

DEBRIEF NOTES 2020 RERF

Here is a quick recap of our discussion points.

Siva

- Past RERF funded proposals: make it easily accessible on the RO site
- RO/RC (/Siva) needs to organize presentations of the recently funded instrumentation and associated research in form or the other. Canvas/zoom?
- Database of expertise at OSU: instead of acquiring formal database packages from an outside vendor, RO/Library may recruit undergrads with the required skillset to create a searchable database. The key to keep this up to date.
- The major challenge on the campus is technical/support staff to support core instrumentation. Mostly, if not all are funded by extramural grants. Many times, there is no one to run/support RERF funded instrumentation or other core facilities. Ro/RC need to come up with possible solutions.
- RERF funding has gone down compared to what was available say five years back. It used to be more than a million. If more of indirects are flowing through colleges, should we revisit the review criteria?
- How much of the matching funds are set aside to support large federal or foundation grants (for a broader understanding of our research investments).

Suggested revisions to the RERF application 2021.

1. Description of the equipment and research capability (up to 100 words):

This will be listed on the website if the proposal is funded.

2. The following in a Table format:
 - Current grants of the PI
 - Current grants of the co-PI

This instrument will be supporting submission of: Identify specific funding agencies and time frame

- PIs/Labs that will be using the proposed instrumentation:
- Projects that will be supported by the instrumentation

Additional PIs contributing matching funds

3. The biosketch must list current grants with specifics: Name and description of the funded research, years of support, total funding

- Pending grants (submitted to the funding agency and waiting for a funding decision): Name and description of the funded research, years of support, total funding

- Past grants (in the last three years): Name and description of the funded research, years of support, total funding

4. Support letters: Need to indicate that the Co-PI/Co-Is have read the proposal and describe their specific usage of the proposed capability in 4 sentences (less than 50 words). Long support letters are discouraged.
5. Make the RERF review simpler with even more clearly defined metrics to minimize reviewers guess work to score a proposal. Andriy will make suggestions and rest of us will chip in too.

Andriy and Colin will come up with a draft table of that the applicants need to provide along with the RERF application (points 1 and 2 above).

Debrief Notes (Susan)

- What was missing this year - Do require the PI and CO-PI current activity grant support and tell in application to say exactly what the Clarity about the support letters
- If you want a list of current grants relevant to the instrumentations
- List of currently funded grants with dollar amounts and funding amounts relevant to the instrument - 2-5 years?
- Ed - could provide guidance for proposals - make sure you include - provide example -
- Helpful tips for good RERF proposal
- Colin - box where you can check whether you have start up funds or not
- The start up fund discussion -
- Letters of support - "I have read the proposal as submitted and I agree."
- Have full council when have these type of discussions - (Andriy - he advocated for note collecting letters of support)
- Colin - make changes now - and have working document
- Ed - biosketch - and be specific about what is wanted
- Andriy - discuss the structure of the process - make it simple
 - Define clear priorities - make rules in advance
 - Simplification of what needs to be provided
 - \$\$\$ more dedicated to multidisciplinary type of research that brings more (perhaps the colleges should fund these type of equipment)
 - Will draft a table -
 - Not a place to learn how to write a proposal - this is teaching to learn how to use an instrument for research
- We don't have to judge what group will use this - (Siva) get clarification
- Hong -
 - likes proposals that have clearly laid out projects and which investigators are used and how used for projects - one way to deal with this is have the table of for users and what they are using it for. Letter of support could be email only - don't need to read all the letters of support - it should all be in the proposal already
 - Show in their biosketch they have current grant and indirect costs supporting their future research
 - If people want to use this equipment - should give consideration about matching funds. Possible rule your investigator has to provide matching fund in order to be considered -

Siva - the project and use of equipment needs to be in the narrative and not through letters of support (Table Format)

- The proposals that got multi colleges - got scored better
- In that context how should the proposals be reviewed
- What grants will be supporting this instrument
- What funding opportunities will be because of this instrument
- Who are the people using this instrument
- **Appreciate flexibility - would like to see more on the table**

Ed - would be interested to see a history of the flow of this money in the university. This is a fixed percentage of overhead - every year we should know what that number is. What is flowing in the colleges and what is flowing in the fund. I Want to understand that better.

- Matching funds (for example to MRI) has that pot of \$\$ grown?
- History of RERF - used to be about 1.2 million dollar - why is available RERF gone
- Need to bring up the matching fund guidelines - again
- Colin - would like to keep the letter of support option - but also li
- **Susan - come up with a draft table - (Colin and Andriy - draft table) - simply proposal with a table -**

Siva - in addition to the written report - maybe have an Ignite -

- who is using it - or a more visible place of what has been funded
- Expert database - models at other universities
- Hong suggestion - Link to investigator web page and some description what the equipment does
- Forum - for RERF for research expertise to be presented -

DEBRIEF NOTES 2019 RERF

RC has disagreement and no clarity about single PI vs. co-PIs. Do we want to focus funds on collaborative proposals? If colleges have sucked out more funding from RERF, could argue to support individuals –funding is likely not trickling down –perhaps going to start-up funds. oCEOAS there is not annual distribution of funds –it goes to start-ups. oCAS is the same – funding goes to start-ups. oCould advocate for the Research Office to retain more funding for RERF. oCollege may be better able to justify funding. oCould be an argument to focus on truly collaborative proposals. oNot intended to support those with more opportunities for external funding. Siva –is this correct. o# of hours to run RERF program–Siva estimated the cost of the RERF process (up to \$40,000 in time) oCurrently proposals do not ask for current and pending funding as well as the amount of funding received in the past two years. RERF guidelines allow acquire, repair, renovate, and improve equipment. Are we in the business of funding emergency care? Perhaps pull out X% for emergency care and the remainder for potentially productive requests