The Research Council is a standing committee of the OSU Faculty Senate. One of its main functions during this academic year remained the evaluation of proposals submitted by the OSU faculty to the Research Equipment Reserve Fund (RERF) and General Research Fund (GRF). In addition, the Research Council provided recommendations on pre-proposals and letters of intent for limited submission funding opportunities. Finally, the Research Council was tasked with reviewing and making recommendations to the Vice President for Research on proposals for Centers and Institutes.

In addition to these mandates, the Research Council plays an active role in identifying and communicating to the University’s administration concerns from the academic community regarding the state of the university’s research infrastructure and
administrative support. This past academic year we provided input to the Vice President for Research regarding guiding principles for research infrastructure recapitalization. Also, we invited various chairs and administrators from compliance committees to give a brief presentation and discuss the mandates, procedures and challenges they face. The objective of this effort is to educate the Research Council members regarding the mandate and functioning of research-related compliance committees on campus, and to provide the chairs and the VP for Research with feedback regarding the contribution of these committees to the university’s research endeavor.

A summary of the activities of the Research Council for academic year 2012-13 is given below:

Proposal Review

This past academic year, the Research Council evaluated 48 General Research Fund (GRF) and 41 Research Equipment Reserved Fund (RERF) proposals. The GRF program was evaluated in two panels (November 2012 and March 2013). RERF proposals were also reviewed in two panels (January 2013 and April 2013). In addition, the Research Council evaluated proposals for the creation of research centers, both lead by College of Agricultural Sciences PIs, one for the development of a Center for Applied Economics and Policy, and the other for the creation of a Center of Small Farms and Community Food Systems. In addition, members of the Research Council provided feedback in the selection of several limited proposal submission opportunities, including the NSF Scalable Nanomanufacturing (SNM), NSF Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) and NSF Material Research Science & Engineering Center (MRSEC) programs, and the Department of State – US-India Education Foundation (USIEF) program.

During the year we considered and addressed several issues related to our mission and working procedures.

1) In order to ensure that the Research Council will meet regularly every month during the academic year, we decided to create a vice-chair position to prepare and lead the meetings when the chair is unavailable. Hillary Egna was elected to this position for the 2012-2013 academic year. We agreed that the vice-chair position should be filled by a member in their second year of committee service since this new position may help achieve a smooth transition from year-to-year if the Faculty Senate elects the vice-chair as committee chair the following year.

2) We evaluated the extent to which this Council should be involved in the creation of college-based centers, and suggested that we should review proposals for centers and institutes that request OSU Administrative financial support, unless requested by the colleges.

3) Following feedback from the Faculty Senate President, the Research Council worked on revisions to proposed modifications to the Council Standing Rules. Following these modifications, the new standing rules were submitted to the Faculty Senate. Although one of the Senate’s feedback recommendations was to reduce the number of Council members due to the difficulty in filling vacancies, we decided to maintain the proposed number (15) to ensure the availability of members to cover
the evaluation of GRF and RERF proposals.

4) As in previous years, we discussed extensively the efficiency in our GRF and RERF review and funding selection process. We recognize that the review process requires a significant time commitment from each one of the committee members, and suggested that members rotating out the previous year should be included as potential reviewers.

5) We provided the Research Office with suggestions regarding guidelines to prioritize research infrastructure recapitalization (see attached text).

6) We met with chairs and administrators of University Compliance Committees to discuss their distinct missions, procedures and challenges. The Compliance Committees covered this year included:

- Institutional Biosafety
- Chemical Safety
- Radiation Safety
- Diving Safety
- Institutional Animal Care and Use
- Institutional Review Board
- Conflict of Interest

Meeting summaries and Research Council recommendations are being prepared to share with the chairs of the respective committees, the Research Office, and the Faculty Senate.

Finally, I would like to express our gratitude to Rich Holdren and Debbie Delmore for their invaluable intellectual and logistic support to the Research Council activities.
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