Office of the Vice President for Research

$50K plus-up to Research Council

$600K for Challenge Grant Program

$420K to Research Council/Travel/Junior Faculty Fellowships

$450K to University Strategic Organizations (USOs; $900K next year)

$2.5 million in Sponsored Research Incentive (SRI)

$1.3 million in master lease payments for previous equipment

OVER $1 million in rent

OVER $1 million for new equipment and proposal cost-share

OVER $0.5 million for renovation

OVER $0.5 million in start-up (coordinating 71 packages)

OVER $0.5 million in one-time costs for retention (plus some ongoing)

More than $9.3 million

Seminar on 22 September at 3 pm in Meacham Auditorium

Complete accounting at the annual "State of Norman Campus Research"
Proposed Changes to the Norman Campus Research Council Programs

Kelvin K. Droegemeier
Office of the Vice President for Research
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

29 August 2011
Office of the Vice President for Research

In Fall 2009, new VPR tasked an ad hoc committee, including the current RC chair and the two past chairs, with conducting a comprehensive review of all internal VPR funding programs and compare with many other universities.

Vice President for Research (5-988, 8-26-04)

Application is made through, and additional program information is available from, the Office of Research Services.

The details of which are announced to all eligible faculty periodically by the Vice President for Research.

The Council also makes recommendations to the Vice President for Research on the allocation of internal funds.

Adapted from: Structure, Descriptions, Charters, and Purposes of University and Campus Councils.

3.23

The Research Council consists of 13 Norman (and Tulsa) Campus faculty who meet monthly (http://vpr-norman.ou.edu/research-council).
Conflicts of interest exist in the review process years. Overall, programs not viewed as optimal for helping faculty low expectations and impacts tracking is weak, programs unchanging for several
Too many programs → continuing programs too prescriptive, funding levels too

Weaknesses
- Reprint Program
- T/3rd Travel Program
- Book Publication Subvention Program
- Potentially Transformative Research Program
- Junior Faculty Fellowship Program
- Small Grant Program
- Over $12000 Requests
- Arts and Humanities Creative Activity Program
- PI Research Investment Program (budget ceiling of $10,000)

Current (bold administered by the Council)

VPR Funding Portfolio
Office of the Vice President for Research

Programs that have limited access to extramural funding? To facilitate undergraduate participation? To improve the competitiveness of extramural proposals? To support thinking? To stimulate involvement in extramural funding by programs not previously transformative

Could internal funding be used more effectively to stimulate bold, transformative ineffective and could be removed?

What funding opportunities could be added and what, if any, are outdated or directed to them?

Scholarship enterprise forward in a compelling manner? Is adequate funding being provided mix of internal funding opportunities appropriate for moving the OU they be?

Are the current goals for internal funding programs appropriate? If not, what should be designed?

Do current internal funding programs achieve the goals for which they were designed possible context.

Other mechanisms be considered? This question should be considered in the should internal funding programs, as presently constructed, be continued, or should

Reference Document

Key Questions in Terms of
established office to support proposal development. VP's office, in particular, by drawing on support from the newly through PI investment awards -- should be coordinated through the internal support for potentially fundable projects -- currently supported.

- Funding to support research time should be expanded.
- Specific new funding categories should be immediately implemented.
- Funding methods and mechanisms
  - The RC should develop a more flexible approach to changes in internal occurred in the past.
  - Internal funding should be better coordinated among OU units than has

Recommendations

The committee gathered and analyzed a great deal of data and

Outcome
Office of the Vice President for Research

There is currently ongoing the analysis of an OU Research Climate survey, to fund.

Endowment that would partially or completely support various categories of RC

We recommend continued discussion -- and potential development -- of an

and diverse review team evaluates all proposals.

We also strongly recommend that the RC model be continued in which a broad
different parts of the University

The VPR office should continue to keep the budget together in relation to

- Multi-year research projects
- More expensive internal research projects
- Innovative and transformational research

A separately budgeted line should be created to support larger grant activities.

Outcome
Plan is to launch the new portfolio in January 2022 (announce it soon)

- CRPDE to assist PIs in developing proposals; high expectations/accountability has no vote
- Proposals reviewed by Council plus an external (to Council) expert reviewer who
  Investments
- Proposals less than $3K go to CRPDE - Council focuses on larger strategic
- T/3/s travel Funding requests still possible as colleges have similar programs
- Far less prescriptive - goal isn't necessarily to obtain external funding
- Budgets up to $75,000

Characteristics of FIP

- Book publication and Open Access Subscription Program (same as before)
- Junior Faculty Fellowship Program (same as before but with more $)
- Faculty Investment Program (FIP)

After 18 months of additional analysis, the Council has

New Research Council Portfolio
Legal counsel, Provost, HSC VPR, ORS, CRPDE, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the Council has developed a COI policy that has been reviewed by the
undesirable
The Council has never operated with a formal review policy, which likewise is

- cannot easily be dismissed if a proposal review is contested
- are arguably unfair especially those early in their career
- are inconsistent with national norms and do not set a good example for faculty

However, such conflicts and is very thorough and fair in its assessments
This hasn’t been a major issue – the Council has operated with great integrity

proposals submitted by colleagues in the same department

The Research Council has, for decades, allowed its members to review

Conflict of Interest Policy
Conflict of Interest Policy

1. During their term of service, Research Council members may not serve as principal or co-principal investigator, or named collaborator, on proposals submitted to Research Council funding programs. They may, however, receive funding from a Research Council grant that was approved prior to the beginning of their term of service.
Conflict of Interest Policy

1. Research Council members must recognize themselves from participating in the discussion will compromise the integrity of the activity under review:

- Are related to the proposal author or coauthor, nominee, or participant in the University organization involved in the proposal;
- Have a financial interest or formal relationship with any company or other non-external sources including state and Federal agencies;
- Projects currently funded by the Council, by other University entities, or by projects currently named as an investigator with the submitting investigator(s) on.
- Principal investigator or other listed investigator has a formal appointment;
- Are formally appointed within the department(s)/program(s) in which the Council (including by leaving the room) if they:

2. Research Council members must recognize themselves from participating in the activity under review.
Conflict of Interest Policy

Should to this policy may result in expulsion from the Council. Failure to Council Chair or the Vice President for Research. Proceedings of the Research not confidential, and the outcomes of those deliberations will not materials involving proposals and nominations are strictly

4. All formal Research Council deliberations and written

which are expected to be rare. compelling reasons and/or evidence for approval of the waivers, Research Council proceedings. Such requests shall provide the Vice President for Research in advance of any formal

3. A waiver of the recusal requirement may be requested from
The Research Council C0I policy is a policy for reviewing RC proposals only.

**NOTE:** Norman Campus Conflict of Interest Policy shall take precedence.

Conflicts of Interest Policy and if a conflict exists between the two policies, the
Norman Campus Conflict of Interest Policy shall be subject to the Norman Campus

6. Members of the Research Council shall be subject to the Norman Campus

Research Council deliberations to those in their academic units.

members from providing General, non-Confidential Information about
members from providing General, non-Confidential Information about
Research Council deliberations to those in their academic units.

Endowment. This is not meant, however, to prohibit Research Council
Endowment. This is not meant, however, to prohibit Research Council

inquiries should be directed to the Center for Research Program Development
inquiries should be directed to the Center for Research Program Development

specific advice about how arguments should be made in a proposal. All such
specific advice about how arguments should be made in a proposal. All such

actions that may come before the Council (for example, editing or providing
actions that may come before the Council (for example, editing or providing

from providing advice regarding specific proposals, nominations, or other
from providing advice regarding specific proposals, nominations, or other

5. Because Research Council members formally vote, they should remain
Because Research Council members formally vote, they should remain
implemented in January 2012

fall, 2011 semester so that it and the new COI policy can be

We desire to announce the new program in the middle of the

faculty Senate input is welcome on both documents

deans have been briefed on all changes including COI policy

Research Council

FIP program description is being drafted for approval by the

Conflict of Interest policy is finished

Current Status and Next Steps
Norman Campus Research Council Conflict of Interest Policies and Procedures
Approved xx August 2011

The University of Oklahoma is a public institution committed to the mission of teaching; research and creative/scholarly activity; professional and University service; and public outreach. To these ends, the University strives to maintain an atmosphere that promotes free, open, and objective scholarly inquiry and compatible professional interactions while recognizing its obligations and limitations as a public institution. Integrity, ethical conduct, and mutual respect are uncompromising principles by which research and creative activity must be pursued. Any breach of these principles undermines the quality of scholarly work and harms the integrity of both the institution and individuals involved.

As a key component of the University’s research and creative activity enterprise, the Norman Campus Research Council strives to maintain the highest ethical standards in its evaluation of proposals and review of nominations for awards. One of the most important elements of ethical conduct is the effective disclosure and management of conflicts of interest (COI). A COI arises when financial, personal or professional considerations may compromise, or create the appearance of compromising, one’s objectivity in carrying out University responsibilities.

It shall be the policy of the Council to fully disclose and, to the extent possible, manage all conflicts of interest (COIs), real and apparent, in accord with the following:

1. During their term of service, Research Council members may not serve as principal or co-principal investigator, or named collaborator, on proposals submitted to Research Council funding programs. They may, however, receive funding from a Research Council grant that was approved prior to the beginning of their term of service.

2. Research Council members must recuse themselves from participating, in any way, in the review of a proposal, nomination, or other activity before the Council (including by leaving the room) if they:
   - Are formally appointed within the department(s)/program(s) in which the principal investigator or other listed investigators has a formal appointment;
   - Are currently named as an investigator with the submitting investigator(s) on projects currently funded by the Council, by other University entities, or by external sources including State and Federal agencies;
   - Have a financial interest or formal relationship with any company or other non-University organization involved in the proposal;
   - Are related to the proposal author or coauthor, nominee, or participant in the activity under review;
   - Believe that participating in the discussion will compromise the integrity of the process.

3. A waiver of the recusal requirement may be requested from the Vice President for Research in advance of any formal Research Council proceeding. Such requests shall provide compelling reasons and/or evidence for approval of the waivers, which are expected to be rare.

4. All formal Research Council deliberations and written materials involving proposals and nominations are strictly confidential, and the outcomes of those deliberations will not be shared without the prior written permission of the Research Council Chair or the Vice President for Research. Failure to adhere to this policy may result in expulsion from the Council.

5. Because Research Council members formally vote, they should refrain from providing advice regarding specific proposals, nominations, or other actions that may come before the Council (for example editing or providing specific advice about how arguments should be made in a proposal). All such inquires should be directed to the Center for Research Program Development and Enrichment. This is not meant, however, to prohibit Research Council members from providing general, non-confidential information about Research Council deliberations to those in their academic units.

6. Members of the Research Council shall be subject to the Norman Campus Conflict of Interest Policy and if a conflict exists between the two policies, the Norman Campus Conflict of Interest Policy shall take precedence.
Recommendations for a Research Incentives and Rewards Program on the Norman Campus

Guiding Principles

In addition to a program for faculty research awards, a companion program of faculty scholarly accomplishment incentives can help increase research and other creative productivity by providing predictable incentives based on accomplishing very specific benchmarks. In effect, if a faculty member accomplishes research goal “X” then he or she can rely on receiving incentive “Y.” This kind of framework will restore some measure of “merit” to university incentives for faculty (which increasingly have emphasized an “across-the-board” approach) and also will counter-balance the lack of annual E&G salary increases.

Faculty can be incentivized in two ways: (1) additional pay and (2) additional resources. Based on discussions through Aspire 2020, different faculty have differing preferences between these two kinds of incentives. Consequently, rather than prescribe one or the other, the choice of taking an incentive as additional pay or as additional resources (or some combination of the two) should be left up to each faculty member eligible for an incentive.

The following principles should guide the creation of a formal Research Incentives and Rewards Program for the Norman Campus.

Timely: Another in a series of across-the-board raises underlines the point that merit has become irrelevant in faculty rewards. For purposes of tenure and promotion, OU has minimal merit thresholds, but the university has no mechanism to incentivize faculty to exceed those thresholds, which is a significant barrier to transforming OU’s scholarly metrics (including external funding). Launching a merit-based incentives program now would have maximal effect on faculty morale and future activities.

Predictable: In addition to recognizing faculty accomplishments, we also want to motivate future actions (that is, more grant proposals, more fellowship applications, more publications, more effort in scholarly endeavors). To accomplish the latter, an incentives program must be multi-year (rather than a one-off or a one-year pilot) and must be predictable. Faculty must have a high level of confidence that a specific accomplishment (such as winning a grant or a prestigious national fellowship, which often takes more than one year to accomplish) will result in a particular reward (unlike annual evaluations that may or may not be followed by a salary increase). To motivate desired behaviors, action A unequivocally should result in reward B.

Meaningful: The reward should be of a magnitude to make a decided difference in a faculty member’s economic life. We want faculty to make qualitative improvements in their research and scholarly effort.
Thus, we need to offer incentives that would make a qualitative difference in how faculty are motivated. Incremental incentives are not transformative.

**Sustainable:** Any incentive program requires an up-front investment prior to any downstream return on that investment. Over multiple years, though, a faculty incentive program should result in increases in external funding and prestigious scholarly accomplishments that are of a greater value to the university (monetarily and in terms of reputation) than the financial costs of the program itself. Thus, from the point of view of external funding, the costs of incentivizing faculty who win sponsored awards should be more than offset by the additional IDC generated from the expected increase in grant proposals. Similarly, incentivizing faculty to apply for prestigious fellowships and win scholarly prizes or designations (such as national academy membership) should be less expensive than the cost of hiring new faculty who already have won similar awards, prizes, or designations.

**Programs Related to External Funding**

**Annual Bonuses:** Faculty members will be given yearly bonuses equivalent to 3% of the IDC each is credited with generating (based on internal routing credit) from annual research expenditures. We will only award bonuses to faculty who generate $33,333 or more of IDC in a given fiscal year (which would be a bonus of $1000) – so that faculty have a threshold to aim at (essentially, research expenditures of at least $66,666 at full IDC annually) and we aren’t awarding bonuses of a few hundred or even tens of dollars for smaller levels of annual expenditures. On this plan, a faculty member with $1m in annual expenditures at full IDC could earn a bonus of $15K. Assuming total IDC generation of $19m annually, the cost of this incentive program would not exceed $570K each year – and given the minimum threshold, would probably come out at around $500K or less. The goals of such a reward would be (1) to motivate faculty who have not sought external funding in the past to do so and (2) to motivate funded faculty to enlarge their grant portfolios. This incentive would become sustainable if it resulted in an increase of $1.3m in research expenditures annually at full IDC.

**Regular investigator-initiated awards** (NIH R01 awards and the regular NSF faculty research awards): $10,000 and Center and larger, multi-investigator grants (NIH P01, P20, P30 and U awards, NSF IGERT and Center awards): $50,000. Currently, the Norman campus has around 140 regular NSF awards, 5 center awards (construed generously), and 20 NIH R01s. That would translate as around $1.85M in incentives. Factoring in equivalent DOE, DOD, NOAA, and other grants, we could estimate an overall cost of $2M in incentives for our current portfolio. That cost, though, would be spread out over a period of years. Assuming that the average length of each grant is 3 years, this would mean an overall cost of around $667K per year for a funded research incentive program. Of course, we hope these incentives would increase number of proposals and awards, so the cost of the incentive program would grow as our funded portfolio grows. An incentive program of this sort can be funded and implemented unilaterally by VPR.

Faculty also can be encouraged to write their grant budgets in ways that fund their own incentives. Faculty already include summer salaries in grant budgets as a way of increasing their pay. The university could provide additional opportunities for self-funded incentives:

**Salary replacement:** Norman campus faculty tend to budget academic year salary replacement (where that is allowed by the funding agency) only up to the level required by their departments for teaching release. In many cases, faculty could justify budgeting greater percentages of their academic year salaries on grants, but do not do so because in most cases they have no access to salary release funds (which are controlled by chairs, directors, and deans). In contrast, most academic health sciences centers
(including OUHSC) make a percentage of salary release available to faculty as a standard part of their overall salary packages. The Norman campus could institute a similar program through which 50% of any academic year salary replacement generated by a faculty member above and beyond that required for course release would be made available to the faculty member either as supplemental pay or as unrestricted research funds. While this arrangement would appear to reduce the control of chairs, directors, and deans over salary replacement funds, in fact it likely will incentivize faculty to increase the amount of those funds over the amounts necessary for teaching release and so result in an overall increase of salary replacement money available to chairs, directors, and deans. This incentive would require a general policy formulated at the Provost’s level to be available to faculty as a standard option, but is currently used on an ad hoc basis in several colleges.

13th month: Some universities use various means (including defining the faculty work week as 60 hours rather than 40 hours and calculating base salaries for grants on a different basis such as including salary from a professional practice plan) to allow faculty to pay themselves from grants at higher rates. These arrangements would require policy changes at the regents’ level and careful attention to compliance issues as well as state law. However, if done appropriately, such arrangements are university-budget neutral and allow faculty to use grant funding to raise their academic rates of pay. Design and implementation will require significant intra-university discussion and coordination.

Postdoc Matching Program: A number of Aspire 2020 participants viewed institutional support for postdocs as a key incentive for research productivity. VPR could offer to pay half the cost of any postdoc supported by a faculty member on external funding (provided the external funding has full, on-campus IDC). That offer could be made conditional on being written into grant proposal budgets as a cost match, which would allow us to track our potential financial exposure and limit the program if it became too expensive. Each postdoc would cost VPR approximately $35K (including fringe) and the program should include an upper limit on postdoc salary of $60K.

Programs Related to Prestigious Scholarly/Creative Accomplishments

Book Awards: Any faculty member whose peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph wins an award from a national professional organization (American Historical Association, MLA, etc.) will be given a $5000 incentive. Based on a review of our Highlights publication, at most there might be 5 such incentives per year for a total cost of $25,000.

Citation Counts: AAU, NRC and other organizations that measure research productivity include the number of times faculty members’ peer-reviewed journal articles are cited among their criteria. While these measures are not perfect and not inclusive of all peer-reviewed journals, they are nonetheless nationally recognized benchmarks of research quality that are used for multiple purposes. Consequently, it is in the university’s best interests to incentivize faculty whose journal articles have the highest number of citations. Each year, VPR could give $1000 each to the OU authors of the top 10 cited articles published within the last five years in the categories of Science Citation, Social Science Citation, and Arts and Humanities Citation (as indexed on Web of Science). This incentive program would cost $30K per year. Obviously, some OU articles would garner incentives in multiple years, but the five-year time limit would phase those articles out so that at most a particular article could generate $5000 in incentives. Each $1000 incentive would be shared among all OU co-authors for a particular article.

Juried Creative, Performance, and Exhibit Awards: Some OU faculty publish creative works in non-peer-reviewed venues while others perform or exhibit rather than publish. As a counter-part to the peer-reviewed scholarly book and monograph award incentive, we could create a $2500 incentive for any
nationally competitive juried award for an OU faculty member’s creative publication, performance or exhibit. Unlike the scholarly book awards, it may take several iterations to identify the kinds of juried creative, performance and exhibit awards that we should incentivize. This incentive program could cost approximately $30K per year.

**Prestigious Fellowships or Designations:** Any faculty member who wins one of the prestigious fellowships or designations (such as national academy membership) listed in the AAU criteria would receive a $5000 bonus in the year in which the award or designation is made. Based on prior history, we are likely to have only five or fewer of these incentives annually, at a cost of $25,000.

**Cost:** The total annual cost of Scholarly and Creative incentives: $60,000 to $110,000. Essentially, this would be an annual cost that is less expensive than one senior faculty salary. The benefit of the incentive program is in magnifying prestigious scholarly and creative accomplishments across multiple faculty members.
| Faculty who receive a Prestigious Fellowships or $10,000 one-time bonus of 50% salary, 100% $10,000 salary with an option to be used as 100% salary | $10,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid entirely from Grants</td>
<td>Instruction that used to cover faculty release above special policies about colleges that have departments and have to be taken for Variable Care will Release as a Bonus. 50% salary or additional replacement beyond that required for course release could be used for Nationally approved list but be used for other awards not on the list (NIH P and U, NSF IGERT, STC and ERC, competitive center or other awards, DoD/NIH Collaborative, etc.,).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| $10,000 | $25,000
| One-time $25,000 bonus upon one-time above $50,000 total budget etc.,) award received above. |
| $50,000 | $10,000
| One-time $10,000 bonus upon competitive investigator-initiated grants (such as NIH RO1, NSF Career and Senior Research Grants, DSI/DOE). |

### Mean of Proposed Incentives for Faculty Research and Creative Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Maximum Per Faculty Benefit</td>
<td>Annual Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$100,000</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>1000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>5000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>5000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>5000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000'000$</td>
<td>5000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>