Executive Summary

Faculty Scholarship Action Team's Final Report – April 18, 2014

Team Members: Ralph Bertrand, Helen Daly, Joan Ericson, Kristine Lang,
Jeff Moore, Paul Myrow, Lori Peck, Tess Powers (chair), Dana Wittmer

In September, President Tiefenthaler appointed a faculty action team to oversee the implementation of the initiative in Recommendation 1 that reads:

To continue to attract, develop, and retain an engaged faculty who are equal to the challenge of teaching on the block, we must enhance resources and flexibility to support faculty scholarship and creativity across the disciplines and activities that make up the learning experience.

Objective #1: "Inventory current support resources (financial, human, etc.) for faculty that seek and receive external funding. Evaluate each current resource for its effectiveness and alignment to the strategic plan and classify each resource as either something to enhance, maintain or reduce."

Objective #2: "Develop ideas for new forms of support for faculty that seek and receive external funding. The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

Objective #3: "By spring break, prepare a comprehensive budget for the proposals along with options for funding enhancements and new support as well as suggestions for streamlined, transparent and fair policies that will better support those receiving external funds.

In December, we submitted a report on Objective #1. This report is available upon request.

In order to address Objective #2, the Faculty Scholarship Action Team has identified 10 new forms of support, which we have called "Recommended Initiatives" for the purposes of this final report. We have classified each Recommended Initiative as:

1) New or Revised Policies/Documents,
2) New Forms of Human Resources Support, or
3) New Forms of Financial Support.

At the end of each Recommended Initiative, we address whether we believe it:

1) advances support for all disciplines
2) promotes collaboration, and/or
3) provides increased flexibility for those who wish to seek external funding.

In order to address Objective #3, we have included Budget Impact information as part of each Recommended Initiative. A comprehensive budget in Excel (provided after the initiatives, and prior to the attachments) provides an overview of the anticipated costs of each recommended initiative.

We will propose an Implementation Timetable during Block 8.

Faculty Scholarship Action Team Recommended Initiatives
Table of Contents

Recommended Initiative #1:

Statement from College Leadership on Role of Scholarship in a Liberal Arts Setting

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concern to Be Addressed: There is still a culture at CC that questions the role of research and scholarship in the lives of its faculty members. While we see that the culture is changing, particularly as new faculty join us, we believe that some faculty will hesitate to pursue external funding if they are not confident that such an activity will be valued by faculty in a decision-making capacity (such as those in their department or on the FEC). Still other faculty will decide to engage in external funding activity in order to achieve the funding level required to pursue research at CC, but not receive appropriate "credit" for the considerable efforts associated with seeking external funding.

We believe that, for our team's recommended initiatives to have a lasting effect, there must be a statement from the College's leadership (such as the Dean and the President) that reaffirms that the College strongly supports research and scholarship – and thus also the search for external funding that may be necessary to support these scholarly activities.

Recommended Initiative #1: We recommend that the College's leadership issue a statement that:

- reaffirms the College's commitment to scholarly activity in the context of our mission to provide the finest liberal arts education in the country
- acknowledges that some (but not all) faculty members' scholarship could be enhanced by external funding
- recognizes that applying for external funding demonstrates a commitment to one's scholarship
- recognizes that applying for external funding demonstrates a respect for the College's resources, as it allows the College's existing resources to go farther
- recognizes that applying for external funding can be a significant time commitment
- reaffirms that all grant application activity is viewed positively; declined applications are *not* viewed negatively and faculty are encouraged to revise and reapply
- acknowledges that faculty scholarship sometimes pulls faculty members away from the classroom, but that the long-term benefits of faculty scholarship outweigh the short-term disadvantages
- while the College's investments in faculty scholarship are an investment in the academic program, the College also recognizes that we must invest in strong block visitors and yearlong visitors so as to ensure our students experience the best liberal arts education

Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Language in the Faculty Handbook

In order for faculty to be assured that their external grant seeking work is deemed meaningful to the College, it is critical that the College codify its support for this kind of work in the tenure and promotion language in the Handbook. Therefore, we believe the statement from college leadership should recommend that the Colorado College community move forward by:

- Encouraging the faculty to consider an update to the tenure and promotion language in the Faculty Handbook. Specifically, the Faculty Scholarship Action Team would like to recommend that the College consider adopting language similar to Middlebury's tenure and promotion language that gives consideration to both *scholarly activity* and *scholarly achievement* (Middlebury's definitions below). The section of Middlebury's Handbook that deals with "Evaluation of Scholarship" is provided as **Attachment 1.1.**

In order to ensure that the academic program remains fully supported, we believe that the statement from college leadership should also indicate that the College will seek to re-allocate or raise additional funds in order to supplement the College's year-long visitor salary pool in order to replace faculty members who will need to be out of the classroom for an extended period to pursue their scholarly work.

(It is not necessary to increase the resources that fund block visitors, because the College actually saves money when a faculty member takes a one-block, grant-paid LOA. The College "saves" 1/9th of the faculty member's salary (ie., $10,000 in the case of a yearly salary of $90,000) during that block, and the College spends only $5,000 - $6,000 for a block visitor.)

Budgetary Impact: We are hoping to create an environment in which more faculty are able to take a full-year sabbatical. College policy supports faculty who take a full-year sabbatical with 5/9th of their salary. For example, a faculty member with a $90,000 academic year salary will receive $50,000 plus benefits during his or her sabbatical year; the College will "save" $40,000 plus some associated benefits.

Full-year sabbaticals may require a full-year visitor, which costs the College ~$60,000 to $70,000 plus benefits. The College applies the "savings" of $40,000 toward this cost, but the College must supply the additional $20,000 to $30,000 to support the full salary of the year-long visitor.

If we are to increase the number of faculty who are able to take a full-year sabbatical, funds will be needed to support an increase in the yearlong visitors' salary pool. **We project that an anticipated increase in grant activity will lead to a net increase of one to two faculty more per year being able to take a full-year sabbatical. The additional cost in one year if one additional faculty member takes year-long sabbatical (*assuming this faculty member is replaced by a year-long visitor*): Salary ($30,000) *assuming the "savings" from the departing faculty member is $40,000* + benefits on a $70,000 salary for the yearlong visitor (30% = $21,000) = $51,000. Additional costs over two years if three additional faculty members during that two-year period take year-long sabbaticals (*and assuming all are replaced by full-year visitors*): $153,000. Projected annualized cost to the College: $76,500.**

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #1:

advances support for all disciplines – All disciplines will benefit a strong statement from college leadership that makes clear that scholarly pursuits, and the search for external funding to support those pursuits, are vital to the liberal arts mission. If the language in the Handbook is changed to explicitly provide "credit" to the search for external funding, faculty from all disciplines will be reassured that time spent on external funding efforts will be valued by the institution.

promotes collaboration – To the extent that the statement promotes grant activity, we believe that it will also promote collaboration for those faculty whose scholarly work is based on collaborative work with others.

provides increased flexibility – Faculty must make difficult choices regarding where to spend their time in order to be best positioned for tenure and promotion. If faculty know that time invested in pursuing external funding will be valued by the institution, then faculty have more choices regarding where and how to invest their time.

Definitions from Middlebury (emphasis in bold added):

"Scholarly activity represents a pattern of related professional involvements, which may include: research and experimentation; writing, analyzing, creating; presentations to peers or to the public; responsible roles in professional organizations; visiting professorships; **applying for and receiving outside grants and fellowships**; and developing new fields of expertise."

"Scholarly achievement is the result of that activity, primarily as evidenced in work that has been (a) performed, executed, or published (as original research communicated to specialists or as the synthesis and interpretation of scholarly material for a more general audience), and (b) **recognized* as being of significantly high quality by scholars and artists within the broader academic community beyond Middlebury College**."

*receiving prestigious or highly competitive grants is considered external recognition as part of scholarly achievement

Recommended Initiative #2:
Increase Flexibility of External Funding Framework
(Particularly Timing of Applications and Acceptance of Awards)

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Context: Of the 20 research grants currently active at Colorado College as of Feb. 2014, 20% were "resubmissions" – that is, they were funded with the second proposal submission. Many funders expect (and welcome) applicants to submit more than once, particularly if they are one of the funders that provides feedback on submissions.

Concern to Be Addressed: Currently our humanities (and some social science faculty) are at a disadvantage when it comes to submitting a competitive research proposal. This is partially because they rarely are able to submit a revision to a proposal, unlike our science faculty who are able to submit multi-year grant proposals two or even three times. Below we propose a number of related recommendations to increase the flexibility of the framework within which faculty may submit proposals for external funding.

Recommended Initiative #2:

- We recommend that the College adopt policies that allow faculty to apply for external support for their research and scholarly activity throughout their professional career, as their projects require external funding, not in a narrow window based on their sabbatical schedule.

- We recommend that the College explore options that would allow faculty to be more flexible regarding when they must notify the College of grant-funded scholarly work. (The timing of funding notifications is often not in sync with when the College currently wants leave requests from faculty.)

- We recommend that the College's new sabbatical policy take into consideration faculty who may receive external funding for scholarly work "out of sync" with their sabbatical schedule.

- We recommend that the College make more clear which benefits are available on a paid leave versus and unpaid leave (draft table has been prepared by Barbara Wilson, **Attachment 2.1**).

We also recommend that the College revise its Policy on Unpaid, Non-Medical Leaves of Absence (LOA) in the following ways:

- We recommend that faculty who take a leave of absence <u>for scholarly purposes</u> have the same benefits (ie. medical, dental, etc.) as those on a paid leave. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this has been available in the past, however the availability of this support should be documented in a policy so that faculty can plan on this support.

- We recommend that, in the case of a faculty member taking a grant-paid LOA for a portion of an academic year (such as a "course buyout"), the College should make clear the formula for how the faculty member will be paid by the College for the remaining academic year. Because there is currently no formula for how faculty taking other LOAs (for medical leave or parental leave, not funded by a grant), we recommend that the College adopt the same formula for both scenarios.

- We recommend that the Policy formally allow faculty who have applied for external funding to support a year-long LOA to inform the Dean's Office after notification of their award, rather than at a certain time of the year. (Our current policy stipulates "early in the fall.")

  See proposed revisions to the College's existing unpaid LOA policy, **Attachment 2.2**.

Rationale for Improving Flexibility of Timing of Grant Applications:

Most funders that support one-year sabbatical fellowships have an annual deadline. Deadlines tend to fall between May and October, and faculty usually learn whether their grant is funded in the following spring. If they are funded, they are expected to accept support for the very next academic year; many funders do not allow a funded faculty member to defer the award for a year. Learning in the spring that a faculty member needs to be replaced can create a burden on the department; departments generally create their schedule for the following academic year in early spring. These timing issues can often deter faculty from even applying in the first place; if they were to be funded, it would create a burden for their department and the College, and nearly all faculty are hesitant to create such a burden.

There is another dimension to this timing issue that also needs to be addressed. Faculty who submit a revision to a grant proposal are more likely to be awarded a grant than those who submit a proposal once. However, submitting a revised proposal assumes, of course, that the faculty member was able to submit his or her first proposal a year earlier (given that most key funders offer annual deadlines). With the exception of faculty in the sciences (who usually submit multi-year grants to support summer work, not necessarily sabbatical periods), faculty at Colorado College are currently not in the position to submit a proposal two years in a row; generally faculty are submitting proposals in anticipation of being able to take a sabbatical leave from the College for a particular year. It would be highly impractical for most CC faculty to submit a sabbatical proposal a year early; the College's current sabbatical policy makes taking a sabbatical a year early impossible (unless desired by the Department for staffing purposes), and most funders do not allow awardees to defer their awards. Therefore, faculty have no incentive to apply early if they won't be able to accept an award. This makes it nearly impossible for faculty to plan to apply two years in a row, which tends to make our proposals in the humanities and social sciences less competitive.

Bottom line: Our humanities faculty and many social science faculty currently have a very narrow window in which to submit an application. And they are currently not in a position to apply two years in row, reducing their proposals' competitiveness.

Faculty Scholarship Action Team's Recommended Initiative #2

Related Rationale for Providing Benefits for LOAs for Scholarly Purposes:

Many external funders provide meaningful opportunities, but the financial award is not always comparable to the faculty member's academic year salary. Fulbright awards, for example, can provide powerful scholarly (and global) experiences, however the stipends associated with these awards vary considerably by country. Well-funded countries tend to be extremely competitive. While some faculty are willing to make the financial sacrifice (and, in fact, would be more interested in visiting a less well-funded country for scholarly or personal reasons), they are not willing to risk losing their key benefits, particularly their medical benefits, for the sake of a fellowship opportunity. Faculty need to be able to count on receiving their medical benefits in the event of a LOA for scholarly purposes if they are to expend the effort in seeking out opportunities such as Fulbrights.

Budgetary Impact

Full-year leaves of absence (with no salary from CC):
    Savings:
        When a faculty member takes a full-year Leave of Absence, made possible by an externally funded grant or fellowship, the College may "make money"; it no longer pays the faculty member's salary (say, $90,000) and instead pays the salary and benefits of the full-year visitor (say, $60,000 for salary and $20,000 in benefits), "saving" $10,000.
    Costs:
        We recommend that faculty members on leave *for scholarly purposes* continue to receive the benefits of faculty on paid leave. Estimation of the cost for benefits for faculty on leave of absence: average college contribution for benefits (eg. family medical benefits) = $10K to $15K per faculty member. In addition, there may be other disadvantages to a faculty member's one-year leave, particularly related to the academic program, which the College should consider; these may differ substantially by department and will have differing associated financial costs.
    Anticipated number of faculty on a leave of absence for scholarly purpose each year: 1 to 2. Estimated annual cost: $20K to $30K per year.

Full-year sabbaticals: As with Recommended Initiative #1, if the framework for applying for external support becomes more flexible, we would anticipate an increase in the number of faculty who are able to take a full-year sabbatical. Therefore funds will be needed to support an increase in the yearlong visitors' salary pool. As noted in Recommended Initiative #1, we project that an anticipated increase in grant activity will lead to a net increase of one to two faculty more per year being able to take a full-year sabbatical. Additional cost in one year if one additional faculty member takes year-long sabbatical: the College uses "savings" from 4/9ths of the departing members' salary and needs approximately $30,000 more + benefits (30% of $70,000 salary, $21,000) = $51,000. Additional costs over two years if three additional faculty members during that two-year period take year-long sabbaticals (and each is replaced with a yearlong visitor): $153,000.
    Anticipated increase in the number of faculty able to take a yearlong sabbatical: 1 to 2 each year. Projected annualized cost to the College: $76,500*.

Both Recommended Initiative #1 and #2 seek to increase the number of faculty who are able to take a yearlong sabbatical. We anticipate that both recommended initiatives, in conjunction, will increase the number of faculty who are able to take a yearlong sabbatical by 1 to 2 each year. Therefore, while both recommended initiatives outline an estimated annualized cost of $76,500, we list this only once on the budget spreadsheet.

Last-Minute Replacement "Premium": One of the most difficult aspects of applying for (and eventually accepting) external funding is that most funders do not notify individuals of whether they will be supported until late spring. Procuring a replacement at that time can be difficult and will likely require an increased financial incentive to finalize contracts with the best block visitors (or yearlong visitors). We estimate that this *additional* "premium" may be between $5,000 and $10,000 annually per faculty member being replaced.

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #2:

advances support for all disciplines – All disciplines, particularly humanities and social science faculty, will benefit from increased flexibility in the timing of applications and the acceptance of awards, as described in detail in the rationale for the initiative. In addition, all disciplines will benefit from knowing they are able to receive benefits during a grant-funded LOA.

The Fulbright Scholar Program is an example of an opportunity that would be far better utilized if CC faculty are awarded benefits during LOAs for scholarly purposes. First of all, all disciplines are eligible to apply for Fulbright awards, which entail international travel. This kind of experience is highly appealing to faculty, however, due to family considerations, the best time to attempt this kind of placement is not always in sync with the faculty member's sabbatical period. In additional, all faculty, regardless of discipline, will be more interested in pursuing a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity such as a Fulbright if they know that they won't have to sacrifice the security of their benefits.

promotes collaboration – To the extent that this initiative promotes grant activity, we believe that it will also promote collaboration for some faculty whose scholarly work engages others.

provides increased flexibility – An increase in flexibility is at the core of this initiative.

Recommended Initiative #3:
Provide Clarity about Financial Support for Grant-Sponsored Activity

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concerns to Be Addressed:

Regarding Individual Research Grants: When faculty apply for external funding to support their research, they are committing to additional research work during the academic year to meet the goals of the grant. Often faculty are concerned that there will not be enough time to both teach and conduct research well and wonder if it's possible to ask the funder to support a grant-funded LOA, or a "course buyout," to reduce their teaching load. In cases when a funder is willing to support a course buyout, faculty (particularly tenure-track faculty) are hesitant to ask for a course buyout out of concern that this will suggest that their teaching is not a priority. In the past, there has been a lack of clarity about when faculty are allowed to ask for a course buyout from a funder, which has the effect of "rewarding" faculty who receive external research grants with more and more work, and less and less time.

Regarding Major Institutional Research Grants: Currently there is little incentive for faculty to apply for major institutional research grants; such grant proposals usually take considerable time to prepare and even more time to administer if funded. In the past, faculty have been expected to administer major institutional grants as an "overload." There has been little to no culture of support for faculty who take on these major, prestigious institutional grants. In addition, funders notice if the lead faculty member is expected to maintain the institution's standard teaching load; this suggests that the grant is not a priority, diminishing its competitiveness.

Recommended Initiative #3: We recommend that the College adopt a policy on "course buyouts" (funded by the grant) and grant-necessary "course release" time (funded by the College) that recognizes the burdens associated with managing prestigious research grants well.

Regarding Individual Research Grants: In those cases in which a funder will support a course buyout, the policy should make clear that faculty should be allowed — even *encouraged* — to request a course buyout during the academic year (in addition to summer salary).

Regarding Institutional Research Grants: In those cases in which a faculty member is interested in applying for a major institutional research grant, the policy should make clear that the College will support them in their work on this grant through a college-funded "course release" in the event that the funder does not allow a request for academic year salary support for the administration of the grant. Such support (formally called "cost-share" if included in the proposal) demonstrates the College commitment to the proposed project and makes the grant proposal more competitive.

This policy should also incorporate language that clarifies how faculty and staff will be paid from grants during the summer and academic year, as this language is currently not available and is closely related to language on how faculty are paid for course buyouts and course releases.

See proposed policy draft, **Attachment 3**.

Rationale: It is important to recognize that certain grant proposals, if funded, will bring both prestige to the institution and a significant administrative burden. (Recognizing this administrative burden, and the burden to an institution's facilities, federal funders provide "indirect costs" in proportion to the "direct costs" of the grant award. More on these in Recommended Initiative #7.) The College should reward those faculty with the initiative and vision to bring in major research grants with time to properly manage the grant activity. Such an investment demonstrates the College's commitment to the faculty member's scholarship and the existing grant and sets the stage for additional grants in the future, both for the faculty member and for the College more generally.

Budgetary Impact:

Anticipated Number of Course Buyouts Annually: A faculty member receives a course buyout when a funder agrees to pay a certain percentage of a faculty member's salary, typically 1/9 (11.11%) of their salary, so that the faculty member can work exclusively on their grant for that percentage of time during the academic year. The faculty member sees no net gain in salary during the academic year, but he or she is relieved of teaching one course. While many funders will not fund course buy-outs — their view is that Colorado College's academic year salary supports both teaching and research — some funders will fund course buyouts, particularly if the nature of the research requires that the faculty member be off-campus at a certain time during the academic year.

>   **Current number of grant-funded course buyouts each year: 1 to 2**

>   **Anticipated increase in the number of grant-funded course buyouts each year (due to an increase in grant activity and/or due to a policy that clearly outlines that course buyouts are encouraged): 1 to 3**

>   **Budgetary Impact of Course Buyouts:** minimal. There will be some cost savings if not replaced by a block visitor (ie. $10,000 in salary not paid by CC) and a small cost savings if replaced with a block visitor ($10,000 in salary not paid by CC and $5,000 paid for a block visitor, for $5,000 in savings).

Anticipated Number of Course Releases Annually: A "course release" is a reduction in teaching load funded by Colorado College in support of the administration of a major institutional research grant. Given the relatively small range of funders that support major institutional research grants (NSF and Howard Hughes Medical Institute come to mind), and given the existing commitments and expertise of CC faculty, we anticipate that the "upper limit" of active institutional research grants would be no more than two to three in any given year.

>   **Budgetary Impact of Course Releases: $6,000 annually (to fund a block visitor) per major institutional grant.**

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #3:

advances support for all disciplines – All disciplines will benefit from a uniformly applied policy that makes it clear that it is appropriate to request a course buyout in a research proposal if allowed by the funder. All disciplines will benefit from a uniformly applied policy that makes it clear that it is appropriate to request an annual course release to administer institutional research grants.

promotes collaboration – By their nature, institutional research grant proposals require thoughtful collaboration. To the extent that this initiative promotes more institutional research grant proposals, this initiative will promote collaboration among our faculty.

provides increased flexibility –   This initiative encourages faculty to ask for and receive support (be it external or internal) for the increased work associated with research grants and grant management. In the case of both course buyouts and course releases, faculty will be granted more time to complete their grant-related work. For many, more time is synonymous with more flexibility.

Recommended Initiative #4:
Create New Position to Support Research Grants

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concerns to Be Addressed:

Current and Future Grant Activity: The Director of Faculty Research Support (DFRS) assists faculty with submitting, on average, 23 applications a year. Over the last five years 43% of applications have been funded, and there are currently ~20 active grants totaling approximately $2.7 million in funding. In addition, as of March 10, there are approximately $3 million in pending research grants. The DFRS gives priority to ensuring all submissions are strong, but as a result, post-award work and policy creation/revision often have to take a back seat.

In addition, we expect and hope that the work of the Faculty Scholarship Action Team will improve the environment for research grant activity, increasing the number of annual submissions in the coming years. While it's difficult to predict, it would certainly be possible for the number of annual submissions to increase to ~30 or more each year, an increase of at least 30%. It would be difficult for the Director of Faculty Research Support to ensure that all submissions remain strong without additional support.

Post-Award Management: As noted above, the Director often has to put post-award support on the "back-burner" due to time constraints. This does not provide faculty with the optimal support they need to manage grants.

In addition, a subcommittee of the Faculty Scholarship Action Team held a meeting with staff assistants who regularly help faculty with research grants. In this meeting, it became clear that managing grant spending is a considerable burden to one or two of the staff assistants; of more concern, it became clear that virtually all of the staff assistants do not feel empowered to question a cost that has been assigned to a particular fund (e.g., a federal grant). This is of concern because our current decentralized system of grant management relies heavily on the staff assistant serving as a "double-check" on costs. While we are certainly not concerned that faculty are intentionally misusing federal funds, we are concerned that our system does not allow for the questioning of costs.

Key Person Dependency: As noted by Internal Auditor Yolanda Lyons, there is currently a "key person dependency" on the position of Director of Faculty Research Support. Should there be a long-term vacancy in that position, there is no one to step in to keep some of the key functions of the position operating.

Support for Students Seeking Fellowships: _Currently the DFRS is tasked with providing support to faculty advisors who assist students and recent graduates with applying to highly competitive fellowships and grants (e.g., Fulbright, Luce). Given the importance of supporting our students and recent alumni in pursing these opportunities, the current support provided by the DFRS does not meet the needs of our students. (Some of our peer institutions have a full-time person handling student fellowship work; the College will want to explore how other colleges handle this in greater depth to determine what would make the most sense for CC.) Regardless, since there is clearly a need for better support than the DFRS is able to provide, this new position could provide additional support until the College makes a determination for how student fellowship applications will be encouraged and supported on a long-term basis._

Recommended Initiative #4: We recommend that the College consider hiring a new full-time position to support the Director of Faculty Research Support, tentatively titled "Research Grants Specialist." This person would be responsible for handling a majority of post-award management duties, administering the Sponsored Research Fund that will be created and allocated as part of Recommended Initiative #7, and learning all operations of the office, such as the fundamentals of federal grant submissions and the College's federal compliance obligations. This person could also provide increased support for student fellowships until the College makes a determination on how best to support those applications.

We provide a preliminary job description as **Attachment 4.1**. _Tasks that are currently handled (unfortunately, often on a minimal, or reactive, basis) by the Director of Faculty Research support are in italics_. **Brand new tasks/duties are in bold.**

A Summary of Our Rationale

A second person supporting faculty research grants would:
1) Support the Director in the context of an increase in grant submission activity
2) Support grant management and oversight
3) Improve effectiveness of Director of Faculty Research Support and the External Research Grants "Office"
4) Address "key person dependency" on the position of Director of Faculty Research Support
5) Prevent loss of grant revenue in the absence of Director of Faculty Research Support
6) In addition, this person could (possibly) administer internal research grants (e.g., Benezet and Dean's Summer Research Grants), and provide training on managing faculty's individual research accounts to ensure consistency in how research accounts are handled _(further discussion needed)_
7) Because providing degree data on our graduates is so important to research grants, this person could also facilitate degree data collection from National Student Clearinghouse and distribution to departments when needed _(further discussion needed)_

Expanded Rationale (We elaborate on the above points)

1) <u>Support Increasing Grant Submission Activity:</u> The Faculty Scholarship Action Team has aimed to develop recommendations that will improve the environment for applying for (and receiving) external research grants. Therefore, we expect that the number of applications submitted each year will increase in the coming years. As the number of research grant proposals increases, the Director of Faculty Research Support will need additional support in order to ensure top quality in each of those submissions.

2) <u>Support Grant Management and Oversight:</u>   The Faculty Scholarship Action Team has determined that the post-award side of our faculty grants process needs considerable support.
   - **Role of Staff Assistants**: Departmental staff assistants currently play a key role in supporting faculty who have won research grants; this support developed naturally over time, given that there was no other source of support on campus. Given the changing climate regarding research grants, we need to rethink how grants are supported and the role of staff assistants in this process. Due to their proximity to faculty and their familiarity with suppliers, it makes sense for staff assistants to continue to support faculty *to a certain extent* in grant spending. It makes sense for faculty to request that they help with purchasing grant-related supplies or with processing grant-related reimbursements.   While it may be appropriate for staff assistants to assist with administrative aspects of grant spending, it is not appropriate for staff assistants to provide the only "second set of eyes" on grant spending. For the sake of appropriate financial checks and balances, we should ensure that grant spending is reviewed by someone over whom the faculty PI has no authority.
   - **Role of the Finance Office**: The College needs someone who can serve as the point person for oversight of grant spending. Lori currently serves as a point person for faculty and staff regarding grant spending, but she does not have the time to provide *oversight* for grant spending. The College needs someone who could be fully trained in the financials of federal grant spending (how to determine if a cost is allowable, allocable, reasonable, and consistent), and who could provide consistent administration of all grants. This kind of training (and the resulting consistency) would be difficult to achieve if we were to maintain our decentralized system that relies heavily on individual staff assistants. In addition, given that a staff member of Finance and Administration is tasked with signing off on financial reporting for research grants, it is logical and appropriate for the same Finance Office staff person to oversee research grant spending.
        The Finance and Administration Office has been undergoing a review of job tasks, and research grants oversight will continue to be part of the portfolio of a member of the Finance Office. The Finance staff person charged with research grants oversight will have the following research grants–related tasks:
        - Setting up new grants in the accounting system
        - Sending invoices/billing to funders
        - Sending financial reports to funders

- Providing the R&D auditor with information
- Preparing the annual NSF survey
- Serving as resource to the DFRS and her new support person
- Being ultimately responsible for overseeing every expense. (Further discussions will be necessary to determine what the entire process will look like.)

- **Role of the Research Grants Specialist**: Faculty need someone with access to Banner who can regularly update them on their remaining grant balances, in addition to being available to answer a variety of other spending-related questions. (An outline of all post-award duties is provided in the Preliminary Job Description, **Attachment 4.1**.) This kind of proactive work is currently not being done due to Tess's and Lori's time constraints and would help greatly in ensuring that grants are spent down appropriately by the end of the grant period – and not overspent. (In the last 3 years, grants were overspent by approximately $20,000 which had to be covered by recovered indirect costs.) Use of the Banner Grants Module (Recommended Initiative #9) may help faculty see this information for themselves; however, access to the information will not guarantee that each faculty member will review their grant spending as regularly and as closely as needed.

    The proposed position will be tasked with reviewing spending against the grant on a regular basis and providing faculty with useful, timely information that helps them make decisions about grant planning and spending. Because there are a number of factors that need to be considered (such as federal expectations for internal controls and the College's own P-card procedures), we need to engage in further discussions with staff assistants, faculty, the Finance Office and others to determine what the process will ultimately look like.

3) <u>Improve Effectiveness of Director of Faculty Research Support and the External Research Grants Office by</u>:
   - Handling some important administrative tasks that could be done by an assistant, such as compliance-related record-keeping (tracking Conflict of Interest documentation, Responsible Conduct of Research documentation, and Time and Effort Reporting) as well as other administrative tasks such as tracking office activity and recovered indirect costs. These duties are provided in italics on the attached Preliminary Job Description, and take approximately 10% of the Director's time. (To be done proactively and comprehensively, these duties would take ~50% of the new person's time.)
   - Allowing the Director to take on more strategic activities, such as:
     - Meeting more consistently and proactively with faculty (ideally in their second year) to discuss the range of internal research funds available and to go over the internal and external grants process
     - Offering grant workshops more regularly, which can serve as a primer for faculty who wish to attend a well-regarded grant-writing workshop (see Recommended Initiative #7)
     - Prospecting proactively for faculty. (Currently individual prospecting is done at the request of a faculty member.) Our grants database, Pivot, makes recommendations for potential

funding sources for each faculty member at Colorado College, but this service is made much more effective if the Director has the time to review each of the recommendations for fit. (Ideally, the Director would focus on faculty in the fourth year of their sabbatical cycle, depending on whether or how our sabbatical policy changes.)

- Establishing written strategic plans for faculty after discussions of various projects and funding options.

- Improving the "Office's" web site, such as:
  - Uploading lists of past grant award winners on the "office" webpage, so that faculty who are exploring external grants may contact faculty who were successful with a particular funder.
  - Creating lists of potential funding opportunities on the "office" webpage using Pivot's "curated lists" feature
  - Developing an interactive/updated Fellowships List, perhaps using one of the following as a template:

    Mount Holyoke: https://www.mtholyoke.edu/sponsoredresearch/external_funding
    (See "Fellowship and Sabbatical Opportunities" document)
    Amherst: https://www.amherst.edu/offices/FCR/funding_opps/fellowship_table
    Oberlin:
    https://blackboard.oberlin.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp?tab_tab_group_id=_3_1&url=%2Fwebapps%2Fblackboard%2Fexecute%2FcourseMain%3Fcourse_id%3D_2674_1

- Giving more attention to the needs of students seeking to apply for nationally competitive scholarships. Due to time constraints, the Director of Faculty Research Support has provided minimal support for students seeking to apply for nationally competitive fellowships. Depending on whether this "office" continues to support student fellowships, a second person in this office could dedicate more time to supporting students by providing information about and helping them apply for nationally competitive fellowships; this could involve organizing events that discuss opportunities or that allow students to learn about key strategies for applying for these opportunities.

- Attending to small "fires" that arise so that the Director can remain focused on office priorities.

4) Address Key Person Dependency: Given the past history of close collaboration between the Director of Faculty Research Support and the Foundation and Corporate Relations, the Faculty Scholarship Action Team originally recommended that the DFRS and the Foundation Relations Office work more closely to ensure continued operations in the event of a vacancy in the DFRS position. While we still think that it is very important for these two areas to work closely together for a variety of reasons, we believe that the Foundation Relations Office would not be able to fully absorb and conduct the activities of the DFRS without the College's development efforts being compromised. Given that the College is about to embark on a significant fund-raising campaign, we do not recommend that the Foundation Relations Office be tasked with taking over the role of the DFRS in the event of a vacancy in the DFRS position; either faculty research grant support would suffer or the College's development efforts would suffer.

5) <u>Prevent Lost Revenue in Absence of DFRS:</u> The Director of Faculty Research Support position was created as a full-time position in August 2005. Over the five years prior to the position being established (2000 to 2005), an average of 7 faculty research grants were submitted each year, bringing in an average of $123,000 each year. From 2006 to 2013, an average of 26 faculty research grants were submitted each year, bringing in an average of ~$647,000 in awards each year. The position of DFRS was vacant from January 2008 through July 2008. During this six-month period *no applications* were submitted, and the awards brought in for the 2007-2008 academic year totaled $87,000. By addressing "key person dependency," the College could avoid a significant loss in grant research revenue during the position's vacancy.

6) <u>Support Dean's Office in Administration of Internal Research Grants</u>: The Dean's Office currently awards several grants that support research activity, including the Benezet Awards, the Mrachek Awards and the Dean's Summer Research Grants. While we do not propose that the method for awarding these grants change, it might be appropriate for this new position to assist with administering those funds. *Further discussions are necessary.*

7) <u>Support Collection and Distribution of Research-Related Data</u>: As noted in Recommended Initiative #9, there is a significant need for the collection of research-related data, including information on undergraduate student researchers each summer and faculty publications with student co-authors. The College is also moving toward being able to collect degree data from the National Student Clearinghouse. This information will be very helpful in preparing external grant submissions, particularly in the natural sciences. There will also be demand from departments who are not seeking external funding who are interested in various kinds of data. If the College does not have a better solution for addressing this need, this new position could facilitate data collection and its distribution to departments. *Further discussions are necessary*

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe that Recommended Initiative #4:

advances support for all disciplines – Because of this position, the Director will be able to provide more pre-award support to faculty from all disciplines who are exploring grant seeking, through workshops, prospecting in Pivot, and one-on-one consultations. This position will provide faculty from all disciplines (as well as their administrative assistants) with greater post-award support, ensuring strong grant management, and a better experience for faculty managing grants.

promotes collaboration – The person in this new position will work collaboratively with faculty, their assistants, Finance and Administration, the Director of Faculty Research Support, other members of the Dean's Office, and many others across the campus, to support the research environment at the College.

provides increased flexibility –   One of the goals of this position is to provide consistent, reliable support to faculty who are managing grants. This position will also manage the Sponsored Research Fund, ensuring that faculty who have applied for support receive notification (and access to any approved financial support) quickly. Our hope is that, by providing consistent, reliable support to faculty in these ways, this position will take tasks (and headaches) off of the plates of CC faculty, thereby providing them with the freedom and flexibility to attend to their research and teaching.

Recommended Initiative #5:
Establish an Advisory Committee for External Research Support

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **increases collaboration**

Concerns to be Addressed:

One of the primary responsibilities of the College in regards to external research funding is to remain in compliance with a variety of federal guidelines. While it is the job of the Director of Faculty Research Support to stay informed on various compliance issues and expectations, the Director would benefit significantly from faculty feedback on how best to implement changes on campus related to these compliance obligations; several policies have been drafted or revised, but they require thoughtful and informed faculty input before progress can be made. In addition, because policy changes that stem from federal requirements often have ripple effects for faculty who are not federally funded, and because many research-related policy changes require the vote of the faculty, it is important that faculty have a voice on an Advisory Committee and that all faculty are presented with proposed policy changes in faculty meetings, as appropriate. Without formal faculty input, the Director has experienced difficulty making progress on policy work, and hence few grant/compliance-related policies have been presented at faculty meetings in recent years.

In addition, we recommended making more transparent and explicit the availability of funding to support faculty research grant activities. We need a body of peers who will allocate this funding fairly, strategically, and in an expedient fashion.

Recommended Initiative #5: We recommend that the College establish an Advisory Committee for External Research Support (ACERS). This faculty committee, representative of each of the divisions and composed of faculty who are experienced in winning external research grants, would meet monthly to:

1) advise the Director on a variety of compliance issues and help develop and revise a number of compliance-related policies including policies on Outside Sources of Funding, Export Controls, Cost-Share and Matching, Time and Effort, and Financial Conflict of Interest (related to PHS funding). We anticipate that, in the next three years, the Advisory Committee would need to discuss and make progress on two to four policies each year, with one to two new or revised policies being presented at faculty meetings on an annual basis.

2) make awards to faculty (similar to Venture Grants) that support the development and competitiveness of external grant submissions (outlined in detail in Recommended Initiative #7). We are recommending that the College increase its investment in the College's Research Grant

Program (Pre-Award Support, Post-Award Support and Research Infrastructure) from approximately $46,000 to a total of $89,000 each year. Of the total budget, approximately $22,000 will be allocated to fixed annual costs that support "research grant infrastructure"; the remaining $67,000 will be awarded to faculty each year. Approximately $35,000 of this funding will be used to support matching grants to outgoing proposals; the remaining $32,000 will be awarded to faculty to support a variety of activities. (Details provided in Recommended Initiative #7.)

Appointments: Because faculty who have received funding, particularly federal funding, are most invested in ensuring that the College meets our compliance obligations, and because faculty who have received external funding are eager to support other faculty on their path to seeking external funding, we seek to appoint to the Advisory Committee faculty who have had experience applying for and/or receiving research funding. To ensure a diversity of opinions and perspectives, we would like the Committee to be a three-person board, representative of each of the divisions.

Budgetary Impact: *none*

Other Impact: Because of the expected workload (monthly meetings to consider proposals, policy review and revision), we would like for this committee to meet the faculty members' committee obligations.

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #5:

advances support for all disciplines – Each division will be represented on the Advisory Committee, and the funding allocation work of the Advisory Committee will support every discipline.

promotes collaboration – With its policy work, the Advisory Committee will facilitate collaboration on the College's approach to how we implement compliance-related policies. With its funding allocation work, the Advisory Committee will become better acquainted with and "invested in" the research (and research grant proposal work) of their fellow faculty members. We believe this will promote a greater sense of community among faculty.

Recommended Initiative #6:

Appoint Faculty Liaisons and Form a Faculty Network to Support Grant Activity

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concern to be Addressed: We believe some faculty may be hesitant to pursue external funding because they are unfamiliar with the process and have not had an opportunity to learn "the fundamentals" of grant preparation. While the Director of Faculty Research Support currently provides some "lessons in grant-writing" on an individual basis as she works with faculty on their submissions (and is hoping to hold more outreach events and workshops to provide this kind of background), we believe some faculty would appreciate being able to talk to and learn from faculty colleagues who have "been there." While this kind of information sharing and peer encouragement has certainly been present on campus in an informal way, we would like formalize it just enough so that the faculty who are interested in seeking external funding have peers whom they can approach, and faculty who are interested in supporting others in this pursuit have the support of the College.

Recommended Initiative #6: We recommend that the College take greater advantage of faculty who have been successful at winning external research grants by tasking the Advisory Committee with 1) appointing one faculty member per division to serve as a **faculty liaison** whose role would be to conduct outreach with faculty and encourage faculty, in a peer-to-peer manner, to pursue external funding, and 2) developing a network of **partner faculty** with a record of grant success to advise **new grant writers** (who have not yet won a major external research grant) on preparing specific proposals for submission. Because reading grant proposals can be incredibly valuable to faculty who may plan to seek external funding in the future, we would like to invite two or three other **faculty readers** to join in the discussion of the new grant writer's proposal.

Details regarding the two components of the initiative:

1. Given the differences in the nature of grant writing and the granting agencies in different divisions of the College, we envision three individuals, one from each division, who would work with departments and individual faculty to promote grant writing. The person might meet with departments, find out faculty members' level of interest, and then meet individually with faculty in a consulting capacity. The individuals chosen for the job should have a record of successful external grant funding and an interest in encouraging proposal writing. If the amount of time is significant, such a position could become a faculty member's committee work for the year. We could test out offering the position as a committee assignment in the Natural Science division, for which external grant writing is more common both in general and at CC.

2. We envision a network of faculty would provide support after the faculty liaison, described above, helps initiate the process of grant writing through encouragement and consultation. The network group would include the "partner" faculty member who is ultimately responsible for providing meaningful and detailed feedback on proposal drafts and guide new grant writers in crafting compelling and cogent grants through detailed discussion of arguments and hypotheses. We envision that this network could also include other "faculty readers" who are interested in being exposed to grant proposals in their division. New grant writers would be encouraged to approach a partner faculty member in the network, someone with whom they feel comfortable, in order to request help with a specific proposal. The partner faculty member would then invite other faculty readers to participate in the discussion, both to provide meaningful feedback on the grant proposal and to provide faculty readers with valuable exposure to grant proposals.

Budgetary Impact: *We anticipate needing three $1,500 "partner faculty" stipends each year. This request is incorporated into the budget request for Recommended Initiative #7. We do not request any honoraria for "faculty readers" as they will not bear the primary responsibility of providing feedback.*

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #6:

advances support for all disciplines – We would like for each division to have a faculty liaison; however it may make sense to initiate this program with the natural science division, for reasons described above.

promotes collaboration – The collaborative nature of this recommended initiative is its most important aspect. When faculty have participated in similar programs, they report feeling a greater connection to their colleagues. We believe the short-term benefit of this program is that it will help faculty win grants, but the longer-term, and perhaps more meaningful benefit is that faculty who are involved will feel a greater connection to colleagues across campus.

provides increased flexibility – This initiative provides faculty with another avenue by which to learn about the grant-writing process. We believe this added flexibility will be valuable to faculty.

Recommended Initiative #7:

Make Financial Support for External Research Grant Activity More Flexible and Accessible

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concern to Be Addressed: Each faculty member has individual needs regarding what kinds of investments would help them become better positioned to apply for and receive external research grant dollars. The goal of the Action Team's entire set of recommendations is to enhance the environment for external research grant activity at the College. The goals of this recommended initiative are 1) to address those needs that could benefit from specific financial investments in individual faculty and the College's "research infrastructure" as a whole and 2) to make availability of funding more transparent and readily accessible.

Recommended Initiative #7:

1) Each faculty member has individual needs regarding what would help them become better positioned to apply for and receive external research grant dollars. In the future, faculty are encouraged to discuss with the Director of Faculty Research Support (DFRS) what they view as hindrances to their applying for and/or receiving grant dollars. For investments of a modest nature (likely less than $1,000; amount to be set by the Advisory Committee for External Research Support), the DFRS should be empowered to address those needs individually whenever possible, while also being as strategic as possible. For investments of greater than $1,000 (for example), faculty should be encouraged to submit a proposal that will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee for External Research Support (Recommended Initiative #5).

2) The College should establish a Sponsored Research Fund, which will be a strategically managed by the Director of Faculty Research Support, with guidance from the Advisory Committee for External Research Support, to support the following three purposes: 1) to increase grant activity or make proposals more competitive, 2) to support faculty who have received grant funding (through matching grants, for example) and 3) to support the College's overall competitiveness for external funding through investments in the College's research environment. Proposals will be considered on a monthly basis in one of the following categories:

Category #1 (Pre-award Support) would support such needs/activities as:

1) travel support to meet with possible grant collaborators
2) travel and registration support to attend well-regarded grant-writing workshops (ideally sponsored by funders; see preliminary list of recommended workshops, **Attachment 7.1**)
3) stipends for faculty who have been successful in grant writing to serve as a mentor to other faculty who are applying (See "partner faculty" in Recommended Initiative #6)

4) other activities proposed by faculty that would enhance their competitiveness for external funding (faculty encouraged to discuss such possibilities with the Director of Faculty Research Support)

5) stipend support to work on institutional research grant applications.

Category #2 (Post-award Support*) would support such needs/activities as:

1) matching funds included as a required or voluntary match to a grant proposal

2) additional support for grant activity not included/allowed in the awarded budget but that would make the grant more competitive, such as a commitment from the College to purchase a certain instrument or provide access to a certain database if the grant is awarded

3) replacement salary to cover a course release funded by the College, often for administering major institutional grants (see Recommended Initiative #3)

4) other activities proposed by faculty that would support their successful completion of grant activity and hence enhance their competitiveness for future external funding (faculty should discuss such possibilities with the DFRS).

While faculty would not "see" support from above items 1 through 3 until the post-award phase, generally faculty will need to request this post-award support prior to grant submission. In this way, these demonstrations of post-award support will make proposals more competitive.

Category #3 (Infrastructure Support) would support such needs/activities as:

1) support for gatherings to discuss topics of importance to the College's research environment

2) other strategic uses that support the College's research environment and therefore makes us more competitive for external funding

The Sponsored Research Fund would also be used to support "infrastructure" costs, such as:

3) the College's annual subscription to the grants database, Pivot

4) the College's annual summer research lunch series

5) expenses incurred to address the College's Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) training and other compliance-related costs (See Recommended Initiative #9)

Rationale: All resources noted above should be viewed as an investment in bringing in additional external research grant dollars. Some funds will be used to position faculty to be more competitive for grant dollars. Some funds will be used to educate faculty on how to prepare a competitive proposal. Some funds will be used to "incentivize" faculty to write institutional grant proposals that wouldn't otherwise be written. Some funds will be used to meet the College's required matching obligations; some funds will be used to demonstrate the College's voluntary commitment to a sponsored project. The goal is to encourage faculty to discuss with the DFRS ways that the College could invest in them so as to better position them to apply for and/or receive grant dollars.

Summary of Current Budget Allocations:

- **Pre-award Support**: The College currently allots $10,000 annually to support pre-award activity. This fund has not been used regularly in recent years. $6000 used in 2014. Current annual total: $10,000.
- **Post-award Support**: The College currently allots $25,000 annually to support matching funds. We used all $25,000 in 2012-2013; we will use all $25,000 in 2013-2014; we are on track to use all $25,000 in 2014-15. Current annual total: $25,000
- **Infrastructure for Research Grants**: The College currently invests in the following activities from a variety of funds, including the Dean's Office operating budget, the primary indirect cost fund and the spendable indirect cost fund: professional memberships and conferences for the DFRS, RCR training, miscellaneous office expenditures, the new grants database, preparing the indirect cost rate proposal every four years, and the annual summer research lunch series. Current annual total: $10,775
Current Investment* in Research Grant Program: $45,775

Summary of Budget Projections for **Enhanced Research Grant Program** (Details on next page):

- **Pre-award Support**: The College currently allots $10,000 annually to support pre-award activity. *We believe anticipated activity will require an **additional $10,000** annually*. Annual total: $20,000.
- **Post-award Support**: The College currently allots $25,000 annually to support matching grants. *Because we anticipate an increase in grant activity, we believe anticipated activity (both matching grants and other post-award activity) will require an **additional $20,000** annually to support post-award activity.* Annual total: $45,000
- **Infrastructure for Research Grants**: *We propose a **net increase of $13,225** to support some enhanced aspects of the College's research infrastructure*, including budgeting $4,000 a year for the indirect cost rate proposal that is submitted every four years, 2) budgeting $2,000 for the annual summer research lunch series, 3) budgeting $2,000 to allocate to faculty proposals in support of Category #3 (see detailed projections next page), 4) budgeting $1,300 more in support of compliance-related training (see Recommended Initiative #9), and 5) budgeting $400 more for more trainings or on-campus workshops. We are also budgeting $3,500 in support of the new grants database; currently the Dean's Office and the Library split the cost of the database, but we would like to budget for the entire database in case the Library is not able to continue to contribute. The College has been spending this money, but this Recommended Initiative formalizes these costs into a research grant program budget. While these costs have been supported by different funds, we believe that moving forward it makes sense for these costs to be deducted from one fund (the new Sponsored Research Fund). Current investment of $10,775 plus an increase of $13,225 combine for $24,000 in support of the College's research grants infrastructure: Annual total: $24,000

Proposed Net Increase in the College's Investment in Research Grant Program: $43,225
Proposed Annual Investment* in Enhanced Research Grant Program: $89,000
*For the purposes of this discussion, we have not included all of the ways the College invests in research (such as salary & benefits for the DFRS, sabbaticals, conference travel, & internal funds that support research; report on these sources is available)

Detail on Projected Financial Resources Needed to Support Enhanced Research Grant Activity

Category #1 (Pre-Award Support):

Anticipated Annual Need

Travel support – Air ($300), hotel ($300), incidentals ($200) = $800 each x 3 per year =	$2,400
Grant workshops – Air (300), registration ($500), incidentals ($200) = $1,300 x 3/year =	$3,900
Stipends for partner faculty (Rec. #6) – $1,500 each x 3 per year =	$4,500
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$5,200
Stipend Support to Write Instit. Research Grant – $8,000 per stipend every other year=	$4,000
Subtotal:	**$20,000**

Current Annual Funding for Pre-Award Activity

"Incentive for Grant Awardees" Fund (to be moved into Sponsored Research Fund)	-$10,000
Difference (New Funding Needed Annually)	**$10,000**

Category #2 (Post-Award Support):

Anticipated Annual Need

Matching Funds (required) – 2 proposals x $10,000 each =	$20,000
Matching Funds (voluntary) – 2 proposals x $7,500 each =	$15,000
Replacement Salary to Support CC-funded Course Release – $5,000 x 1 per year	$5,000
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$5,000
Subtotal:	**$45,000**

Current Annual Funding for Post-Award Activity

"Matching Grant" Fund (to be moved into Sponsored Research Fund)	-$25,000
Difference (New Funding Needed Annually)	**$20,000**

Category #3 (Infrastructure Support):

Anticipated Annual Need

Pivot Database Subscription (up from $3,500, to budget for entire cost)	$8,500
Consultant to Prepare Indirect Cost Rate Proposal (~$16K every four years)	$4,000
RCR training/compliance (up from $1,200)	$2,500
Professional Development/Conferences for DFRS & Support Person (Rec. #4)	$3,000
Annual Summer Lunch Series	$2,000
Institutional memberships (ICO) and Individual memberships (NCURA)	$1,700
Office Expenditures, ie, lunches, smaller workshops, etc. (up from $500)	$800
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$1,500
Subtotal:	**$24,000**

Current Annual Funding for Infrastructure Support

(No formal allotment, but these costs have been supported by Dean's Office and recovered Indirect Cost funds)	- $10,775
Difference (New Funding Needed Annually)	**$13,225**
Total Annual Funding Needed to Support Enhanced Faculty Research Grant Activity:	**$89,000**
Total New Annual Funding Needed to Support Faculty Research Grant Activity:	**$43,225**

A Strategic Use of Indirect Costs to Launch our Enhanced Research Grant Program

We propose to make more strategic use of our recovered Facilities and Administration ("F&A") Costs, more commonly referred to as "indirect costs" (also "overhead") to fund an enhanced Research Grant Program. Below we provide background on how these funds come to the College.

Background on Facilities and Administration Costs (more commonly known as Indirect Costs):
Institutions that accept research grants also take on other "hidden" costs in order to support that research, both to house the research and to administer the research funding. Most federal funders recognize that these are reals costs that are tied to research, and they provide "F&A" or indirect costs at a rate that is based on the "direct costs" of the grant. (For a more detailed background on F&A costs and on how this rate is determined, please see **Attachment 7.2**.) The College's rate as of July 1, 2006 was 36.0% and the College's rate as of July 1, 2010 was 39.0%.

A Brief History of F&A Cost Recovery
Since 2008, the College has billed federal funders for a total of $377,000 ($11K in 08-09, $71K in 09-10, $94K in 10-11, $57K in 11-12, $71K in 12-13, and $72K to date in 13-14) in Facilities and Administration Costs. Based on the College's 2007 "IDC Reallocation Policy" (**Attachment 7.3**), each July 25% of recovered funds from the previous fiscal year (housed temporarily in the "Primary Indirect Cost Fund" (1100002-130004) are moved to general revenue and 75% are moved to a "Spendable Indirect Cost Fund" (110002-140009). Because the recovered IDC for the current fiscal year ($72K to date) will not be reallocated until early July 2014, ~75% of $300,000 has been moved into the Spendable Indirect Costs Fund (minus funds to cover grant overspending and the 2009 IDC rate proposal; see Section #1 of Attachment 7.4), for a total of $214,124 that has been moved into the Spendable Indirect Cost Fund since 2008.   A total of $42K has been spent from the fund (Section #2 of **Attachment 7.4**) which leaves ~ $180,000 in the fund as of March 14, 2014.

Encumbrances to the Spendable Indirect Cost Fund
The College has encumbered $83K in the Spendable Indirect Cost Fund through the remainder of the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the majority of which is a $64K commitment to supplement the Kresge Fund based on more requests this year than can be accommodated by available funding. By June 30, 2014, there will be just under $100,000 in the Spendable Indirect Cost Fund.

Projected Revenue from Indirect Costs
Over the next four years CC will be receiving an average of $66K annually in recovered indirect costs *from already-funded grants*. New, as yet unfunded grants will increase this average by an amount that is difficult to predict. That said, there are currently four proposals that requested indirect costs that have been submitted and are currently being reviewed. If all were to be funded, they would increase the annual average of indirect costs to $170,000 over the next four years. (See IDC projection, **Attachment 7.5**.)

Proposed Funding Plan

Proposed Revenue Sources to Support Enhanced Research Grant Program

	Existing Resources	Current Fund Number	Additional Resources	Proposed Source for Additional Funding	Total Resources
Pre-Award Activities	$10,000	110002-140011	$10,000	110002-140009	$20,000
Post-Award Activities	$25,000	141062-140001	$20,000	110002-140009	$45,000
Research Infrastructure	$10,775	110002-140009*	$13,225	110002-140009	$24,000
		(*plus Dean's Operating)			
	$45,775		**$43,225**		**$89,000**

<u>Proposed Use of Recovered Indirect Costs</u>: Currently about $10,775 of the recovered indirect costs are spent on Research Infrastructure annually. We propose to use an additional $43,225 more of the recovered indirect costs to fund our enhanced research program, for a total of $54,000 each year from indirect costs. **We propose amending the Indirect Cost Reallocation Policy (see Attachment 7.3) on a four- to five-year trial basis so that each July $54,000 in recovered indirect costs from the previous academic year be moved into the new Sponsored Research Fund, together with the $10,000 and $25,000 noted in the table above, for a total annual budget of $89,000 in the Sponsored Research Fund.**

<u>Maintenance of Spendable Indirect Costs Fund as a Reserve</u>
As noted above on page 5, there will be ~ $100,000 remaining in the Spendable Indirect Costs Fund by summer 2014. It is very important for the research grant program, specifically the Advisory Committee for External Research Support, to maintain access to this funding in the event there is a need for a large match to a research grant that cannot be covered by the proposed level of annual grant matching funding ($35,000). For example, the College proposed a $100,000 cash match to our 2011 proposal to the Howard Hughes Medical Institute – and a similar match may be needed in our 2015 proposal to HHMI. Such a reserve will ensure that the College (specifically, the Advisory Committee) is not forced to choose between supporting (with matching funds) either one major proposal or several smaller, but equally important proposals. **As long as the Advisory Committee for External Research Funding can maintain access to the ~$100,000 in the Spendable Indirect Costs Fund as a reserve, then we would propose that any recovered IDC over $54,000 from the previous academic year be moved into general revenue each July.** We have not yet included in our budget an amount to replenish the reserve; we will likely need to adjust our budget once an appropriate amount has been identified by the Advisory Committee.

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #7:

advances support for all disciplines – All disciplines will benefit from an additional financial support, as described above. Faculty from all disciplines will be encouraged to benefit from attending grant writing workshops, traveling to meet with collaborators, etc.

promotes collaboration – Some of the funding will support faculty who need to meet with collaborators in order to discuss a grant proposal. Some of the funding will support matches to collaborative proposals. Some of the funding will support conference travel for the DFRS, which supports her professional connections and facilitates collaborative efforts with peer institutions.

provides increased flexibility –   This initiative encourages faculty to discuss their own individual needs with the DRFS so that she can better address the needs of faculty seeking to apply for and receive external research funding. In addition, we have proposed that each category of funding from the Sponsored Research Fund allow for proposals that have not been explicitly outlined in this initiative, so as to ensure that we encourage a wide range of proposals, and hence provide the most flexibility possible to faculty.

Recommended Initiative #8:

Assess and Allocate (or Raise) Resources Needed for Equipment Purchases and Maintenance (to Include Resources Needed for Competitive Start-up Packages in the Natural Sciences)

- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concerns to Be Addressed:

Research in the natural sciences can be disproportionately costly compared to research in the humanities and social sciences. While the Action Team has strived to identify initiatives that will reap benefits for all disciplines, there is no escaping that, in order for our colleagues in the natural sciences to succeed in their research, they need access to state-of-the-art equipment that is well maintained. We have the following concerns related to funding for our natural science faculty's research equipment:

Concern #1: We are not taking full advantage of the one external funding source available for major research equipment grants: the National Science Foundation's Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) program. In the last 10 years, only five MRI proposals have been submitted (three funded, one declined, one pending), although each institution is allowed to submit up to two in each (now annual) cycle.

Concern #2: Anecdotal evidence suggests that Colorado College's start-up packages, particularly in the sciences, are not competitive with our peer (or aspirational) colleges. We understand the College is already conducting an in-depth analysis of this issue, which we applaud.

Concern #3: Based on its spending history, the Kresge Endowment has spent about 65% of its payout to support equipment maintenance. While equipment maintenance is critical, we are concerned that this was not the intended purpose of the Kresge Endowment. The summary of our 1994 proposal stated: "A Science Initiatives challenge grant from the Kresge Foundation provides timely support for Colorado College to build on its excellent facilities and science program by acquiring new equipment and providing for its maintenance and eventual replacement."   A 1998 memo summarized how the endowment should be used: "With this program, Kresge expects overall improvement and enhancement of our science equipment resources. They do not want us to merely use these new funds to substitute for what the college might otherwise have spent to maintain the status quo of five years ago."

Concern #4: In order to achieve our mission to provide the best liberal arts education in the country, we need to ensure that our students are exposed to state-of-the-art research equipment in the classroom and laboratory. Unfortunately, there are virtually no granting agencies that support classroom equipment any longer; educational institutions are expected to take the lead in making those investments.

Recommended Initiative #8: We recommend that the College embark on the following related activities to improve its equipment infrastructure:

1) **We need to encourage faculty to submit more MRI proposals.**

   Like all grant-writing, applying for an MRI is a bit of a gamble; funding rates have generally declined since 2005 from 33% to 22%. It's understandable that faculty, already pressed for time, would not want to invest time in preparing a proposal with a somewhat limited chance of success; they might prefer to "make do" with the equipment they have in order to collect some publishable data. However MRI awards can provide significant support to our faculty's research agendas – and may ultimately save the College a substantial amount of money.

   Because NSF has imposed a limit of no more than two MRI acquisition proposals per institution in each grant cycle, we propose that the Advisory Committee review abbreviated proposals (likely three months before NSF's annual deadline) from all interested faculty to identify the two proposals that will be put forward. (Some years, this may be only one.) We also propose that there be a trial period of perhaps four to five years during which faculty who prepare an MRI be awarded a $4,000 "incentive grant" upon submission of their MRI proposal.

   Budgetary Impact: $4,000 - $8,000 each year.

2) **We need to assure faculty that the College will support MRI-funded equipment with maintenance support.**

   Some faculty may be reluctant to apply to the MRI program for better equipment because they are concerned — and justifiably so — that additional equipment will bring additional costs to the College through ongoing maintenance contracts and the time associated with CC personnel (themselves and others) needing to tend to the equipment. As part of the proposal preparation process, faculty have needed to request – and obtain – from the College long-term support for the equipment. This may present an additional headache that further deters faculty from applying for MRIs.

   Because MRI grants are funded based on the strength of the proposed research that will require the equipment, an MRI award demonstrates the science community's support of the proposed research. We propose that the College commit to funding the ongoing maintenance associated with any equipment funded by an MRI grant.

   Budgetary Impact: The costs of ongoing service contracts will vary considerably based on the kind of equipment proposed. The lower end of service contracts is $2,000 to

$5,000 per year. The costs of service contracts for sophisticated equipment can easily fall between $10,000 and $15,000 each year. If we submit two MRI proposals each year and one is funded each year, we could expect an increase of approximately $10,000 each year. The impact is cumulative: estimated costs of $10,000 after one year, $20,000 after two, etc.

3) **We should ensure Colorado College has our own resources in the event that MRI proposals are not funded.**

NSF funds 20% of proposals overall, and the MRI program's recent funding rates have been comparable (18% - 22%). While we have a strong record of securing the MRI proposals we have submitted (3 funded out of 5 submitted during the last 10 years), we cannot rely on it exclusively to support our faculty's equipment needs. We need to ensure that adequate resources exist to support the purchase of state-of-the-art equipment for faculty research – and the associated training of undergraduates in state-of-the-art equipment that accompanies faculty research.

We propose that the College consider raising equipment funding that is tied to faculty research grant applications in the following ways:

Track #1: Funding is tied to MRI applications. Faculty who apply for an MRI become eligible for this new source of internal equipment support in the event the faculty member does not receive the MRI award. The Advisory Committee will determine which equipment is funded based on the merits of the MRI proposals, the NSF reviewers' comments, and availability of funding.

Track #2: Funding is tied to other kinds of research grant proposals, either as voluntary or required matching funds for equipment. For example, there will be instances in which a certain kind of equipment is needed in order to perform the proposed research effectively; however, the College does not yet own the needed equipment. The grant proposal would be made more competitive by indicating that the needed equipment will be purchased if the research proposal is funded. This kind of commitment is considered a voluntary (but legally binding) match to the proposal.

Budgetary Impact: Projections are difficult, given that the costs of equipment can vary so substantially. We estimate that $50,000 annually would be a conservative estimate.

4) **We should reassess the College's reliance on the Kresge Endowment to pay for equipment maintenance.**

With Kresge funding being used predominantly to support maintenance, the College should consider how we can adjust spending on this fund to better meet the original intent of the Kresge grant.

Because equipment maintenance is and will remain a pressing need, we propose that the College identify as a goal the need to shift the allocation between maintenance and new equipment to closer to 50%-50% (down from an historic allocation of 65% for maintenance and 35% for new equipment). The College will need to engage in discussions beyond the scope of our Action Team on how best to meet this goal.

Budgetary Impact: The College has historically directed 65% of the annual payout for the Kresge Endowment toward equipment maintenance. This means, on average, $78,000 of the endowment has supported equipment maintenance. If this shifts to no more than 50%, the amount available for equipment maintenance will decrease from $78,000 to $60,000, a reduction of $18,000.

5) **We should raise additional resources to make our start-up packages more competitive.**

We understand that the College is currently examining this issue in a comprehensive way. We anticipate that this study will reveal that the College could invest further in start-up packages, particularly in the sciences, in order to be more competitive.

We urge the College to do whatever is necessary to ensure that we are able to offer more competitive start-up packages. By investing in more competitive start-up packages, the College will both attract the best possible candidates and give our new faculty the best possible start to their careers. Given heightened expectations related to publishing, we need to ensure the College has the resources necessary to support the equipment needs of our new natural science faculty. After all, they need equipment to be able to demonstrate promising preliminary results, which in turn makes them more competitive for external research funding.

Budgetary Impact: As this depends considerably on the analysis of the start-up packages at other institutions, we cannot project the budgetary impact at this time.

6) **We should raise additional funding for our science program more generally – to support such things as student stipends, faculty stipends, supplies and new equipment in the classroom – to make us more competitive for external research grants.**

Both the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health recognize that funding directed to faculty at small educational institutions can have a significant impact on our ability to attract and retain talented students in the sciences. They know that a disproportionately high number of our graduates get a PhD in the sciences, and therefore small liberal arts colleges are an excellent investment. But they also want to know that the institutions they are funding are equally committed to investing in that

training by raising and allocating resources for classroom equipment, summer research stipends, research equipment and maintenance.

We propose that the College engage in a comprehensive assessment of funding needs to support such areas as:
- Classroom equipment in the sciences
- Student stipends (assessment could include students from all disciplines)
- Faculty stipends to support mentoring students during the summer (all disciplines)
- Summer Research programming (all disciplines, all students on campus)

A strong investment in these areas demonstrates to federal funders that Colorado College is committed to providing our students with an excellent education in the sciences and will make our applications for research funding more competitive.

Budgetary Impact: As this depends considerably on the proposed assessment of funding needs, we cannot project the budgetary impact at this time.

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #8:

promotes collaboration – Research in the sciences is, by its very nature, highly collaborative. Our investments in the sciences will support numerous collaborations, both between faculty at CC, between a CC faculty member and faculty at other institutions, and between our faculty and our students. In addition, MRI proposals are almost always collaborative in nature because usually at least two or three faculty would benefit from a particular instrument. These faculty work closely together both in preparing the grant proposal and, if funded, in sharing time on the instrument.

provides increased flexibility –   Natural science faculty spend a considerable amount of time pulling together various funding resources in order to conduct their research. To the extent that an increase in resources makes conducting research easier (perhaps they will be able to apply to fewer sources for support; perhaps their research will be more efficient due to better equipment), we believe this recommendation will provide increased flexibility for our natural science faculty.

Recommended Initiative #9:

Invest in Technological Support Structures to Enhance Research Environment

- **advances support for all disciplines**
- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concern to Be Addressed: Our research grant program currently does not take advantage of some technological advances and services that would make certain aspects of our operations more efficient or more robust.

Recommended Initiative #9: Various aspects of research grant activity can be improved by a judicious investment in technological services geared toward supporting the research environment. In November the College invested in the premier grant database, Pivot, using funding from recovered indirect costs. We recommend that the College invest in other technological services to augment our research grant activity. The following three services are our top priorities.

1. **Banner Grants Module**.   Improving post-award management has been a key focus of our Action Team, and we believe that investing in a grants management software package will have a significant, positive impact on the College's ability to manage existing grants. There are a variety of software programs that can assist with grants management, both on the pre-award side and the post-award side. These include products by Sage, RE, Streamlink (Amplifund), Capital Management Group (Grant Maximizer), and Banner. Because Banner offers a grants management module as part of its services at no additional annual cost, the Finance Office has chosen to move forward with Banner's grants module; we know we would have no compatibility issues and the price is attractive.

It is important to note that, based on comments on the professional list-serve for research grant administrators ("CLASP"), we are confident that we will be satisfied with the services and functionality of the Banner Grants Module. On the pre-award side, features include the ability to save final documents to the system and the ability to create budget line-items. On the post-award side, features include 1) a full data repository of each grant in the system, 2) the importation of salary information from the HR/payroll system, 3) the ability to create and assign reimbursement line items, 4) ability to create budget tracking reports, 5) the ability to import actual spending from Banner, and 6) the ability to create grant status reports.

Budgetary Impact: The College has not yet implemented the Banner Grants Module for two key reasons: 1) There is a cost associated with implementing the grants module: We will need to hire a consultant to work with members of Finance on implementing the module (we will need guidance on how to populate certain fields, for example). 2) Once integrated into Banner, key members will need to invest a fair amount of time to learn the module's capabilities. **The one-time cost of the consultant and associated training has been estimated at $30,800 based on an estimated 140 hours of work.**

2. **Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative:** The issue of compliance is an increasingly important aspect of maintaining our ability to apply for and receive funding. The federal government, and specific federal agencies, continue to heighten their expectations regarding grantees' policies and procedures pertaining to grant activity. For example, in October 2009, NSF published its implementation of Section 7009 of the America COMPETES Act regarding Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) — namely that proposals submitted after January 4, 2010 needed to include a certification that the proposing institution had an RCR plan in place that met certain requirements. Colorado College's plan requires that any student receiving a stipend from a federal grant must have RCR training – and, per NSF, we must have documentation that this training takes place.

To meet this requirement, for the last four summers we have directed student researchers to take the relatively low-cost online RCR training offered by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). (See https://www.citiprogram.org/)   The number of students required to take this training has ranged from 11 to 17 in each of the last four years; the Director of Faculty Research Support (DFRS) has worked with each student individually to ensure that they are registered with CITI, that they complete their training, and that they (and the DFRS) will receive the "completion report" documenting the training.

Reasons for Becoming a "Subscribing Institution":

Financial: During the first year of meeting the RCR requirement (2010), "independent learners" (individual students) could access online RCR training for free. However, as of August 2013, the cost has increased to $100 per student. If we make no changes in how we address the RCR requirement, we can expect to spend at least $1,500 each year on RCR training. (RCR training can NOT be added to a grant budget; therefore the College must pick up this cost.) This figure will only rise as the number of federal grants supporting research (and student researchers) increases. Moreover, private funders are increasingly interested in seeing that their funded students receive training in the ethical conduct of research. **In a few years' time, we are likely to be spending $2,000 on RCR alone.**

Additional Training Content: CITI provides online training in a number of other areas of research compliance, including Animal Care and Use (see Recommended Initiative #10), Conflict of Interest, Export Controls, Biosafety and Biosecurity, and Human Subjects Research. **For $2,500 annually, CC could become a "subscribing organization" to CITI.** As a subscribing institution, we would have access to nearly all of CITI's training content, and we could customize trainings for certain learner groups. Currently the following institutions are subscribers: Allegheny, Amherst, Bates, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Grinnell, Pomona, Macalester, William and Mary, Wake Forest, and Williams.

While "homegrown" training would be preferable to online training, the Action Team anticipates that the College would not be able to develop and provide trainings in all of the following areas that we should be providing – namely Animal Care and Use, Conflict of Interest, Export Controls, and Biosafety and Biosecurity. (Amanda Udis-Kessler is developing a strong training module for Human Subjects Research). Therefore, CITI membership offers a useful service at a competitive price.

Budgetary Impact: Current annual cost: ~$1,500. Annual cost as a subscribing institution: $2,500.

3. **National Student Clearinghouse's Student Tracker**: The College has a long history of working with National Student Clearinghouse (NSCH). Specifically, the Admission Office has used its services since 2010 to identify where applicants to CC decide to matriculate. NSCH's Student Tracker Service also includes a feature called Degree Verify that would provide information on the post-graduate degrees obtained by Colorado College graduates. This kind of information is increasingly critical to the competitiveness of external grants, particularly in the sciences. Both federal and private funders of the sciences seek information on graduates who go on to earn Masters and PhDs in the sciences, and some funders (eg., Merck AAAS, Beckman Foundation, Howard Hughes Medical Institute) seek very detailed information about these graduates (including gender/ethnicity information and career path information). While individual faculty often remain in contact with alumni, and some science departments find a way to track some of this information on their own, the information tracked is not consistent between faculty or departments, is not always updated in "real time" based on contact from those alumni, does not capture all of the information that external funders usually request, and is not easily accessible. (It should be noted that when Megan Nicklaus, the Director of the Career Center, first joined the College in the summer of 2013, she met individually with many departments across the College; in virtually every meeting, she was asked if she could help them obtain graduate degree information.)

The College is moving toward using Degree Verify. Enterprise Information Systems and the Registrar's Office (specifically, Vish Paradkar and Phil Apodaca) have been testing the process to ensure that our Degree Verify data requests will be compatible with NSCH's system. Once this capability is confirmed, however, there is will be a need for a significant collaboration among members of Advancement, Admissions, the Career Center, the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, ITS, the Dean's Office and the academic departments to both obtain useful data from NSCH and make it easily accessible to interested parties.

Budget Impact: While Degree Verify is a free service (we receive degree information as long as we are providing NSCH with information on who receives a degree from CC), there will be a need for the College to allocate appropriate staff time in ITS and constituent offices in order to take advantage of this service.

**Related Data Collection Issue**: In addition to seeking degree data on our graduates, external funders are also keenly interested in the nature of our student research environment. Specifically, our applications for external funding would be made more competitive if we captured better, more consistent, more reliable, more easily accessible data on our student research environment, such as how many students are conducting natural science research each summer, how many faculty are mentoring these students, how many student-coauthored papers appeared in peer-reviewed journals, what the researchers' class years are, how many engage in more than one research opportunity before graduation, what their gender and ethnicity are, etc. It would also be very useful if the information on our student researchers was tied more explicitly to the internal funding sources that supported them, so that we could describe to funders with greater confidence the extent of the College's existing financial commitments to student research. Improved internal access to this data would also be very helpful.

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #9:

advances support for all disciplines – All disciplines will benefit from easily accessible financial information, easily accessible training on compliance issues, and easily accessible graduate information on our alumni.

promotes collaboration – Successfully implementing all three of these services will require a high degree of collaboration among departments across campus.
- Implementing the Banner Grants Module will require collaboration among Advancement (both Advancement Services and the Foundation Relations Office), Finance, the Dean's Office (DFRS), and the consultant.
- Taking advantage of a CITI membership will require collaboration among members of the Dean's Office (Director of Assessment and Program Review, DFRS), the President's Office (Chief of Staff, Internal Auditor), and numerous individual faculty applying for or managing active grants.
- As noted above, in order to take full advantage of Degree Verify, there will be a need for significant collaboration among members of Advancement, Admissions, the Career Center, the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness, the Dean's Office and the academic departments. Similarly, the collection other useful research-related data as noted above will also require a high degree of collaboration.

provides increased flexibility –
- Once faculty are trained on using the Banner Grants Module, it should make accessing their grant information and understanding their grant finances much easier. To the extent that this saves time, it will also increase flexibility.
- Obtaining a CITI membership will allow the College to obtain access to training in a much wider range of topics. To the extent that access to CITI allows us to provide necessary compliance training (while we perhaps consider developing our own "homegrown" forms of training), the CITI membership will provide needed flexibility.
- By pursuing a more consistent (and perhaps centralized) approach to obtaining Degree Verify data, we will hopefully take the burden off of individual faculty who are tracking this information for their own students. To the extent that this saves them time and concern, it will provide increased flexibility.

Recommended Initiative #10:

Support the Creation of an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)

- **promotes collaboration**
- **provides increased flexibility**

Concerns to Be Addressed:

1) *We currently have between six and eight faculty for whom an IACUC is necessary if they are to apply for federal funding. (See "Context" below.)*
2) *Having an IACUC is now a matter of standard practice at small liberal arts colleges. By not having an operational IACUC, we appear either behind the times or unethical (or both) to both colleagues and potential hires.*

Context: [From Wikipedia, with apologies] "Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees are of central importance to the application of laws to animal research in the United States. Most research involving laboratory animals is funded by the National Institutes of Health or other federal agencies. The NIH Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare has been directed by law to develop policies that describe the role of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees. ….. Every institution that uses animals for federally funded laboratory research must have an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Each local IACUC reviews research protocols and conducts evaluations of the institution's animal care and use, which includes the results of inspections of facilities that are required by law."

Rationale: Establishing an IACUC takes time and, to a certain extent, money. Time is needed in order to understand fully the Public Health Service (PHS) Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (a 20-pg document), as well as the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (a 250-page document). Time is needed to recruit a five-person Committee with the appropriate profile/credentials and a willingness to commit to membership. Time is needed to draft an "Assurance" (documenting that we have an IACUC, who the members are, how they were identified, how often they meet, how often they conduct facility inspections, etc.) that meets PHS guidelines. (Our Assurance needs to be approved by, and filed with, the Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare.) Time is also needed to determine how laboratory facilities need to be updated to meet PHS guidelines; time would also be needed to make the appropriate improvements.

Because the faculty member with the most at stake (Lori Driscoll) has been chair for the last three years, time has, to date, been particularly difficult to obtain. She is concluding her term as chair this spring, and is committed to working on this issue with increased focus this summer. Because Krista Fish has submitted a collaborative proposal for NSF funding (and IACUC approval will be needed prior to accepting funding), she is also highly motivated to work on this issue with Lori.

Recommended Initiative #10: We recommend that the College fully support the efforts of Lori Driscoll and Krista Fish to establish an IACUC in the next 6 to 12 months.

Budgetary Impact:
- The Dean's Office has already agreed to use the Spendable Indirect Cost Fund to support the time that Lori and Krista will invest this summer in the administrative aspects of launching an IACUC.
- There may be costs associated with changing the laboratories to meet specific guidelines. This could be minimal, or **it could cost as much as $20,000.** We will not know more until Lori and Krista have been able to spend dedicated time researching this aspect of the guidelines and comparing them to our current facilities. We recommend that the College support the modification of the laboratories to whatever extent is needed.
- There is an annual conference, dubbed "IACUC 101," that provides very useful information to institutions in the early phases of establishing their IACUCs. The College should send at least one person to attend the next IACUC 101. **One-time cost: $2,000**
- There are likely costs associated with ongoing IACUC training. If the College pursues a membership with CITI (See Recommended Initiative #9), then an additional cost to the College may be minimal, as CITI offers Animal Care training. We will not know about training requirements associated with maintaining our IACUC committee until Lori and Krista have been able to spend dedicated time researching this aspect of the guidelines. If we are not able to use CITI, then it's likely to cost between **$1,000 and $2,000 annually for training.**
- There may be other minimal costs associated with maintaining an IACUC, such as a modest annual stipend to the veterinarian who is required to be a member of the 5-member committee. **Modest annual stipends of $500-$1000** are not uncommon among our peers, depending on a variety of factors.

Anticipated annual costs: $500-$3,000 for vet honorarium and potential training costs.
Anticipated one-time costs: $2,000 - $22,000 for IACUC 101 and potential facilities upgrades

---

Illustrating Success and Progress:

From the Faculty Scholarship Action Team charge: "The ideas brought forward, in order to illustrate success and progress on the initiative, should advance the support for all disciplines, promote collaboration, and provide increased flexibility for faculty who wish to seek external funding."

We believe Recommended Initiative #10:

promotes collaboration – As noted, having an IACUC makes it possible for our faculty to apply for federal funds. To the extent that such eligibility makes our faculty able to pursue collaborative research with colleagues at other institutions, then this initiative promotes collaboration.

provides increased flexibility – To the extent that such eligibility provides our faculty with the option to apply for funding whenever they are interested in pursuing such funding, then this initiative promotes flexibility.

Recommended Initiative #1

Middlebury College's Language on Evaluation of Scholarship

c. Evaluation of Scholarship

A candidate's scholarship or artistic production is considered in terms of activity and of achievement.

Scholarly activity represents a pattern of related professional involvements, which may include: research and experimentation; writing, analyzing, creating; presentations to peers or to the public; responsible roles in professional organizations; visiting professorships; applying for and receiving outside grants and fellowships; and developing new fields of expertise.

Scholarly achievement is the result of that activity, primarily as evidenced in work that has been (a) performed, executed, or published (as original research communicated to specialists or as the synthesis and interpretation of scholarly material for a more general audience), and (b) recognized as being of significantly high quality by scholars and artists within the broader academic community beyond Middlebury College.

Evaluation is undertaken by colleagues and by other appropriate professionals in the candidate's field. In reviews for tenure and for full professor (not required for faculty who were awarded tenure prior to 2011), scholars from outside the College will be asked to judge the candidate's scholarship. Evaluators will be supplied with the *Handbook* description of the scholarly activity and achievement appropriate to the review in question and will be asked to evaluate it on that basis. *[updated Jan. 7, 2011]*

Benefits for Faculty while on Leave

Attachment 2.1

Benefit	Paid Leave	Unpaid Leave
Medical	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	Benefits continue if paid solely by faculty member. Payments processed through COBRA vendor plus 2% admin fees
Dental	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	Benefits continue if paid solely by faculty member. Payments processed through COBRA vendor plus 2% admin fees
Vision	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	Benefits continue if paid solely by faculty member. Payments processed through COBRA vendor plus 2% admin fees
Flexible Spending Account	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	Contributions stop. Benefit may be used with on existing balance. Faculty may elect to fun entire plan year amount which must be contributed prior to the LWOP.
Basic Life	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	CONFIRMING WITH VENDOR
Optional Life	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	Contributions stops because no wages are being earned with the college.
Accidental Death & Dismemberment	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	CONFIRMING WITH VENDOR
Long Term Disability	Continue as usual with payroll deductions for any premium cost	CONFIRMING WITH VENDOR
Workers' Compensation	Stops *	No coverage
Retirement Contributions - mandatory	Continue	Contributions stop because no wages are being earned with the college to deduct contributions.
Retirement Contributions - voluntary	Continue	Contributions stop because no wages are being earned with the college.
Emeriti	Continue	Contributions stop because no wages are being earned with the college.
Tuition Assistance Program	Continue	Benefits will continue for the remainder of the semester that had been approved. Thereafter tuition benefits will not be available while in an unpaid leave status.
Other voluntary plans (llegal, auto, long-term care, etc.)	Continue	Contributions stop because no wages are being earned with the college to deduct contributions.

Paid Leave: Sabbatical, non-medical
Unpaid Leave:

*Colorado College provides Workers' Compensation coverage to all employees for work-related injuries and illnesses.

HR, October 2013

Recommended Initiative #2: Increase Flexibility of External Funding Framework

Proposed Language for Unpaid Non-medical Leaves

<mark>CURRENT POLICY</mark>

C. Unpaid Non-Medical Leaves

In order to accommodate individual needs that its sabbatical program is not designed to meet, Colorado College allows faculty members to apply for unpaid leaves that can range in length from a single Block to two years. Applications for planned unpaid leaves are due in the Dean's Office early in the fall of the academic year preceding the year in which the leave is to be taken. Applications must be accompanied by a statement from the department chair that describes the effect of the leave on the department and provides the chair's judgment regarding the need for a replacement. Full-year unpaid leaves may count toward eligibility for tenure or sabbatical leave only with the Dean's prior approval. Such approval requires evidence that the requested leave would benefit the College by enhancing the faculty member's professional development.

<mark>PROPOSED POLICY</mark> – DRAFT as of Feb. 20, 2014

C. Unpaid Non-Medical Leaves

In order to accommodate individual needs that its sabbatical program is not designed to meet, Colorado College allows faculty members to apply for unpaid leaves that can range in length from a single Block to two years.

A leave of absence without salary may be arranged through consultation with the department concerned and with the Dean. Such a leave will ordinarily not be granted within two years of a sabbatical leave or other leave of absence already taken and will generally not count as time at Colorado College in computing eligibility for a sabbatical year and tenure. Full-year unpaid leaves may count toward eligibility for tenure or sabbatical leave only with the Dean's prior approval. Such approval requires evidence that the requested leave would benefit the College by enhancing the faculty member's professional development.

In the event a faculty member takes an unpaid, non-medical leave of absence for a portion of the academic year, his or her academic year salary will be determined based on the following formula:

The total number of days in the contract period (inclusive of all weekends, holidays, Winter Break, Half Block, etc.) minus the total number of days that the faculty member will be on a leave of absence will equal the total number of days the faculty member is working for Colorado College. The total number of days working for Colorado College divided by the total number of days in the contract period will equal the percentage of academic year base salary to be received over the course of the academic year.

In each of the last four academic years, there have been 266 days in each faculty member's contract period, which starts at Fall Conference and ends with Commencement. For the purposes of this policy, we will say 266 is the standard number of days in each contract period. If a faculty member seeks to take a one-block leave of absence during Block 6, the leave will be counted from the first day of the block through four days after the end of the block so as to include Block Break (Feb. 17 – March 16), for a total of 28 days. The faculty member will have been on contract with the College for 238 days (266 total days – 28 days on leave). Therefore the faculty member will receive 238/266 percent of his or her academic year salary, or 89.5% of his or her academic year salary.

Faculty members on leaves of absence without salary for *scholarly purposes* will receive the same fringe benefits as Faculty on paid leave [see "Benefits for Faculty while on Leave" table], except that the College will make no contribution on their behalf to the faculty member's retirement plan or Emeriti plan. Specifically, the College will continue to pay the institution's portion of medical, dental and vision benefits. Faculty should make arrangements with HR to provide the employee's portion for the length of the leave of absence. During the leave of absence, contributions to voluntary benefits (Flexible Spending Account, Optional Life, Voluntary Retirement Contributions, legal plan contributions, auto & long-term care) will stop, as no wages are being earned from which the College can deduct contributions. In some cases, the Dean will consult with the appropriate divisional executive committee to determine whether an activity to be undertaken qualifies as one with a "scholarly purpose."

Faculty on leaves of absence without salary for *other than scholarly purposes* are responsible for making their own arrangements for continuing fringe benefit coverage and ordinarily will be expected to pay the full cost of such coverage. In the absence of special arrangements, Colorado College life, health**,** dental, and disability insurance will terminate at the beginning of the leave. For further information, contact the Human Resources Department.

With the exception of leaves of absences to be funded by external grants, applications for planned unpaid leaves are due in the Dean's Office early in the fall of the academic year preceding the year in which the leave is to be taken. Applications must be accompanied by a statement from the department chair that describes the effect of the leave on the department and provides the chair's judgment regarding the need for a replacement.

In the event the leave of absence will be funded by an external grant, the faculty member shall discuss the opportunity and the notification timeline with his or her department chair well prior to grant submission. As part of the internal approval process for external research grants, the department chair will be asked to provide a brief statement that describes the effect of the potential leave on the department, provides the chair's judgment regarding the need for a replacement should funding be granted, describes the chair's anticipated plan of action once funding is announced, and outlines whether augmented funding will be needed to secure a year-long visitor on a short timetable. Once notification of external funding has been announced, the chair shall submit an updated statement to the Dean's Office, and if needed, a request for a year-long visitor, within three weeks.

Perhaps we could add the table in Attachment 2.1 to the Handbook?

G. Salary and Benefits During Leaves

Salary and benefits continue during sabbatical leaves, but benefit costs that are calculated as a percentage of base salary will differ from the faculty member's normal costs according to sabbatical compensation (that is, either full pay or five-ninths pay).

Faculty members on a full-year sabbatical may accept employment outside the College for the equivalent of one-half the leave; but if they are employed and receive benefits elsewhere during the leave, during that time they will not receive similar benefits from the College.

The spirit of the sabbatical program requires that faculty members on half-year sabbatical leave not be employed elsewhere and not receive any non-College salary or other compensation. Faculty members planning an unpaid leave may consult with the Human Resources Office regarding benefits for which they are eligible. Faculty members on unpaid leave are responsible for making arrangements with the Human Resources Office to pay for their benefit programs.
A faculty member who desires a change in salary payment because of a planned leave must make the necessary arrangements with the Business Office at least thirty days before the leave is to begin. The College expects faculty members on leave to keep the Business Office, the Dean's Office, and the College mail service informed of any forwarding address or other new contact information.

For more detailed current information regarding benefits during leaves, contact the Human Resources Office.

_____

Policies and Procedures
Colorado College Policy

Faculty and Staff Compensation for Work on Sponsored Projects *

This policy language has been borrowed heavily from Keene State College

Responsible Office: Office of the Dean	Approved By:
Responsible Party: Director of Faculty Research Support	Approval Date:
Last Revision:	Effective Date:
Related Policies: Unpaid, Non-Medical Leave; Employment Outside the College	
Additional References: OMB Circular A-110; OMB Circular A-21; National Science Foundation Grant Proposal Guide, Section II.C.2.g.i (Salaries and Wages)	

Summary Statement

External funders often support specific, "sponsored" projects to be undertaken by college personnel. These projects often make possible student research and other activities of importance to Colorado College. Without exception, sponsored projects also lead to additional work, some of which the funder supports, some of which the College must support.

Because the federal government is a primary sponsor of research and other scholarly activities of Colorado College, the cost policies of the federal government, contained in OMB Circular A-21, are extended to all sponsored projects, regardless of sponsor type.

Scope
All financial and administrative policies involving community members across campus are within the scope of this policy. If there is variance between departmental expectations and the common approach described through college policy, the college will look to the campus community to support the spirit and the objectives of college policy.

A. Policy

A. POLICY

(1) <u>Authorities Delegated and Retained/Administrative Responsibility</u>

The President of the College delegates administration of the College's research activities to the Dean of the College. The President of the College delegates administration of the College's non-research grant activity to the Vice President for Advancement.

(2) <u>Policy Summary</u>

This policy clarifies how faculty and staff are compensated by grants, and under what circumstances the College may compensate faculty for grant-related work.

(3) <u>Faculty (full-time/tenure track) Compensation from Sponsored Projects – Academic Year Effort</u>

Per OMB circular A-21, Section J. 10.d., faculty may not receive more than their regular annual salary as a result of participation in sponsored projects during the academic year.

Some sponsors will reimburse the College for a portion of a faculty member's academic year salary when the sponsored project is carried out during the academic year. This does not increase the faculty member's salary, but generally helps the College recover a portion of the salary expenses that are allocable to the sponsored project. This is commonly referred to as a "course buy-out" of the faculty member's time by the grant.

Example: A faculty member's annual nine-month salary equals $75,000. As a PI on a grant, the faculty member requests and is granted one month's salary ($1/9^{th}$ of $75,000, or $8,325) from the sponsor in academic year salary to cover 11.1% effort spent on the project during the academic year. The faculty member still receives a salary of $75,000 for the academic year: $66,675 from the College and $8,325 from the sponsor.

Colorado College salary funds "freed up" by a course buyout provided by a sponsored project shall be used to support the hire of a block-visitor replacement, if deemed necessary by the Dean, in consultation with the department chair. Faculty should consult with, and receive approval from, the Dean and the department chair regarding any requested course buyout well in advance of the grant proposal's submission.

Faculty should be aware that the National Science Foundation, one of the College's primary research sponsors, "regards research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member's regular organizational salary."

However, when a faculty member will be serving as a Project Director on a major institutional or programmatic grant, he or she may request a course buyout – in general no more than one month per year – to compensate for the work associated with administering the grant, whenever allowable to the sponsor. As noted, faculty should consult with the Dean and the department chair regarding any course buyout requested in a grant proposal well in advance of the grant proposal's submission.

In cases in which academic year administrative salary for the Project Director is not an allowable expense by the sponsor, the faculty member, in coordination with the appropriate Colorado College grants official, should present to the Dean, well in advance of proposal submission, a brief case for "course release" (a reduction in teaching funded by the College) including a summary of the grant's anticipated benefits to the College and an estimation of the time needed to administer the grant. The Dean, in consultation with department chair and the President, will determine whether a course release funded by the College will be granted, as well as the nature and frequency of the course release.

(4) Faculty (full-time/tenure track) Compensation from Sponsored Projects – Summer Effort

A faculty member on a nine-month contract may be paid summer salary (supplemental pay over and above the 9-month academic year salary) for effort contributed to a sponsored project during the 3-month summer period. Charges are based on the same monthly base rate of pay as during the previous academic year. Summer salary chargeable to grants and contracts is limited to that effort actually expended on the project. Faculty members receiving two months of summer support (maximum allowable) from a sponsored project must put the entire two summer months into the work of the grant. Faculty **may not** be paid summer salary for effort expended during the academic year.

Example 1: A faculty member on a 9-month contract may be paid one-ninth of his/her prior academic year salary for one summer month of sponsored research. If the faculty member's academic year salary is $75,000 for nine months, the faculty member receives an additional $8,333 ($75,000 / 9 = $8,333) for the month spent working on the sponsored research project. The total pay received by the faculty member: $75,000 (for academic year) + $8,333 = $83,333.

Example 2: A faculty member plans to spend two weeks at ½ effort (one week total effort) in the summer preparing for a grant-funded project (e.g., an institute he or she will lead). Delivery of the institute itself will constitute one additional week of full-time effort. Thus, the faculty member may receive summer pay from the grant equivalent to 2 weeks in total (or half a month's salary). Assuming the faculty member's salary is $75,000 for nine months, the faculty member receives an additional $4,167 for the grant-funded summer work ($75,000 / 9 = $8,333 monthly salary divided by 2 = $4,167 to determine ½-month effort).

Faculty should work with the Director of Faculty Research Support to complete the Faculty Grant Salary Payment Form, which the Director will submit to Payroll.

(5) Staff Additional Pay From Sponsored Projects

Staff performing work on sponsored projects may receive additional pay beyond their regular compensation in instances where the work is clearly distinct from their normal duties and occurs outside of their normal work hours or during a period for which the individual has used accrued leave (e.g., earned time or vacation) from their regular position during the period for which they request supplemental pay. Requests must be made using the Staff Additional Pay Request Addendum Form, and must be approved by the individual's Supervisor and HR. The direct supervisor is responsible for ensuring the terms of the approval (i.e., outside of normal business hours or use of vacation time) are followed.

Example 1: A staff member is hired to code data collected during the course of a grant project. The staff member performs the coding outside of the normal business hours associated with his regular full-time appointment. He may receive additional pay for this work from grant funds provided they were budgeted for in the approved grant proposal.

Example 2: A staff member is hired to transcribe interviews conducted for a grant project. The staff member conducts the work during normal business hours, but uses one day of vacation time per month to take leave from her normal duties in order to conduct the transcription work. She may receive additional pay for this work from grant funds provided they were budgeted for in the approved grant proposal.

Human Resources can help faculty identify appropriate individuals within the KSC community who might have appropriate skill sets to perform the grant related work required. Contact Director of HR for assistance.

(6) Administrative Support Costs Charged to Sponsored Projects

Because administrative support is designated under OMB Circular A-21 as being part of our F&A costs, administrative support salaries should not be directly charged to federal grants (supplemental or otherwise). PIs with extraordinary administrative support needs in connection with a grant should consult with the Director of Faculty Research Support prior to proposal submission about utilizing some of the F&A dollars returned to the school under the College's F&A Distribution Policy to assist with these needs.

For non-federal grants which do not accept our federally negotiated F&A rate, administrative support allocable to the project may be directly charged to the grant.

Board Approval –
A. This policy does not require approval by the college's Board of Trustees.
B. Periodic review of policies shall take place in accordance with each policy's individual review frequency.

B. PROCEDURES

(1) Internal Endorsement for Research or Scholarly Grant Activity
   Any proposal for outside support for research activity must receive an endorsement from the Dean of the College, the chair of your Department, the Controller and others as appropriate. Please consult with the Director of Faculty Research Support to initiate the process.

(2) Internal Endorsement for Institutional Grants
   Any proposal for outside grant support of institutional activities (such as visiting professors, speakers, or curriculum development) must receive an endorsement from the Dean of the College, the Controller and others as appropriate. Please consult with the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations to discuss the process.

C. FORMS

(1) Internal Endorsement Form for External Research Grant Activity
(2) Faculty Grant Salary Payment Form
(3) Staff Additional Pay Request Addendum Form

D. DEFINITIONS

Course Buy-out: a reduction in teaching load that is funded by the external funder. The faculty member sees no change in academic year salary. The College "saves" on the faculty member's academic year salary, which can be used to support a block-visitor replacement if deemed necessary.

Course Release: a reduction in teaching load that is funded by the College. The faculty member sees no change in academic year salary. The College invests in the sponsored project by supporting the faculty member's salary during the course release. The College also may demonstrate an investment by supporting a block-visitor replacement.

Recommended Initiative #4

Preliminary Description for Proposed Position

<u>OVERVIEW</u>

Tentative Title:	**Research Grants Specialist**
Department:	Dean's Office
Reports to:	Director of Faculty Research Support
Number of direct reports:	0
Salary Band:	4
Range:	$33,630 to $42K
Exempt / Non Exempt:	TBD
Date:	TBD

<u>POSITION SUMMARY</u>

Manages the research grants process, focusing primarily on post-award issues. Will lead the award acceptance and award activation process. Will track grants and submission of required technical, financial and other (compliance-related) reports.

Pre-award responsibilities include assisting in identifying funding opportunities; assisting in preparing proposal packages both electronically and physically.

Outreach responsibilities include organizing workshops, panels and other events to support faculty who are seeking or managing grants.

Tentative: Student Fellowship responsibilities include organizing workshops, panels and other events to support students who are interested in applying for external grants and fellowships. (Further discussion on this is necessary)

Key to font type and color coding:

Tasks that are currently being handled by the Director of Faculty Research Support (or in some cases another staff member) – and will be moved to this position – are in italics

New tasks that are not currently being done (with any regularity) are in bold and italics

Possible tasks that *could* fall to this position are in red. (*Italics if already being done*, ***bold and italics if a new task.) Further discussions will be necessary.***

As noted in Recommended Initiative #4, a member of the Finance and Administration staff must be tasked with providing oversight on research grant spending. For the purposes of providing our current thinking on how tasks will be divided between the Finance staff person and the DFRS support person, we provide some tasks in blue below that reflect how the proposed position would support the Finance staff person. Further discussion is necessary.

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

Pre-award Responsibilities (15%)

- Prospecting assistance 10%
    - ***Providing expert advice on the new Pivot grants database***
    - ***Organizing trainings on using Pivot***
    - *Providing faculty with one-on-one prospecting support*
    - ***Searching sponsor websites***
    - ***Reading sponsor agency newsletters and updates***
    - ***Creating "curated lists" in Pivot for groups of faculty***

- Proposal assistance 5%
    - *Assisting faculty with preparation of internal proposal routing forms*
    - *Assisting Director in working with faculty to prepare budgets and budget justifications*
    - *Proposal submission support (copying, mailing, pdf generation, etc.) as needed*
    - *Ensuring all application materials are collected, and requesting or preparing any missing documents*
    - *Completing agency forms and packages for electronic submissions*
    - *Ensuring all required compliance documents are filed*
    - *Ensuring NSF proposals are signed by the Dean within 5 days of submission*
    - ***Maintaining password-protected webpage of successful proposals (and requesting sample proposals through CLASP, FOIA, etc.)***

Post-Award Responsibilities (55%)

- Award Acceptance 5%
    - *Reviewing award documentation for terms, including sub-award and budget requirements*
    - *Verifying and documenting that awardee is not debarred/suspended*
    - *Updating all tracking documents (including Notification of Awards document, Active Grants document, Conflict of Interest Tracking document, Projected IDC tracking document, Faculty Payroll tracking document for Time and Effort compliance, Responsible Conduct of Research tracking document for RCR compliance)*

- Award Activation and Notification 10%
    - *Notifying key offices (including President's Office, Dean's Office, appropriate Dept. chair, Finance & Administration, Communications, Foundation Relations) of new award*
    - *Submitting request to Finance staff person for new fund number*
    - ***Entering awarded budget into Banner***
    - *Preparing documents for Post-Award Meeting with the PI and other appropriate individuals*
    - *Responding to inquiries from the PI, including general procedural questions*
    - *Serving as liaison with Finance Office on grant-related accounting and post-award compliance issues*

- Administrative Management   40%

  Responsible for the efficient, timely and accurate administration of awarded grants through assistance with financial management, monitoring compliance with award agreements, properly handling changes after the award, and grant close-out.

  Financial Management
  - ***Becoming an expert user of the Banner Grants Module, if adopted by the Finance Office, and training staff and/or faculty on its use (see Recommended Initiative #9)***
  - *Preparing Faculty Grant Salary Payment Forms based on awarded budget (and communications with faculty) for DFRS's signature (usually in May for paid summer research)*
  - ***Assisting faculty in the process of initiating research students for grant-paid work***
  - ***Monitoring financial performance of sponsored projects, including reporting to each faculty PI at least twice per year on YTD expenditures, total expenditures, cost-share to date and total direct costs remaining.***
  - *Monitoring sub-recipients, including budget and reporting requirements, annual A-133 letters, etc.*
  - *Working with and supporting staff assistants in their support of faculty PIs*
  - *Working with and supporting the Finance staff member charged with research grant oversight by:*
    - Providing Finance staff member with documentation requested by the R&D auditor, as needed
    - Working with PIs to ensuring expenditures are "allowable, allocable, reasonable and consistent"
    - Ensuring expenditures are treated consistently and working with support staff to provide them with consistent information and support

  Compliance with Award Commitments
  - ***Monitoring grant reporting deadlines and other agency-related requests, communicating approaching deadlines to PIs, Finance, etc.***
  - *Working with PIs to ensure committed cost-share is tracked and documented*
  - *Tracking institutional commitments and any special award requirements (e.g., institutional match)*
  - *Tracking Conflict of Interest documents from PIs (semi-annually)*
  - *Preparing Time & Effort documents for PIs (annually)*
  - *Communicating with PIs about RCR requirements for their grant-paid research students and working with students to ensure RCR training is completed and documented*

  Changes After the Award
  - *Assist faculty with grant management, in particular assisting with determining if there needs to be prior approval from the funder given the nature of any changes after the award*
  - *Assisting faculty with conducting internal rebudgeting process to be documented via the College's Prior Approval Form*

- ***Meeting with faculty several months prior to a grant's expiration to ensure grant is paid down appropriately or to determine whether a "no-cost extension" request will need to be needed*** *(managing NCE request process as needed)*

<u>Close-Out of Grants</u>
- ***Managing the award close-out process***
- *Ensuring all appropriate forms (COI, RCR, T&E, Excluded Party documentation) are in the grant file*

Internal Grant Administration Responsibilities (10%)
- Managing (new) Sponsored Research Fund (see Recommended Initiative #7)
  - *Assisting the Director in tracking encumbrances (such as research infrastructure costs and pending and actual match commitments)*
  - *Sending out regular calls for proposals and collecting them, distributing them to the Advisory Board*
  - ***Helping the Director and Advisory Board for External Research Support track available funding for internal allocations***
  - ***Drafting award letters based on awards made monthly by the Advisory Board***
  - ***Transferring funds to faculty Research Accounts***
  - ***Requesting and collecting brief reports on internal grants made***
  - ***(Possible New Task) Working with faculty to train them on accessing and tracking their Research Account spending (based on recent TLC session with Anne Hyde that indicated that regular training on research account management is not taking place)***

- Managing Other Internal Funds that Support Research (*Possible; further discussion needed*)
  - *Assisting the Dean's Office in issuing calls for Benezet, Mrachek, and Dean's Summer Research Grants.*
  - *Collecting proposals and distributing to the Research and Development Board*
  - *Drafting and distributing award letters*
  - *Tracking winners and collecting reports*

Event Planning and Execution (10%)
- Summer Research Lunch Series
  - *Work with faculty to identify dates, locations, food and AV equipment needed for Summer Research Lunch Series*
- Outreach Event Planning
  - ***Work with DFRS to plan and execute three to four training sessions per year on Pivot, grant writing, and grant management***
- Student Fellowship Event Planning
  - *Work with faculty advisors, DFRS, the Career Center, the Writing Center and others to plan and execute two to three events per year that highlight various opportunities for students and recent alumni*

Office Administration (5%)
- *Updating and improving the Faculty Grants website in consultation with the DFRS*
- *Maintaining the College's registration in SAM.gov, Grants.gov, and several other grants-related databases*
- *Managing users in grant submission systems (Fastlane for NSFR, eRA Commons for NIH, Grants.gov for most other federal funders) and assisting faculty in logging in and navigating system*
- *Maintaining hard copy and electronic filing systems (create files, file documents)*
- *Prepare overnight and other packages for delivery*
- *Photocopying and scanning as needed*
- *Generating standard and ad hoc reports regarding grant data as needed*

(POSSIBLE) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (5%) –

If not needed, more time could be devoted to Pre-Award responsibilities or Management of Internal Grants

- Coordination of "Program" for Grants and Fellowships for Students and Recent Graduates
  - *Organizing annual spring forum*
  - *Updating documentation on advisor information*
  - *Updating web site, etc.*

- ***Facilitation of data collection from National Student Clearinghouse and distribution to departments (once this data becomes available). Tasks could include:***
  - ***Working with appropriate departments to prepare files for uploading to NSC (would likely include Carolyn Dickerson in Advancement, Ben Moffit in the Institutional Effectiveness, Megan Nicklaus in the Career Center, Matt Bonser in Admissions, Phil Apodaca and various departmental chairs and/or staff assistants, etc.)***
  - ***Receiving and formatting data files and distribution to appropriate constituencies***

Essential Functions

- Must be able to communicate in English, including the ability to speak in public.
- Must be able to operate standard office equipment, including computer, printer, copier, calculator, and fax machine.
- Must be able to speak on the telephone.

Required Skills and Abilities

Strong organization skills; strong oral and communication skills; ability to handle multiple tasks; ability to work under deadlines and prioritize workload; ability to reprioritize quickly as new information about clients' needs become clear; ability to work in a supportive and collaborative fashion within the Dean's Office and with a diverse range of clients and colleagues; ability to communicate technical details clearly and respectfully to colleagues who may be unfamiliar with the process described.

Required Experience

3-5 years of experience working in support of grants strongly preferred

Recommended Initiative #7

Make Financial Support More Flexible and Accessible

Preliminary List of Recommended Workshops for Faculty

1) CUR Proposal Writing Workshop (http://www.cur.org/conferences_and_events/institutes) – I highly recommend hosting a CUR Proposal Writing Workshop on your campus or sending faculty to the CUR Proposal Writing Workshops that are offered each summer.

2) CUR Dialogues (http://www.cur.org/conferences_and_events/cur_dialogues/)– The CUR Dialogues typically includes half-day grant development and writing workshops.

3) How to Write a Winning NSF CAREER Proposal (http://academicresearchgrants.com/workshops_and_seminars)– Excellent webinar offered by Academic Research Funding Strategies, LLC

4) NSF Regional Grants Conferences (http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/outreach.jsp)– These typically have ½ day grant writing workshops.

5) NIH Regional Seminars (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/seminars.htm) - Always include ½ day workshops on best practices and nuts and bolts of putting together NIH applications.

Indirect Costs: What the Heck Are They?

A clarification on terminology: While these misunderstood costs are often referred to as "indirect costs," the correct term is "Facilities and Administration Costs" or, more briefly, "F&A Costs." The Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which regularly issues instructions and guidance to federal agencies, changed the term in 1996 in an effort to emphasize that indirect costs are real costs to educational institutions.

OMB Circulars: The OMB communicates to federal agencies via "OMB Circulars." OMB Circular A-21, "Cost Principles for Educational Institutions," provides guidance to federal agencies on determining costs associated with grants to educational institutions. While Circular A-21 is not issued directly to educational institutions, A-21 does outline the standards federal agencies should employ when working with education institutions in the grant-making realm. Therefore educational institutions are expected to understand and follow these principles.

Summary of Circular A-21: Circular A-21 lays out "basic considerations" such as what makes a cost "allowable," "reasonable" and "allocable." It describes direct costs and F&A costs, and how to determine an institution's F&A rate.

Direct versus F&A Costs: Direct costs can be directly attributable to a specific project (eg. salaries, supplies, equipment, travel expenses). F&A costs are general "support expenses" that cannot be specifically tied to a particular project (eg. utilities expenses and staff who support a number of projects).

Determination of the F&A Rate: The total F&A costs at an institution divided by the total direct costs at an institution determines its F&A rate. For example, if an institution can document that it has spent $1 on F&A costs for every $2 it has spent on direct costs, then that institution would propose an F&A rate of 50.0% to the federal government. Because the institution negotiates this rate with the federal government, the institution's final (approved) F&A rate will likely be less than the proposed F&A rate. (These negotiations take place on a regular schedule, every few years.) It is common practice to determine an on-campus F&A rate and an off-campus F&A rate. Because an institution's facilities are not used for off-campus projects, F&A costs associated with facilities are not included in the off-campus F&A total.

Determination of Colorado College's F&A Rates: Because the total direct cost of work covered by A-21 does not exceed $10 million per year, Colorado College is eligible to use a "simplified method for small institutions." Colorado College's costs, as documented in the College's most recent F&A proposal, submitted in the fall of 2009, are as follows:

Total F&A Costs for 2009 FY:		Total Direct Costs for 2009 FY:	
Institutional Support:	$9,339,215*	Instruction:	$37,265,928
Library:	$3,468,200*	Research:	$1,138,222
Department Administration:	$790,945*	Academic Services:	$4,602,713
Depreciation & Amortization:	$3,344,405	Student Services:	$14,494,163
Interest Expense:	$720,133	Auxiliary Expenses:	$3,916,140
Operations and Maintenance:	$13,317,306	Public Service:	$1,446,840
Total on-campus F&A Costs:	**$30,980,203**	**Total:**	**$62,864,005**
(Total off-campus F&A Costs:	$13,598,360*)		

Recently Proposed F&A Rate (on campus):   *Recently Proposed F&A Rate (off campus):*

Total F&A Costs:	$30,980,203	= 49.28%	Total F&A Costs:	$13,598,360	=21.63%
Total Direct Costs:	$62,864,005		Total Direct Costs:	$62,864,005	

Approved (Final) F&A Rate (through June 2015):   = 39.00% (on campus) and   *17.30% off-campus*

Application of F&A Rate: The federal government recognizes that there are F&A costs associated with every sponsored project, and the government has made a commitment to pay its fair share of the true costs of conducting research. For this reason, proposers are expected to include both direct and F&A costs in grant requests. If the College anticipates spending $100,000 in direct costs, then the College can expect to pay $39,000 in associated F&A costs. The College receives reimbursement from the federal government, a process termed "F&A cost recovery."

Expenditure of Indirect Funds ("F&A Costs") Recovered
Sept. 2007

Given that F&A costs are real costs incurred by the college each time it accepts a grant for a sponsored project, the customary procedure at liberal arts colleges is to allocate the recovered funds to expenses directly related to faculty scholarly and creative activity. An appropriate allocation for the funds would include the following.

25% to budget for Director of Sponsored Research/Faculty Grants position (costs include salary, professional memberships, conference travel, materials)

75% to deans' budget for faculty research and development. This discretionary fund can be used for:
·   matching funds in grant applications (a common requirement in many federal grant applications)
·   supplements to sabbatical grants (especially in the humanities and social sciences, in which funding for leaves is not based on salary level)
·   expenses not covered by external funding sources (conferences, workshops, subventions for textbooks and monographs, publishing illustrations)
·   supplements to start-up funds (specific one-time expenses for research needs)
·   equipment (small items necessary for research, computers)
·   materials (chemicals, software, reproductions/printing)
·   travel (domestic and international, seldom funded through external grants)
·   faculty without permanent residence or with other conditions that limit the types of external funding for which they are eligible

<mark>PROPOSED PROVISIONAL IDC POLICY</mark>

Expenditure of Indirect Funds ("F&A Costs") Recovered
2014

Given that F&A costs are real costs incurred by the College each time it accepts a grant for a sponsored project, the customary procedure at liberal arts colleges is to allocate the recovered funds to expenses directly related to faculty scholarly and creative activity.

Beginning in the 2014-2015 academic year the allocation shall be as follows:

-   On or about July 1, $54,000 in recovered indirect costs from the previous academic year shall be moved to the Sponsored Research Fund to support Enhanced Research Grant Activities outlined on the following page.

-   The remainder shall be allocated to general revenue, which may be used to support salaries and benefits associated with supporting faculty research grant activity, such as the Director of Faculty Research Support.

This allocation of recovered indirect costs is designed to provide a "start-up" investment in faculty research grant activity for the next 3 to 5 years. The College is encouraged to identify long-term sources of funding to maintain pre-award, post-award and research grant infrastructure support.

As additional sources of funding are identified, the College is encouraged to adjust this policy so that the portion directed to general revenue increases, thereby supporting the many hidden costs of performing research.

(Proposed) Budget for Enhanced Research Grant Activity

Category #1 (Pre-Award Support):

   Anticipated Annual Need

Travel support – Air ($300), hotel ($300), incidentals ($200) = $800 each x 3 per year =	$2,400
Grant workshops – Air (300), registration ($500), incidentals ($200) = $1,300 x 3/year =	$3,900
Stipends for lead faculty (Rec. #6) – $1,500 each x 3 per year =	$4,500
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$5,200
Stipend Support to Write Instit. Research Grant – $8,000 per stipend every other year=	$4,000
Subtotal:	**$20,000**

Category #2 (Post-Award Support):

   Anticipated Annual Need

Matching Funds (required) – 2 proposals x $10,000 each =	$20,000
Matching Funds (voluntary) – 2 proposals x $7,500 each =	$15,000
Replacement Salary to Cover CC-funded Course Release – $5,000 x 1 per year	$5,000
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$5,000
Subtotal:	**$45,000**

Category #3 (Infrastructure Support):

   Anticipated Annual Need

Pivot Database Subscription (up from $3,500, to budget for entire cost)	$8,500
Consultant to Prepare Indirect Cost Rate Proposal (~$16K every four years)	$4,000
RCR training/compliance (up from $1,200)	$2,500
Professional Development/Conferences for DFRS & Support Person (Rec. #4)	$3,000
Annual Summer Lunch Series	$2,000
Institutional memberships (ICO) and Individual memberships (NCURA)	$1,700
Office Expenditures, ie, lunches, smaller workshops, etc. (up from $500)	$800
Other Activities (TBD) – estimation	$1,500
Subtotal:	**$24,000**
Total Annual Funding in Support of Enhanced Faculty Research Grant Activity:	**$89,000**

Summary of Actual Spending from
Recovered Indirect Costs
2008 - 2014

Section #1

Actual Spending from Primary Indirect Costs Fund	Amount	category/purpose	stage	notes
Overspending on grants	$17,305	compliance	post-award	$15K attributable to one grant; invoice not submitted during period of performance
Subtotal for Post-Award	$17,305			
Fee for IDC F&A rate proposal(2009)	$13,500		infrastructure	2009 payment taken from primary IDC fund
Subtotal for Research Infrastructure	$13,500			
Total	**$30,805**			

Section #2

Actual Spending from Spendable Indirect Costs Fund	Amount	category/purpose	stage	notes
Stipends for institutional grant proposal (HHMI)	$15,300	grant incentive	pre-award	pulled faculty away from individual research; potential benefits to college
Subtotal for Pre-Award	$15,300			
RCR Training costs	$925	compliance	post-award	required training per NSF
To replace equipment that failed during NSF grant	$3,275	equipment	post-award	equipment needed to perform research
Student assistant in biology	$2,396			
Misc.	$76			
Subtotal for Post-Award	$6,672			
Institutional membership - Independent Colleges Office	$15,166	professional network	infrastructure	benefits to college and to Tess
Grant databases - Grant Advisor, Pivot	$4,157	prospecting	infrastructure	
Research binders	$338	knowledge	infrastructure	
Event on Scholarly Communication	$662	professional network	infrastructure	benefits to college
Subtotal for Research Infrastructure	$20,323			
Total	**$42,295**			

Section #3

Encumbrances to the Spendable Indirect Costs Fund	Amount	category/purpose	stage	notes	
none	$0	grant incentive	pre-award		0
Subtotal for Pre-Award	$0				
Student assistant in biology	**$3,700**		post-award		
To Supplement Kresge Fund due to 13-14 requests	**$64,330**	equipment	post-award	equipment needed to perform research	
Subtotal for Post-Award	$68,030				
Fee for IDC F&A rate proposal(2013)	**$15,000**		infrastructure	2009 payment taken from primary IDC fund	
Subtotal for Research Infrastructure	$15,000				
Total	**$83,030**				

Attachment 7.5
Grants at Colorado College with Projected* Indirect Costs

Projections based on awarded budget. Actual Recovered IDC based on Actual Spending

Active Grants with IDC	Funder	Faculty Member	Division	Department	Awarded	Title	Start Date	End Date	Prime Award Number	Subaward Number	Approved IDC 13-14	Approved IDC 14-15	Approved IDC 15-16	Approved IDC 16-17
1	NSF - MCB	Phoebe and Kristine	NS	Biology, Physics	$507,653	RUI: Biology-Physics Collaboration to Investigate the Genetic and Structural Basis for Competence in Bacteria	2/15/14	1/31/18	MCB–1330511			$17,859	$19,782	$20,363
2	NSF- IOS - Organization	Darrell Killian	NS	Biology	$374,725	IOS Proposal: Collaborative Research: RUI: The role of RNA-binding proteins in C. elegan dendrite morphogenisis	6/1/13	5/31/2016	IOS-1257703		$33,535	$35,451	$36,153	
3	NSF- EAR	Paul Myrow	NS	Geology	$59,985	Collaborative Research: Testing Himalayan tectonic and erosional history via chronostratigraphic correlation between the Lesser Himalaya and Indian	10/1/11	9/30/2014	EAR-1124518		$4,266			
4	NSF-EAR	Paul Myrow	NS	Geology	$159,070	Collaborative Research: Laboratory and numerical experiments on the response of wave ripples to changes in oscillary flow	9/15/12	8/31/2015	EAR-1225879		$5,721	$12,393		
5	NSF - DUE - TUES	Andrea Bruder	NS	Mathematics	$76,334	Collaborative Research: Bridging Math and Science - Authentic Laboratory Experiences in Mathematical Biology	8/15/13	7/31/2015	1245407	n/a	$10,385	$8,759		
6	National Endowment for Humanities (via UC-D)	Sarah Hautzinger	SS	Anthropology	$65,985	The New Normal: Deployment Stress on a Post-9/11 Homefront	1/1/13	12/31/2014	RZ-51459-12 (grant # from NEH to UCD)		$13,127	$5,387		
7	National Institute of Justice	Dana Wittmer	SS	Political Science	$339,001	Identifying Effective Counter-Trafficking Practises in the US	1/1/13	12/31/2014			$11,987	$30,024		
						Confirmed Total					$79,021	$109,873	$55,935	$20,363
Pending Grants with IDC (submitted and under review)														
8	NSF	Neena Grover	NS	Chemistry	~$454,000							$30,995	$31,546	$32,124
9	DOD	Andrew Price-Smtih	SS	Poli Sci	~$1.2 million							$83,527	$75,106	$92,825
10	NSF	Mike Taber	SS	Education	~$1.2 million							$23,779	$19,659	$20,099
11	NSF	Krista Fish	SS	Anthropology	~$50,000							$3,780	$3,780	
						Possible Total					$79,021	$251,954	$186,026	$165,411

4/18/2014 4:10 PM

Comprehensive Budget for the Faculty Scholarship Action Team's
10 Recommended Initiatives

Initiative #	Name of Recommended Initiative	Anticipated Change	Indicators/Outcomes	Description of Expense	Basis for "Unit" Cost	Estimated "Unit" Cost	Basis for Projection	One-time Cost?	Projected Minumum Annual Cost	Projected Maximum Annual Cost
1	Statement from Leadership	More faculty feeling confident in investing time in applying for external funding	More faculty applying for external funding	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		$0	$0
2	Increased Flexibility	More faculty applying for meaningful fellowships & grants that may not come with comparable salary component (Fulbright, eg.)	More faculty taking unpaid LOA with benefits (if LOA for scholarly purposes)	College's contribution to medical, dental, vision benefits	Average cost of College's contribution per person	$10,000 to $15,000 per faculty member	1 to 2 faculty per year		$20,000	$30,000
2	Increased Flexibility	Faculty in H and SS being able to apply a year or two prior to sabbatical (and resubmit if needed); faculty being able to apply when project is ripe, not only on sabbatical schedule	More faculty applying for external funding; being able to accept external funding; being able to take full-year sabbaticals	Cost of full-year visitor replacement	Average cost of full-time visiting faculty member - $70,000 in salary and $21,000 in benefits	$91,000	net increase of 1 to 2 more faculty each year being able to take a full-year sabbatical due to external funding; including "savings" from 4/9 of departing faculty member's salary (see Budgetary Impact section of narrative)		$51,000	$153,000
2	Increased Flexibility	Faculty member (and College) being notified (and needing to accept funding) in spring for following academic year	Dept. will need to have identified possible block visitors for the fall, or possible full-year visitor	Premium associated with last-minute contract(s) with block visitors or full-year visitor	Estimation: additional $5,000 to $10,000 for block visitors, or ~$5,000 - $10,000 bump in yearlong visitor's salary	$10,000	net increase of 1 to 2 more yearlong visitors each year being signed in late spring		$5,000	$20,000
3	Increased Clarity on Financial Support	Faculty encouraged to request course buyouts in grant proposals when allowable	More faculty requesting and receiving annual course buyouts (or grant-funded LOA)	College doesn't pay faculty member for one block, and instead (in most cases) pays a block visitor	Faculty member's monthly salary (est. $10,000) not paid and block visitor salary ($5000) paid	($5,000)	net increase of 1 to 3 more course buyouts each year		($5,000)	($15,000)
3	Increased Clarity on Financial Support	Faculty applying for major institutional research grants promised support from the College in the form of college-funded course releases when course buyout not allowable or strategic	More faculty receiving annual course releases to support administrative of major research grant	College awards a course release and (in most cases) pays for a block visitor to replace the faculty member	$5000 per course release to fund the block visitor	$5,000	net increase of 1 to 2 more course releases each year		$5,000	$10,000
4	New Faculty Grants Manager Position	Better support for faculty managing grants, more effective use of Director's time, more time on Student Fellowship program	No grants overspent, no serious findings in R&D Single Audit	Salary and Benefits for person in Band 4	Salary and Benefits for administrative professional with experience in grants	Miniumum of $33,600, anticipated: $38K	Benefits calculated at 30%		$43,680	$49,400
5	Advisory Committee for External Research Support	More progress in drafting and revising grant-related policies; more strategic investment in faculty seeking or receiving research funding	Three to four policies created/revised each year; 2 presented at faculty meeting each year (for next ~3 years)	no dollar cost; we are asking that serving on this Comittee satisfies the faculty member's committee service commitment	n/a	n/a	n/a		$0	$0
6	Faculty Liaison and Faculty Network	Faculty more formally supporting other faculty in their search for external funding	Faculty Liaison(s) holding valuable conversations with faculty in his/her division; Partner Faculty providing valuable feedback to faculty who are applying; Faculty Readers learning about the external research grant process	Stipend for Partner Faculty to support one application comprehensively	$1500 stipend for Partner Faculty per proposal submitted	$1,500	~3 proposals supported in each year, declining in out years (this cost is incorporated into Recommended Initiative #7, hence "$0" here)		$0	$0

Comprehensive Budget for the Faculty Scholarship Action Team's
10 Recommended Initiatives

Initiative #	Name of Recommended Initiative	Anticipated Change	Indicators/Outcomes	Description of Expense	Basis for "Unit" Cost	Estimated "Unit" Cost	Basis for Projection	One-time Cost?	Projected Minumum Annual Cost	Projected Maximum Annual Cost
7	Increased Financial Support	Indirect Costs Funds used strategically; use of IDC funds much more transparent	Faculty applying for funds that will make them more competitive for external funding; faculty who are funded by Sponsored Research Fund prepare a proposal for external support within 12-18 months; general increase in # of annual research grant applications	Increased investment in Pre-Award Support, Post-Award Support and Research Infrastructure	See Detailed Budget in Recommended Initiative #7	$54,000	See Detailed Budget in Recommended Initiative #7		$54,000	$54,000
8	Research Infrastructure - MRI stipends	More MRI proposals submitted	At least one MRI proposal each year	MRI incentive grant, awarded after successful submission	MRI allows up to 2 proposals per institution per year	$4000 each	One to two proposals each year		$4,000	$8,000
8	Research Infrastructure - Kresge-like support	Increased funding for new equipment	More funding available for new equipment	New equipment, particularly MRI proposals not funded by NSF and/or matching funds for equipment, and/or classroom equipment	guestimate	$50,000	guestimate		$50,000	$100,000
8	Research Infrastructure - Start-up Costs	More competitive start-up packages available	College able to attract best candidates	Funding for equipment, supplies, student researchers	TBD	TBD	0 to 2 new faculty in the sciences each year		TBD	TBD
9	Technological Investments - Banner Grant Module	Faculty better able to access real-time grant spending data; Research Grants Office better able to support faculty	Zero grants overspent; faculty report ease of use; staff assistants not needed to track spending in "shadow" databases	Hiring consultant to show Finance how to incorporate the module and to train Finance and DFRS, etc. on use	Consultant's hourly rate	$220/hour	140 hours	$30,800		
9	Technological Investments - CITI membership	More topics available for online training	Use of CITI for Conflict of Interest, Export Control, Animal Care	Difference between cost of current annual compliance training and annual membership	Annual membership of ($2,500) minus average annual cost for RCR alone ($1,500)	$1,000			$1,000	$1,000
10	Creation of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee	IACUC is created; Assurance is submitted to OLAW	Faculty who work with animals are able to apply for federal funding	One-time costs: Laboratory upgrades, one-time intensive training	Estimation until research completed by L Driscoll and K Fish	n/a	n/a	$22,000		
10	Creation of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee	IACUC is created; Assurance is submitted to OLAW	Faculty who work with animals are able to apply for federal funding	Annual costs: ongoing training, Vet stipend	Estimation until research completed by L Driscoll and K Fish	$2500 for ongoing training (if CITI can not be used); $500 for Vet stipend	n/a		$500	$2,500