largely based on that in use by the Aquaculture CRSP. It is

recommended that all future members of Research Council be required to sign this document and adhere to its principles as a means of ensuring the integrity of the Council's deliberations.