Faculty Senate Research Policy and Planning Committee
Minutes, February 13, 2014

Attending: Seeger, Schofield, Minion, Ramaswami, Beckman, Johansen, Badenhope, VPR Sarah Nusser and guest Associate Vice President Ellen Rasmussen.

Welcome and introductions: Vice President for Research Nusser and faculty. Discussion of role and relationship between VPR office and Faculty Senate Research Policy and Planning Committee. Badenhope presented the primary function of the committee as advisory to the VPR office, and suggested a collaborative process for problem identification and action on research policy and planning to make the most of faculty knowledge and expertise, as appropriate in the administrative process. The RPP committee members also noted our faculty senate reporting role through the Resource Policy and Allocation Council, which meets with the Senior Vice President and Provost on a monthly bases to discuss the formulation of budgets and operating plans. Agendas for upcoming meetings will be formulated by Badenhope with the VPR’s input.

Review and approval of 1/23/2014 minutes: Minion moved, Schofield seconded. Unanimous approval.

Goals and ideas for supporting and managing research at ISU- VPR Sarah Nusser Dr. Nusser Outlined some initial thought on her goals for leadership and administration of the research enterprise at ISU, prefacing her comments with a note that having been in office less than two weeks, these ideas must be considered preliminary. As she continues to meet with the units and faculty that relate to the research enterprise, she will firm up goals and strategies and communicate them as appropriate. Dr. Nusser wishes to continue to create a supportive environment for research start up and implementation by working with staff in units reporting to her office, including OSPA and ORR. She noted that the office has done a tremendous job of coping with ongoing change in demands from external sponsors (such as federal agencies) while also undergoing reductions in staffing and other resources. However, she sees opportunity for staff to review approval and compliance processes for members of the ISU research community. She also noted she is reviewing the information available on the faculty experience with research, starting with a review of the “listening sessions” conducted by Sharron Quisenberry and the VPR office staff. Once she has had an opportunity to synthesize and discuss those findings with her staff, she would like to present her thoughts to the RPP committee. Finally, Nusser will be exploring the breadth of support structures and activities available for the research enterprise at ISU and how these might be developed to further enhance research at ISU. VPR Nusser’s review activities outlined above are likely to continue through spring semester, with a more refined set of goals and initiatives coming later in the year.

“Facts about Indirect Costs and Indirect Cost Revenue” presentation by Associate Vice President Ellen Rasmussen. In response to questions raised by Badenhope and the committee in prior meetings with the administration, Rasmussen prepared a concise factual presentation about how indirect costs work at Iowa State University, noting that up to the point of institutional reallocation the policies for establishing rates and allowable items within the rates are the same for every institution that works with the US federal government. Our rates (and the audit to ensure their correctness) are externally reviewed by “a cognizant agency,” in our case, the Department of Human Services. Indirect costs (synonymous with Facilities and Administrative costs) are charged for all
sponsored activities that occur under ISU’s umbrella, including sponsored teaching, contracts, and formal research activities. Thus indirect revenue is associated with a broad range of activities, not just research. Funds received by the university are not allocable to any one particular activity, by definition, and when they enter our system as dollars to be spent those dollars are “fungible.” Iowa State University continues to divide these revenues between divisions of central administration, (VPR at 10%, Facilities at 20%), the “Academic Home” (Colleges or Extension, 45%) of the person responsible for the contract, the Unit that administers the work (Centers, Institutes, Extension, at 10%). and the PI responsible for the sponsored activity (at 15%). Each level of administration, including the PI’s, are then responsible for subsequent allocation of IDC to support the various needs. In the case of VPR office, some of these expenses are used to support faculty start up packages, staffing at OSPA, and facilitating complex grant proposals, for example. At the college level, blended tuition revenues and indirect revenues might support utility expenses, classroom renovations, equipment purchases to support research, or mini grants to support scholarly and creative activities. Faculty involved in activities generating indirect may use their indirect allocation in ways consistent with state policy to support their work, whether supporting student assistance, buying equipment or creating or publishing appropriate works. Above the PI level, anticipated indirect revenues are budgeted in each university division, and in each unit’s (college’s) “base,” based on previous years. In other words, the university anticipates some indirect cost recovery as part of the ongoing operating budget, and the revenue generation of indirect doesn’t necessarily result in budget surpluses.

Good of the Order: The RPP would like to discuss student participation and employment in the research enterprise at ISU in the next RPP meeting.

Reminder of future meeting dates at 4:00 PM LOM: Thursday, March 6; Thursday, April 10

Motion to Adjourn: Beckman, seconded, Minion. Unanimous approval.