Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
Research Council

J. D. Birdwell, Chair
April 23, 2002

The Research Council was given the following charge by the Faculty Senate for the 2001-2002 academic year. Each of these points will be discussed in turn.

Faculty Senate Charge to Research Council, 2001-2002

The Research Council shall engage the Administration including but not limited to the President, the Vice President for Research and Information Technology, the Associate Vice-President for Research, and the Provost regarding all aspects of the University's research mission, including but not limited to:

1. Recommendations for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers
2. Allocation of research incentive funds, startup funds for new faculty, faculty accounts, incentives to work with centers
3. Follow-up on faculty leave policy
4. Leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants; contract and grant management
5. University supercomputer initiatives, the Joint Institute for Computational Science, and DII's support infrastructure
6. Impact of restructuring on the Research Council
7. Public exposure of research and outreach
8. Benchmarks and measurement of University progress
9. Stipends and benefits for graduate students
10. Overview of IRB/Human Subjects, Federal requirements, and compliance at UT
11. Faculty titles

The Research Council shall, in addition, explore the possibility of collaboration with comparable bodies at Memphis and Tullahoma.

The Research Council shall, further, remain engaged in:
1. The functioning of the faculty workstation refresh program
2. Its historically close collaboration and supportive activities with the Office of Research.

Recommendations for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers

The Policies and Procedures committee of the Research Council was asked to review the existing guidelines that govern university centers. This effort is still in progress and will be continued over the summer term.

Allocation of research incentive funds, startup funds for new faculty, faculty accounts, incentives to work with centers

A focus area that was identified at the Faculty Senate retreat in the Fall of 2001 was "Research Infrastructure: F&A Distribution/Carryover of RIF Funds." Doug Birdwell was designated as coordinator of the effort to create an action plan. The effort included the Research Council and its Research

Infrastructure committee, and representatives from the Office of Research and Information Technology, the Provost's Office, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, and the University's Business and Finance office.

The October 8, 2001 meeting of the Research Council hosted a discussion with Ms. Denise Barlow (Finance Office), Ms. Verna Howard (Controller's Office), and Mr. Ray Hamilton (Executive Director, Budget & Finance) to obtain an understanding of the mechanisms that govern F&A charges to grants and contracts and exchange views. Subsequent to this meeting, the Research Council's Research Infrastructure committee has developed, through a series of e-mailed documents and discussions, a working draft paper that describes a set of recommended modifications to policies and procedures governing F&A. To ensure representation of the diverse groups that are affected by the policies and procedures governing F&A, the following people were included in these discussions: Dr. Beauvais Lyons (Chair, Faculty Senate Budget Committee), Ms. Sylvia Davis (Vice President -- Budget & Finance), Dr. Loren Crabtree (Provost), Mr. Ray Hamilton, Ms. Denise Barlow, Dr. Dwayne McCay (Vice President -- Research & Information Technology), and Dr. Arlene Garrison (Assistant Vice President).

To a great extent, the administrators within this group remained on the sidelines during these discussions, primarily, it appears, to allow faculty opinions to form and be discussed without unduly influencing the process. Toward the end of the discussions, Dr. Garrison, and to a lesser extent, Ms. Davis and Mr. Hamilton took a more active role, and their efforts are gratefully acknowledged in helping craft the final draft. The recommendations were discussed by the Research Council at its April 22, 2002 meeting, and will be presented to the Faculty Senate as a working draft document for discussion at its April 29, 2002 meeting..

Follow-up on faculty leave policy

Barbara Dewey served as the representative for the Research Council on the Faculty Senate's Professional Leave Task Force. This task force proposed a faculty leave policy to the Faculty Senate, which was amended and approved on March 4, 2002, and is available from the Faculty Senate's web site.

Leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants; contract and grant management

Two issues were identified here: First, leave time for personnel whose primary account is associated with a contract or grant accumulates while a person is employed, but the cost of leave (which will be incurred at some point in the future) is not billed to the contract/grant account. Problems occur under any of the following conditions:

- A contract or grant terminates before an individual takes the accumulated leave.
- An individual with a significant leave accumulation accepts a position paid by a different primary account.
- An individual terminates employment with the University after the contract/grant has terminated but before the accumulated leave has been taken.

In all of these cases, another account in the University must pick up the cost of the accumulated leave. This problem was discussed during the Faculty Senate retreat, and initially, the individuals at the retreat from Business and Finance thought the problem would be easy to fix. Later, they determined that it was more difficult that they initially believed. At the present time, this problem has not been fixed, but at least the issue has been identified and raised with the Business and Finance office.

The second issue concerns financial management of contracts and grants. Many problems associated with the new IRIS financial system have been identified over the course of this year, and faculty who are principal investigators continue to have severe problems tracking contract and grant finances. On January 25, 2002, Doug Birdwell met with Sylvia Davis and Neal Wormsley and discussed many of the known problems. To combat the problems with IRIS, many faculty members are maintaining a set of "shadow books" that allow them to more closely track contract and grant expenditures. Problems continue, however, because of excessive delays in posting information to IRIS accounts, excessive delays in billing contract and grant costs to external sponsors, and errors caused by both inaccurate entries in IRIS and data conversion errors when data were moved from the IMS system. Furthermore, it is clear to many faculty

members that IRIS reports do not meet the needs of sponsored contract and grant management. For example, it is not possible to generate the running cumulative cost and cost projection reports and graphs that many, if not most, federal Contracting Officers and Contracting Officer's Technical Representatives expect to see on a periodic (often monthly) basis. Additional complications occur because of the absence of a system to handle encumberance of funds.

The planned business warehouse should alleviate some of these problems, as it will allow data to be pulled into spreadsheets and should ease the management of accounts. The business warehouse should be established quickly, although it should also be well-planned and executed, with adequate security. It would be difficult for the campus to absorb another perturbation in its business and financial systems such as IRIS has imposed.

On April 8, 2002, a roundtable discussion on IRIS was sponsored by the Faculty Senate and held with representatives from the faculty, accountants and bookkeepers in college and departmental units, and Business and Finance. Many issues with IRIS that are continuing to cause problems were identified, and are listed in an attachment to this report. There is a significant degree of concern across campus with the proposed effort certification process, due to the absence or inadequacy of training, the persistent confusion that exists due to the manner in which salaries are charged to contracts and paid for personnel on 9 month appointments, and the restrictions that the new procedures place on a faculty member's ability to move charges among contract and grant accounts. The coming months will determine how effectively the business and financial services organizations in the university can deal with these issues.

University supercomputer initiatives, the Joint Institute for Computational Science, and DII's support infrastructure

The 2001-2002 academic year began with substantial controversy surrounding the relocation of the Joint Institute for Computational Science (JICS) from the Knoxville campus to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The fundamental issue here was the absence of consultation with affected faculty on the Knoxville campus by the administration before the decision was made to move JICS. The result has been the loss of a valuable resource on the Knoxville campus: the short courses sponsored and run by JICS in parallel computation that were used by many faculty to introduce new students to this area of research.

Discussions among several individuals on the Research Council and other faculty revealed many other issues related to information technology where wisdom would dictate a more reasoned approach to evaluation of alternatives and decision making. The Faculty Senate retreat also identified this area as a focus area, and tasked the Research Council with the creation of an action plan to address the need. The Research Council proposed, and the Faculty Senate adopted at its November 26, 2001 meeting, a resolution to create the Strategic Planning Group on Computing and Networking. This group consists of all interested members of the University community who wish to participate in an electronic forum to identify and discuss issues related to information technology. The text of the resolution, as well as the electronic discussion forum, can be found on the Internet at http://www.lit.net/cgi-bin/netforum/spgcn/a/1.

In parallel with this effort, the Office of Research and Information Technology was tasked by the Provost to develop, with the assistance of SAIC of Oak Ridge, a strategic plan for information technology. A draft of this strategic plan is available on the Internet at http://oit.utk.edu/cbt/RITE7.pdf. A meeting was scheduled by Provost Crabtree on March 12, 2002 to bring representatives from the faculty, the Office of Research and Information Technology (ORIT), and the administration together to discuss strategic planning and tactical management of information technology. An Information Technology Academic Council has been formed, and is meeting in April, to provide input to ORIT and the Provost on these issues, and, we hope, to develop a workable and maintainable IT management structure for the university.

A very important component of information technology deployment and management is security of our information resources. During the Fall term, the University commissioned IBM to perform a security assessment of UT's information resources. The report, when it arrived, was highly critical of the University's awareness of the need for, and implementation of information security. Several of the issues that were described in the IBM report were discussed by the Research Council at its February 25, 2002

meeting. Doug Birdwell e-mailed a letter on behalf of the Research Council to President Fly expressing the Research Council's deep concern for the risks to the University's research programs and reputation due to weaknesses in UT's protection of its information technology resources. The Research Council urges the new President to deal effectively and swiftly with the severe risks facing the University, as documented in the IBM report.

Impact of restructuring on the Research Council

This charge was in response to a restructuring process that began under President Gilley. Its goal was to assess the impact of the elimination of the UT System and the reorganization of the campus units on the mission, activities, and priorities of the Research Council. At the present time, the Research Council is operating under the same basis, namely, for the Knoxville campus, as it did under the previous organizational structure. After President Gilley's resignation, it appeared that there was too much uncertainty to expend effort on this task at the present time.

Public exposure of research and outreach

Promotion of the University's missions and research through pubic exposure and outreach continues to be a goal of the Research Council. The Office of Research has a new Director of Communications, Bill Dockery, who has met with the Research Council and solicited suggestions. The *Alumnus* now has an emphasis on research activities, which will provide another means for public exposure of the university's research activities.

Benchmarks and measurement of University progress

This charge was in response to former President Gilley's announcement during the 2000-2001 academic year that the benchmark of University progress was to be the NSF list of federal research funding to universities and research centers. Several individuals on the Research Council considered this viewpoint to be myopic and in ignorance of the breadth of contributions to the regional, national, and international communities made by the University. Since Dr. Gilley's departure, there appears to have been little need to react to the viewpoints that he expressed.

Stipends and benefits for graduate students

At the Faculty Senate retreat, Dr. Anne Mayhew announced changes to University-wide rules governing stipends and benefits for graduate teaching assistants and graduate assistants that made further action by the Research Council at this time unnecessary.

Overview of IRB/Human Subjects, Federal requirements, and compliance at UT

A search for a compliance officer is currently in progress, with representation on the search committee from the Research Council. The search committee is currently accepting applications. Other compliance activities within the Office of Research included an invitation to Glenn Graber, IRB Chair, to participate on a national panel regarding review of human subjects protocols, and the appointment of a Radiation Safety Officer. Also, the pending AAALAC accreditation will include all of the research units in the Institute of Agriculture. This is the first time they have been part of the accreditation application, and the IACUC and the Office of Lab Animal Care have worked very hard to respond to all the AAALAC findings and to develop a plan for inclusion of the Agriculture units. New funding was provided to IACUC for its oversight activities.

Faculty titles

A resolution was discussed, amended, and approved, by the Faculty Senate during their March 4, 2002 meeting. The Research Council had reviewed drafts of the proposal during several iterations, and had provided suggestions and criticism where it was deemed appropriate. The resolution implements new faculty titles and qualifications during a trial period through December, 2003.

The functioning of the faculty workstation refresh program

Several members of the Research Council were not pleased that the Office of Research and Information Technology elected to restrict the list of vendors from which faculty could purchase laptop computers and workstations in the Spring of 2001 to Dell and Apple. This, coupled with the findings of a special review by UT Audit and Consulting Services titled "Contracts and Small Research Center Proposals" and dated November 14, 2001, and the fact that problems existed in many Dell computers that were delivered during the Spring of 2001, led to a request that Dwayne McCay meet with the Research Council at the January 28, 2002 meeting to address concerns about the Dell contract audit and the Faculty Workstation Refresh Program. Both Dwayne McCay and Brice Bible attended the meeting. Dwayne McCay stated that single-sourcing with Dell was done to maximize the use of funds, and that the refresh program is being run out of the Office of the Provost. He suggested that the Research Council follow up with a discussion with Clif Woods.

Subsequently, Doug Birdwell, Gayle Baker, and Clif Woods discussed the structure of the Faculty Workstation Refresh Program and the Research Council's intent that faculty members be able to choose computer configurations from multiple vendors. The program was modified this Spring to accommodate this request. To date, the Faculty Workstation Refresh Program remains on track to allow all faculty members to obtain a new computer once every three years, continuing to achieve the original goal set forth in the Research Council's original proposal to establish the program.

Activities with the Office of Research

The Research Council provides assistance to the Office of Research by reviewing proposals and making funding recommendations under a number of internal University research programs. These Scholarly Activity and Research Incentive Funds (SARIF) include EPPE (the Exhibit, Performance, and Publication Expense Fund), the Summer Graduate Research Assistantship (GRA) Fund, and, this year for the first time, the SARIF Equipment & Infrastructure Fund. In addition, the Research Council reviews nomination packages for the Provost's Awards for Research and Creative Achievement and the Provost's Awards for Professional Promise in Research and Creative Achievement. Finally, the Research Council provides reviews for proposals to create research or multidisciplinary centers and for the renewal of these centers at five-year intervals.

This important work is handled by the following Special Panels of the Research Council: Provost's Research Awards (chaired by Michael Gant), SARIF: Summer Special Research Assistants (chaired by Pat Fisher), EPPE (chaired by Elizabeth Sutherland), and Centers Evaluation (chaired by Ham Bozdogan). A Special Panel for SARIF: Equipment and Infrastructure Awards (chaired by Gayle Baker) was appointed by the Chair to provide reviews and funding recommendations on faculty proposals for the Office of Research. Although the SARIF Equipment and Infrastructure Awards program has provided annual awards for several years, this is the first year that the Research Council has been involved in the selection process.

The individuals who agreed to serve on these panels spent many hours serving as reviewers and coming to a consensus to make recommendations to the Office of Research, and the chairs did an admirable job providing the sustained effort, organizational skills, and smooth work flow that allowed these important functions to be completed. I deeply appreciate their dedication to this University and thank them for their contributions. Summaries of the actions taken based on recommendations of these special panels are attached, with the exception of the Equipment and Infrastructure Awards, which are not yet public.

Attachments to the Report
Research Council
April 23, 2002

A.   Charge to the Research Council
B.   Centers Reviewed by the Special Panel on Centers Evaluation
C.   EPPE Awards
D.   SARIF Summer Research Awards
E.   Provost's Awards
F.   Strategic Planning Group on Computing & Networking – Charter
G.   Strategic Planning Group on Computing & Networking – Network Forum
H.   IRIS Project Problems Identified at the April 8, 2002 Roundtable
I.   Recommended Modifications to Policies and Procedures Governing Receipt
        and Distribution of Facilities and Administrative Charges to Grants and
        Contracts (April 19, 2002 DRAFT) – Research Infrastructure Committee

A. Charge to the Research Council

Faculty Senate Charge to Research Council, 2001-2002

The Research Council shall engage the Administration including but not limited to the President, the Vice President for Research and Information Technology, the Associate Vice-President for Research, and the Provost regarding all aspects of the University's research mission, including but not limited to:

1. Recommendations for uniform procedures governing establishment, funding, review, and abolition of multidisciplinary centers
2. Allocation of research incentive funds, startup funds for new faculty, faculty accounts, incentives to work with centers
3. Follow-up on faculty leave policy
4. Leave time accumulations and charges to contracts and grants; contract and grant management
5. University supercomputer initiatives, the Joint Institute for Computational Science, and DII's support infrastructure
6. Impact of restructuring on the Research Council
7. Public exposure of research and outreach
8. Benchmarks and measurement of University progress
9. Stipends and benefits for graduate students
10. Overview of IRB/Human Subjects, Federal requirements, and compliance at UT
11. Faculty titles

The Research Council shall, in addition, explore the possibility of collaboration with comparable bodies at Memphis and Tullahoma.

The Research Council shall, further, remain engaged in:

1. The functioning of the faculty workstation refresh program
2. Its historically close collaboration and supportive activities with the Office of Research.

Comments to: birdwell@hickory.engr.utk.edu
Last updated August 14, 2001.

B.   Centers Reviewed by the Special Panel on Centers Evaluation

Special Panel on Centers Evaluation
Research Council

The following Centers were reviewed for Fall, 2002:

Center for Children and Young Adult Literature
Center on Deafness
Institute for Resonance Ionization Spectroscopy (IRIS)
Social Science Research Institute (SSRI)

During the Spring, 2002 term, the following application for Center status was reviewed:

Applied Visualization Center

Reviews of the following Centers during Spring, 2000 are in progress and should be completed in May, 2002:

The Institute for Environmental Modeling
Planetary Geosciences Institutes
Energy, Environment and Resources Center

C. EPPE Awards

Date	Name	College	Department	Description	Am't Req't	Am't App'd
5/2/2001	DeGennaro, Ramon	Business Adm.	Finance	resubmission fee	$160	$160
6/5/2001	Dadmun, Mark	Arts & Sciences	Chemistry	production costs/cover	$900	$900
6/20/2001	Brakke, Michael	Arts & Sciences	Art	exhibition transportation	$1,500	$1,000
6/20/2001	Jung, Anita	Arts & Sciences	Art, Art History & Design	exhibition expenses	$1,610	$1,400
6/20/2001	Stewart, Clark	Arts and Sciences	Art	framing costs	$388	$388
6/20/2001	Zomchick, John	Arts & Sciences	English	travel and photography	$100	$100
8/10/2001	Driese, Steven	Geological Science	Geological Sciences	paper charges	$300	$300
8/10/2001	Neff, Amy	Arts & Sciences	Art	photo reprints	$680	$680
8/20/2001	Simek, Jan	Arts and Sciences	Anthropology	to aid in publishing a special issue of the Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology	$2,000	$1,500
8/27/2001	Howell, Liz	Arts & Sciences	Biochemistry and Cellular and Molecular Biology	color figures	$1,680	$1,680
10/3/2001	Brosnan, Kathleeen	Arts and Sciences	History	publication costs -- monograph	$250	$250
10/3/2001	Gay, Leslie	Arts and Sciences	Music	copyright costs -- Music and Technoculture	$451	$400
10/3/2001	Jung, Anita	Arts and Sciences	Art	Southern Graphics Council Portfolio Project	$1,068	$1,068
10/3/2001	Kaplan, Gregory	Arts and Sciences	Modern Foreign Languages	publication costs for index to Evolution of Converso Literature	$560	$426

Date	Name	College	Department	Description	Am't Req't	Am't App'd
10/3/2001	Xue, Ziling	Arts and Sciences	Chemistry	page charges for Angewandte Chemie article	$700	$700
10/31/2001	Fox, David	Architecture	Architecture	to exhibit faculty work executed as a part of the College of Architecture and Design's SIS	$668	$668
11/13/2001	Hiles, Timothy	Arts and Sciences	Art	interactive book, Art of the Twentieth Century. . .	$1,020	$600
11/13/2001	Tonn, Bruce	Arts and Sciences	Urban and Regional Planning	illustration of future scenarios	$1,800	$900
11/27/2001	Drisin, Adam	Architecture	Architecture	framing and matting of A.M. Drisin: Buildings, Projects, Paintings, 1990-2001	$3,016	$1,000
11/27/2001	Goldenstein, Marcia	Arts & Sciences	Art	framing exhibit at Howard Community College	$296	$296
11/27/2001	Levy, Karen Romeiser, John	Arts & Sciences	Modern Foreign Languages	publication costs of Volume 29 of the Revue Andre Malraux Review	$750	$250
12/17/2001	DeGennaro, Ramon	Business Adm.	Finance	submission fee to the Journal of Banking and Finance	$160	$160
12/17/2001	Ferreira, Mariana	Arts & Sciences	Anthropology	prepare manuscript -- Xavante nutrition	$2,979	$1,000

Date	Name	College	Department	Description	Am't Req't	Am't App'd
1/14/2002	Brown, Melinda	Education	HPER	choreographic exhibit at Southeast Regional American College Dance Festival	$2,553	$1,000
1/14/2002	DeGennaro, Ramon	Business Adm.	Finance	cover submission fee to Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting	$85	$85
2/4/2002	Alligood, Martha	Nursing	Nursing	registration fees	$300	$300
2/6/2002	McLeod, Carolyn	Arts & Sciences	Philosophy	purchase of photograph for cover of book -- Self-Trust and Reproductive Anatomy	$610	$610
2/13/2002	Peterson, Cynthia	Arts & Sciences	Biochemistry and Cellular and Molecular Biology	Publication of Manuscript in The Journal of Biological Chemistry	$512	
2/17/2002	Brogden, Sally	Arts & Sciences	Art	Three sculpture exhibitions	$1,000	$1,000
3/13/2002	Brizio-Skov, Flavia	Arts & Sciences	Modern Foreign Languages	Antonio Tabucchi Manuscript Publication	$1,000	$1,000
4/12/2002	Sutherland, Elizabeth	Arts & Sciences	Classics	production of book	$665	
4/15/2002	McKay, Larry	Arts & Sciences	Geological Sciences	for article in Journal of	$434	
Balance			**$18,565.00**			
BUDGET			**$40,000.00**			
FY 01/02 Commitment			**$21,435**			
		EPPE FUNDS TOTALS			**$30,195**	**$19,821**

D.	SARIF Summer Research Awards

SARIF Summer Research Awards

Date Approved	Name	College	Department
4/1/2002	Atwood, Kenneth	Arts & Sciences	Modern Foreign Languages & Literatures
4/1/2002	Barnhart, Jennifer	Arts & Sciences	Political Science
4/1/2002	Bownas, Jennifer	School of Information Sciences	
4/1/2002	Byrd, Rebecca	Human Ecology	Child & Family Studies
4/1/2002	Coakley, Tanya	Social Work	
4/1/2002	Davis, Hugh	Arts & Sciences	English
4/1/2002	Engel, Erika	Business	Management
4/1/2002	Fontenot, Maria	Communications	Broadcasting
4/1/2002	Fussner, Jill	Audiology & Speech Pathology	Audiology
4/1/2002	Galliford, Carrie	Arts & Sciences	History
4/1/2002	Goodman, Rachel	Arts & Sciences	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
4/1/2002	Johnson, Christopher	Arts & Sciences	Art
4/1/2002	Jones, Chad	Arts & Sciences	Music
4/1/2002	Jones, Laura	Human Ecology	Nutrition
4/1/2002	Kang, Hye Jung	Arts & Sciences	Physics & Astronomy
4/1/2002	Kim, Tae-Houn	Arts & Sciences	Botany
4/1/2002	Kinser, Kathleen	Communications	Journalism and Public Relations
4/1/2002	Landdeck, Katherine	Arts & Sciences	History

4/1/2002	Ness, Scott	Arts & Sciences	Physics & Astronomy
4/1/2002	Omitaomu, Femi	Engineering	Industrial Engineering
4/1/2002	Paulek, Adam	Arts & Sciences	Art
4/1/2002	Prince, Debra	Arts & Sciences	Art
4/1/2002	Strother, Shawn	Business	Finance
4/1/2002	Tanner, Ben	Arts & Sciences	Geological Sciences
4/1/2002	Tharpe, Jessica	Arts & Sciences	Geography
4/1/2002	Vasilevska, Violeta	Arts & Sciences	Mathematics
4/1/2002	Walguarney, Justin	Arts & Sciences	Psychology
4/1/2002	Wang, Hui	Engineering	Civil & Environmental Engineering
4/1/2002	Wright, James	Arts & Sciences	Sociology
4/1/2002	Yoon, Sukhoon	Education	Exercise Science & Sport Mangement

E.   Provost's Awards

Provost's Awards for Research and Creative Achievement -- 2002

Marilyn Kallett	English
Kathleen Lawler	Psychology
Witold Nazarewicz	Physics
David Northington	Music

Provost's Awards for Professional Promise in Research and Creative Achievement – 2002

Wesley Baldwin	Music
S. Douglas Gilman	Chemistry

F.   Strategic Planning Group on Computing & Networking – Charter

Forum: UT Strategic Planning Group / Computing & Networking

Topic: Charter and Activities

Topic Posted by: Doug Birdwell (birdwell@hickory.engr.utk.edu)
Organization: Research Council
Date Posted: Wed Jan 9 0:47:11 2002
Topic Description: Motion creating the SPG, activities, and plans.

Posted by: Doug Birdwell (birdwell@hickory.engr.utk.edu)
Organization: Research Council
Date posted: Wed Jan 9 0:57:27 2002
Subject: Motion creating the SPG/C&N
Message:
The Strategic Planning Group on Computing and Networking was created by vote of the Faculty Senate at its November 12, 2001 meeting approving the following motion:

"Whereas the faculty should provide leadership by establishing strategic directions for the development of computer and network resources to meet the needs of the University community,

"Therefore, the Strategic Planning Group on Computing and Networking is hereby established.

"The organization of this group is to be managed by the Research Council and open to all faculty members. The chair of the group is to be a tenured faculty member appointed for a renewable one year term, to be selected by the President of the Senate and the Chair of the Research Council acting in concert.

The group is charged to solicit the views and input of all University faculty, staff, and students, and to develop and maintain a strategic plan for University computing and networking resource development, to be updated annually and provided to the Faculty Senate, the Vice President for Research and Information Technology, and other appropriate administrative units for implementation."

About NetForum - v.2.0.3

Fri Apr 19 9:54:19 2002

G.   Strategic Planning Group on Computing & Networking – Network Forum

Forum: UT Strategic Planning Group / Computing & Networking

Owner: Bill Blass
Contact: Bill Blass(wblass@utk.edu)
Description: The Strategic Planning Group on Computing and Networking is charged to solicit the views and input of all University faculty, staff, and students, and to develop and maintain a strategic plan for University computing and networking resource development, to be updated annually and provided to the Faculty Senate, the Vice President for Research and Information Technology, and other appropriate administrative units for implementation. This discussion forum has been created to solicit and organize information relevant to purpose of the SPG/C&N and record any discussions that occur.

Discussion Topics: (click on the topic to view messages)

- **Charter and Activities**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Wed Jan 9 0:57:27 2002)
- **IT Staffing Requirements and Compensation Levels**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Wed Jan 9 10:35:23 2002)
- **Cluster/Grid Computing**
    (1 message, 1 reply, last message/reply posted Mon Mar 18 0:58:55 2002)
- **Networked Storage**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Wed Jan 9 11:21:48 2002)
- **Support Services / Applications and Systems Administration**
    (no messages)
- **SAP / IRIS -- Business IT Systems and Services**
    (3 messages, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Sat Apr 6 0:10:35 2002)
- **Network Security**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Wed Jan 9 11:29:51 2002)
- **(Very) High Performance Computing**
    (no messages)
- **Priorities and Paying the Bills**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Wed Jan 9 11:38:40 2002)
- **New SPG Members & Contributors**
    (no messages)
- **OIT Strategic Planning Document**
    (1 message, 0 replies, last message/reply posted Sat Mar 9 4:22:56 2002)

About NetForum - v.2.0.3

Fri Apr 19 9:52:14 2002

H.   IRIS Project Problems Identified at the April 8, 2002 Roundtable

IRIS Project Problems & Issues Identified at the
IRIS Project Roundtable on April 8, 2002

1. A formal process is needed that continues to solicit feedback from users about needs and problems, evaluates the feedback, and takes appropriate action.
2. System security: IRIS systems appear to be susceptible to network attacks, steps need to be taken to remedy design errors caused by a lack of understanding of security issues during the early phases of the project, and the security hole that allows payments to be made by bypassing the established work flow needs to be fixed.
3. IRIS is not able to encumber payroll on R accounts.
4. It is not easy to extract information from IRIS other than through the established time periods.
5. Faculty and staff can not obtain the information necessary to audit expenses from IRIS reports without using multiple reports or other sources of data.
6. Department heads are not signing invoices they had approved in IRIS.
7. IRIS overly restricts the movement of funds.
8. Delays….
9. The new ledger doesn't have account specific information in the header, such as F&A rate, award value, and expiration date.
10. IRIS lacks the ability to provide periodic tracking and display of summary information over the lifetime of a contract or account.
11. Managers of private funds need a summarization report over all accounts for which they are responsible.
12. The budgets are only as up to date as the Research Office maintains them, and the Research Office has been running behind. Similar problems exist with billing.
13. Tracking is needed that can include expectations (i.e., not "official records")
14. DMS and IMS were automatically reconciled. That doesn't happen with the XLS spreadsheets that are being used as "shadow books" to make up for the deficiencies in IRIS.
15. IRIS supports an "accountant's view" (restrictions in the ability to change XXX) versus a "user's view" (needing the ability to spend funds to zero).
16. Training of faculty is necessary to support the effort certification process. For example, severe confusion is likely in the differences between academic year and summer term charges for personnel on 9 month appointments.
17. It took one bookkeeper two weeks to figure out how to put a discount on equipment purchases!
18. IRIS security to date is user authentication, not security!
19. A special termination date of 9999 for personnel on grants and contracts is evidently important information that is not easy to find.
20. Nothing populates into the PIF, leading to a lot of looking up of information and retyping. Note that the student systems group is looking into evaluation of vendors that can provide pre-population of data in forms. No idea when this will be available, though.
21. Principal investigators need a page with all his or her budgets listed in one place.
22. Getting up-to-date account information is essential, and is not happening at present.

23. "Not being about to juggle funds by moving salaries among accounts is a major problem. The university is going to lose money."
24. Re-filling out information on effort certification forms is wasteful and a pain.
25. IRIS won't allow closing out an account.
26. Where are the monthly statements of bills to granting agencies?
27. When funds reservations are entered with a description, the description later disappears.
28. Not being able to automatically clear funds reservations when money is expended is a problem.
29. Check stubs don't give health insurance type and 403B payees.
30. HR & Payroll systems do not allow document parking because the software doesn't support it.
31. "Can IRIS be made more efficient so everyone doesn't have to keep their own books?"
32. Not being about to go back more than 6 months to re-allocate effort certification is a problem.

I.   Recommended Modifications to Policies and Procedures Governing Receipt and Distribution of Facilities and Administrative Charges to Grants and Contracts (April 19, 2002 DRAFT) – Research Infrastructure Committee

WORKING DRAFT

Recommended Modifications to Policies and Procedures Governing Receipt and Distribution of Facilities and Administrative Charges to Grants and Contracts

Research Council
April 23, 2002

History

A focus area that was identified at the Faculty Senate retreat in the Fall of 2001 was "Research Infrastructure: F&A Distribution/Carryover of RIF Funds." Doug Birdwell, Chair of the Research Council was designated as coordinator of the effort to create an action plan. The effort included the Research Council and its Research Infrastructure committee, and representatives from the Office of Research and Information Technology, the Provost's Office, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, and the university's Business & Finance office.

The October 8, 2001 meeting of the Research Council hosted a discussion with Ms. Denise Barlow (Finance Office), Ms. Verna Howard (Controller's Office), and Mr. Ray Hamilton (Executive Director, Budget & Finance) to obtain an understanding of the mechanisms that govern F&A charges to grants and contracts and exchange views. Subsequent to this meeting, the Research Council's Research Infrastructure committee developed, through a series of e-mailed documents and discussions, a set of recommended modifications to policies and procedures governing F&A. To ensure representation of the diverse groups that are affected by the policies and procedures governing F&A, the following people were included in these discussions: Dr. Beauvais Lyons (Chair, Faculty Senate Budget Committee), Ms. Sylvia Davis (Vice President – Budget & Finance), Dr. Loren Crabtree (Provost), Mr. Ray Hamilton, Ms. Denise Barlow, Dr. Dwayne McCay (Vice President – Research & Information Technology), and Dr. Arlene Garrison (Assistant Vice President).

To a great extent, the administrators within this group remained on the sidelines during these discussions, primarily, it appears, to allow faculty opinions to form and be discussed without unduly influencing the process. Toward the end of the discussions, Dr. Garrison, and to a lesser extent, Ms. Davis and Mr. Hamilton took a more active role, and their efforts are gratefully acknowledged in helping to craft the final draft. The recommendations of this group are summarized in the remainder of this document. These recommendations have been discussed at the Research Council at its April 22, 2002 meeting, and the Research Council voted to submit this document to the Faculty Senate as a working draft document to encourage thought and further discussion.

Executive Summary

The Research Council recommends the following modifications to the University's policies and procedures governing Facilities and Administrative income. These recommendations are discussed in more detail in the body of this document.

WORKING DRAFT

1. A portion of F&A receipts should be returned directly to the control of the faculty members who are responsible for their generation. It is recommended that funds equal to one-third of net F&A receipts received from a contract or grant be returned to the principal investigator(s) of that contract or grant.
2. Additional incentives provided to faculty members who perform research and generate external financial sponsorship are strongly encouraged.
3. The Associate Vice-President for Research provides funding for internal research and development (IR&D) activities directed by University faculty and funds centralized mandatory cost sharing of direct costs on externally funded projects. IR&D awards are, and should continue to be, made using a competitive proposal process with faculty review. It is recommended that the University budget state funds equal to one-third of net F&A income received in the previous year for these purposes.
4. The remaining portion of F&A recoveries (one-third of net F&A income) should remain in the University's general fund to assist in covering the costs for research infrastructure across the University.
5. Individual discretionary accounts should be established for each faculty member to receive and hold returned F&A, or Research Incentive Funds. These accounts should not be subject to a fiscal year boundary.
6. Procedures should be implemented to effect the transfer of F&A funds to their final recipients within one month of the date the funds are earned by the University.
7. As an investment to promote the growth of the University's research enterprise, the budget for administrative costs of the Office of Research should be determined by an audit of anticipated functions and necessary infrastructure and by comparison with similar organizations in other tier I research universities. This budget should relate to where the University wants to be, and not to where we are. The budget allocation for IR&D/matching activities should not be affected by the budget allocation for research administration.
8. The University should commit the necessary resources to provide solid documentation of its proposed F&A structure for each Federal audit and to enable it to adopt a strong position in F&A rate negotiations.

Background

Facilities and Administrative (F&A) charges to grants and contracts are designed to reimburse costs associated with the conduct of research activities that can not attributed, and therefore billed, to a single grant or contract. The rates charged are determined by audit and negotiation with an agency of the Federal government, generally at three-year intervals, and are applied against direct costs charged to grants and contracts, less categories of charges that are exempt from F&A such as student fees and portions of equipment and subcontracting expenses.

In fiscal year 1999-2000, the University had gross F&A receipts of approximately $12M. Of this, $9-10M was net income to the University due to cost sharing. Of this net income 75% was deposited to the university's general fund, and 25% was distributed as Research

Incentive Funds, or RIF, to deans and directors. The Office of Research, or OR, received an annual budget for fiscal year 2000-2001 equal to approximately 23% of the previous year's net F&A receipts. These funds, allocated as separate budget items, covered both the costs of research administration and the costs of internal research and development awards and matches on external grants and contracts. The net effect of these allocations provided income to the general fund of the University equivalent to 52% of the net F&A received during fiscal year 1999-2000.

Because the F&A is from external sponsors, in the majority of instances it is received by UT without restrictions specifying a date by when it must be spent. Much of it, however, is transferred into E accounts, where it must be spent by the end of the fiscal year in which it is received. There is a process by which a percentage of RIF receipts can be carried over to the next fiscal year, but this is not widely known or used.

Currently, a large portion of the University's F&A income is used to offset shortfalls in the base budgets of academic units. This often provides no benefit to the University's research infrastructure. It also generates the perception by both faculty and external sponsors that F&A is a tax on doing research within the University rather than a payment toward the costs of providing a sound research infrastructure.

The University has a process in place that is used to justify and negotiate its F&A rates with the Federal government; however, it is not clear that this is as effective as it could be. For example, although library costs have been steadily increasing over the past decade, the government prevailed during the last F&A rate negotiations in arguing that the transition to digital technologies is lowering library costs. In fact, the opposite is true, and data documenting this have not been successfully assembled and presented to the government during negotiations. Adequate funding in order to build and maintain a high-quality library system is essential to success in seeking competitively funded external grants and contracts, and the government should not have been able to successfully argue for reduced library contributions to the F&A rate in the recent negotiations. Both consultants and collaborations with other universities can be very effective in preparation for F&A rate negotiations; there is, however, no substitute for solid preparation and supporting documentation.

The best investment the University can make toward increased sponsored research productivity is at the lowest administrative level: the faculty who generate sponsored research income. Unfortunately, many groups are in competition for Research "Incentive" Funds (RIF), and the faculty who generate externally sponsored awards are often placed last in priority to receive the funds. The current model for use of the RIF portion of F&A involves departments, colleges, campuses, and centers, placing them in competition for these dollars. Some existing recipients have justification. For others the status quo is the result of a history of inadequate funding, and a portion of RIF is absorbed to cover the costs of operations. Correction of this situation requires financial planning and some reallocation of resources. Departmental and college operating budgets should be adequately funded, and F&A income should be used to support research infrastructure.

The University provides mechanisms, both centrally through the ORIT-managed SARIF programs and some support toward start-up funds for newly hired faculty, and in a decentralized fashion through some departments and colleges, to provide funding to support "Internal Research and Development" (IR&D). Of these efforts, the budgeted level of funding by the state for SARIF programs is determined by the prior year's net F&A income. Cost sharing requirements are covered in a similar manner. These are worthy programs, and the SARIF programs, in particular, should be funded at a meaningfully higher level. ORIT is responsible for the continued monitoring of cost-sharing obligations. Commitments are reviewed carefully and are only made in cases where the cost-sharing is mandatory and the benefits to the University are found to exceed the costs. This review process must be continued, recognizing that in some cases the University will be unable to submit proposals due to the limited amount of funding available for cost sharing.

An issue closely related to F&A is recovery of direct costs from contracts and grants. The ability to recover funds such as faculty salaries varies across disciplines. Recoveries are common, and are essential, due to the structure of their budgets, in the departments within the College of Engineering. Some federal agencies discourage academic year recoveries of faculty salaries if there is no clear reduction on other faculty duties. This can force universities to assume the burden of faculty costs associated with research grants from these agencies. In programs within many departments in the humanities and social sciences, external funds are extremely limited or unavailable, and the University must structure these departmental budgets in a manner that includes the cost of performing research if it wishes to be competitive as a tier I research institution. Where salary recoveries can be made, these funds usually are more than adequate to cover the costs of hiring non-tenure track faculty, staff, or graduate students to meet the duties of faculty released for time spent on research. It is therefore possible for some academic units to generate surplus income from salary recoveries and use that income to build research infrastructure. In some cases, these academic units return a portion of this income to the faculty members who have been responsible for its generation, either as funds to support research infrastructure or as salary incentive supplements. These measures are effective in the promotion and growth of the research enterprise and should be encouraged.

Recommendations

As was outlined above, the Research Council recommends the following modifications to the University's policies and procedures governing Facilities and Administrative income.

1. A portion of F&A receipts should be returned directly to the control of the faculty members who are responsible for their generation. It is recommended that funds equal to one-third of net F&A receipts received from a contract or grant be returned to the principal investigator(s) of that contract or grant to support research infrastructure. This provides both the necessary support for research infrastructure at the points where it is likely to do the most good, and an incentive for principal

investigators to both increase their external funding and avoid situations involving cost-sharing of F&A charges.

2. Additional incentives provided to faculty members who perform research and generate external financial sponsorship are strongly encouraged. Examples include current practices in some academic units, such as incentive salary payments and incentive research funds provided using funds generated by release time charges.

3. The Associate Vice-President for Research provides funding for internal research and development (IR&D) activities directed by University faculty and funds centralized mandatory cost sharing of direct costs (other than waiver or reduction in F&A charges, which account for the difference between gross and net F&A income) on externally funded projects. IR&D awards are, and should continue to be, made using a competitive proposal process with faculty review. Funding of mandatory cost-sharing is, and should continue to be, determined on a case-by-case basis using the guidance that long-term benefits to the University should outweigh costs. Cost-sharing through either reduced collection of F&A income or reduced recovery of direct costs should continue to be discouraged if it is not mandated by the funding agency. It is recommended that the University budget state funds equal to one-third of net F&A income received in the previous year for these purposes.

4. The remaining portion of F&A recoveries (one-third of net F&A income) should remain in the University's general fund to assist in covering the costs for research infrastructure across the University. This distribution removes the direct use of F&A recoveries, through the Research Incentive Funds, by colleges and departments, and, without adjustment, would leave several campus units with budget shortfalls totaling at most $2.5M (25% of the net F&A received, based upon FY 1999-2000 data). The actual total shortfall is significantly less because a portion of RIF collections are already returned to the faculty members who generate the funds. College and departmental budgets should be adjusted by the amounts of their shortfalls to accommodate this redistribution.

5. Individual discretionary accounts should be established for each faculty member to receive and hold returned F&A, or Research Incentive Funds. These accounts should not be subject to a fiscal year boundary. These accounts should not be subject to a fiscal year boundary, but rather should allow funds to accumulate until spent by the designated faculty members. The accounts should also be used to receive and hold any start-up funds designated for use by newly hired faculty, and every newly hired faculty member should have such an account. To avoid the long-term accumulation of unused funds in these accounts, procedures should be formulated and adopted, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, that require funds received in these accounts to be spent within a designated time from their date of receipt. A five-year lifetime for these funds is recommended.

6. Procedures should be implemented to effect the transfer of F&A funds to their final recipients (general fund or faculty discretionary account) within one month of the date the funds are earned by the University.

7. The administrative costs of the Office of Research are currently funded using state funds, but the level of this funding is related, along with the level of funding for IR&D/matching activities, to net F&A income received during a prior budget cycle. In fiscal year 2000-2001, the total funding for these two categories was budgeted at a level of approximately 23% of net F&A income received during the previous year. As an investment to promote the growth of the University's research enterprise, the budget for administrative costs of the Office of Research should be determined by an audit of anticipated functions and necessary infrastructure and by comparison with similar organizations in other tier I research universities. This budget should relate to where the University wants to be, and not to where we are. The budget allocation for IR&D/matching activities should not be affected by the budget allocation for research administration. While it is legitimate to include the costs within ORIT that are associated with research management within the justification to Federal auditors in negotiations to adjust the F&A rates, the budget for research administration functions should not depend upon a prior year's net F&A income.

8. The University should commit the necessary resources to provide solid documentation of its proposed F&A structure for each Federal audit and to enable it to adopt a strong position in F&A rate negotiations.