

Research Council 2006-2007 Annual Report

Prepared by Mark Leid, Chair

Members

Mark Leid, Chair '07	Pharmaceutical Sciences
Bill Husband '07	History
Lew Semprini '07	Civil, Construction & Environmental Engineering
Staci Simonich '07	Environmental & Molecular Toxicology
Greg Rorrer (v. Schultz) '08	Chemical Engineering
Claudia Maier '08	Chemistry
Alan Herlihy '09	Fisheries & Wildlife
TBA (v. Friedman) '09	
Rakesh Gupta '09	Wood Science & Technology

Ex-Officio: John Cassady Research Office

Alternates

Elisar Barbar '07	Biochemistry & Biophysics
Phil Rossignol '07	Fisheries & Wildlife
Fred Stevens '07	Pharmacy
Maret Traber '07	Linus Pauling Institute
Luiz Bermudez '07	Veterinary Medicine

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 31 GRF and 35 RERF proposals. The GRF program was evaluated in two panels over the past academic year, with a total of 8 successful GRF proposals (\$79,954; 26% of proposals reviewed), while RERF proposals resulted from a single call, of which 18 RERF proposals were recommended for funding (\$617,666; 51% of proposals reviewed). The Research Council evaluated 9 NSF Partnerships for International Research and Education (PIRE) pre-proposals and recommended three (33%) for advancement to the full proposal stage. Finally, the Research Council considered 10 pre-proposals for the NSF Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) mechanism, of which three (30%) were selected to move forward to the submission phase. Considered together, the Research Council deliberated on a total of 85 proposals and pre-proposals during the 2006-07 academic year.

Review of Centers, Institutes, and Programs (CIPs). The Research Council considered two Category I CIP proposals during the 2006-07 academic year. The Council recommended the establishment of the Marine Mammal Institute and the Native American Collaborative Institute.

Other Issues

1. Policies for proposal review. New policies were implemented for both [RERF](#) and [GRF](#) reviews. Those policies are summarized in the attached documents. In addition, the Council recommended the following changes for all proposal reviews conducted by the Council:
 - o All Research Council members will receive all proposals electronically – this might be best accomplished by either sending a CD to reviewers or making the proposal downloadable from a Research Office web site.
 - o Each proposal will be assigned to three reviewers (primary, secondary, reader).

- Each reviewer will give a preliminary score prior to the meeting.
 - The proposals will be initially ranked based on these preliminary scores.
 - Proposals on which there is strong agreement between all three reviewers that the proposal is not sufficiently competitive will not be discussed further.
 - During the Research Council review meeting, each reviewer will give their preliminary score for those proposals that will be reviewed, followed by a succinct summary of the merits and potential problems of the proposal.
 - The floor will be opened to comments from the general membership.
 - The entire Research Council membership will then record their scores confidentially on a scoring sheet that will be collected and tallied by the Research Office, Coordinator of Special Programs after the meeting.
 - The Research Council chairperson will then make a recommendation to the Vice President for Research based on the final, ranked proposals.
 - Reviewers who serve as PIs on proposals submitted for any Research Office funding mechanism shall be excused from reviewing proposals during that cycle so as to avoid a potential conflict of interest.
 - Reviewers who are unable to attend the review meeting for any reason shall be excused from reviewing proposals for that cycle.
2. **OPE rates.** The Council had previously discussed what was perceived by faculty to be excessive OPE rates at this institution. Research Accounting investigated this and found that OPE rates at OSU were comparable to UO and PSU. However, the Council noted that this was largely due to recent increases at both UO and PSU, which effectively closed the differential OPE rate gap at state institutions.
3. **Duties of Research Council.** The Council originally felt that the Council's volume of work related to the review of new and existing CIPs would increase dramatically if the recommendations of the task force on CIPs were implemented. This has not really developed into an area of significant concern. The Council recommends holding the membership of the Council at current levels, along with continued monitoring of the situation.