

## Research Council 2010-2011 Annual Report

### Membership

Tony Lachenbruch, Chair '11	Public Health
Karen Higgins '11	Teacher and Counselor Education
Flo Leibowitz '11	Philosophy
Vince Remcho '11	Chemistry
Andy Ungerer '11	Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences
Sourabh Apte '12	Mechanical, Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering
Siva Kolluri '12	Environmental & Molecular Toxicology
Barb Lachenbruch '12	Wood Science & Engineering
Jennifer McKay '12	Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences
Todd Mockler '12 (Resigned April 2011)	Botany & Plant Pathology
Ping Hsieh '13	Business
Laurel Kristick '13	OSU Libraries
Mark Leid '13	Pharmacy
Ricardo Letelier '13	Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences
Mahfuz Sarker '13	Veterinary Medicine

Ex-Officio: Research Office – Rick Spinrad/Rich Holdren

Executive Committee Liaison: Theo Dreher

Liaison to Research Office: Debbie Delmore

The Research Council is a standing committee of the OSU Faculty Senate. The main function of the council is to evaluate proposals submitted by the OSU faculty to the Research Equipment Reserve Fund (RERF), General Research Fund (GRF), as well as pre-proposals or letters of intent for limited submission funding opportunities, most commonly in response to calls by NSF. The Research Council also reviews proposals on Centers and Institutes (CI), and makes recommendations to the Vice President for Research. A summary of the activities of the Research Council for academic year 2010-11 is given below:

### Proposal Reviews

This past academic year, the Research Council evaluated 45 GRF and 42 RERF proposals.

The GRF program was evaluated in two panels (November 2010 and April 2011). RERF proposals were also reviewed in two panels (January 2011 and May 2011). A total of 11 GRF proposals with a total budget of \$108,290 were recommended for funding and a total of 19 RERF proposals with a total budget of \$664,809 were recommended for funding. During the May 2011 review, we found that there were 7 proposals worthy of funding, but they totaled more than the \$200,000 allotted. We recommended more proposals leaving the decision to the Research Office. One large proposal may not have been sufficiently justified. In addition, one proposal was to replace equipment that had been damaged when on loan. The Council believes that poor handling of equipment should be borne by the party inflicting the damage or their department, and not by the University.

**Review of Centers and Institutes (CIs):** The Research Council reviewed the proposal for CL@SE from the CLA the 2010-11 academic year. The Council approved the proposal with some concerns that were sent to the Vice President for Research. No Final Report from the 2009-2010 Academic year was available so no recommendations could be acted upon.

We considered several issues regarding our working process.

A subcommittee met in fall term (Mark Leid, Flo Leibowitz, and Vince Remcho) to review the application forms and instructions for RERF and GRF proposals and suggest revisions as needed. The revised instructions emphasized the importance of writing for readers who are not experts in the same discipline. Revisions in the application form were made for clarification but for clarification/simplification only. The

subcommittee further recommended a transition to an on-line application process for all internal grant proposals.

In the charge we were given, we discussed how proposals were reviewed and considered how final reports were to be published. We determined that summaries of the reviews would be issued to all applicants, whether approved for funding or not. The primary reviewer on the application will provide the review. The final reports of projects will be posted on the web. We discussed how these might be posted, as there was concern that some ideas could be hijacked.

One issue we wrestled with was how we scored the proposals. We found ourselves repeatedly re-scoring and re-ranking proposals. We instituted two additional scoring methods as adjuncts: we had each reviewer rank the proposals they reviewed and computed the mean ranks. We also used a trimmed mean (remove the highest and lowest scores and find the mean of the remaining scores). This is like the system used in judging diving or gymnastics - it is a well known statistical method. In addition, one of our members suggested that we recommend some proposals as "must fund" and a few others as "fund if money is available." This is similar to NSF's scoring.

We discussed the OSU Research Agenda being proposed by VP Rick Spinrad and endorsed it.

Professor Todd Mockler resigned from the Research Council at the April Meeting as he is resigning from Oregon State. A replacement has not been named.

The RC expresses its gratitude to Rich Holdren and Debbie Delmore for their efforts in making the review process go smoothly.