

Graduate Deans' Group
Thursday, March 12, 2009, 2:00 – 3:15 p.m.
Fourth Floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower

Attending:

Vincent Anfara, Mary Albrecht, Joy DeSensi (Chair), Bill Dunne, Tom George, Tom Ladd, Jan Lee, Sally McMillan, Masood Parang, Carol Parker, Cynthia Rocha, Gregory Sedrick, Brad Fenwick, Carolyn Hodges, Mohanan MK, Stefanie Ohnesorg, Kay Reed.

The Graduate Deans' Group meeting was called to order by Joy DeSensi, on Thursday, March 12, 2009, at 2:00 p.m. in Fourth Floor Conference Room, Andy Holt Tower.

1. Minutes of the Preceding Meeting

The minutes of the February 5, 2009 meeting were approved.

2. Task Force on Assistantships

Carolyn Hodges shared the following conclusions and recommendations from the report from the Task Force on Assistantships:

- Develop a plan to provide benchmark data on graduate programs on an ongoing basis.
- Formalize a process for review of graduate support on a regular basis
- Provide a description of functions for the committee on graduate support within the Graduate Council.
- Work with the Office of Institutional Research to provide reasonable comparisons with National Research Council (NRC) data.
- Review state-funded graduate positions in non-academic units.
- Continue to explore mechanisms for alternative support of graduate students.
- Some unresolved issues are current job descriptions for graduate assistants, graduate teaching assistants, and graduate teaching associates; distinction of differences between 9 month and 12-month positions; stipend distinctions between master-level and doctoral-level graduate assistants; and general recommendations about teaching responsibilities being in the hands of teaching assistants rather than lecturers.

This report will be presented to the Council of Deans and Graduate Council.

3. Stimulus Package and Impact on Opportunity for Funding Research

Brad Fenwick shared information from the following handouts: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (\$787B), Federal S & T Budget Outlook, and Advice to Faculty. (Attachments 1,2,3)

4. Information Items from Faculty Senate

Vincent Anfara shared the following information:

- Gay has created a handout with the Graduate Council members by Colleges to be replaced. New members need to be sent to the Graduate School by March 30.
- Graduate Council elected Michael Essington as Vice Chair/Chair Elect.
- Calendar of 2009 – 2010 Graduate Council meetings are posted on the Graduate School website.
- Faculty Senate Executive Committee will present a five category scale faculty annual review resolution for approval at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 23.
- Faculty Senate Task Force on Effectiveness has made a few changes to the committees. There will be no changes made to the Graduate Council.

5. Graduate Deans' Group Bylaws Changes

The Graduate Deans' Group Bylaws were approved. They will be posted on the Graduate Council website and will be considered the first reading. The bylaws will be presented for approval at the next Graduate Council meeting.

6. Graduate Handbooks Template

Joy DeSensi stated that the 2006 Graduate Handbooks Template has been located and revisions will be made. Changes will be emailed to the Graduate Deans' Group for approval. The new template will be posted on the Graduate School website.

7. Other Business

There will be a called meeting of the Graduate Deans' Group to discuss the graduate catalog with Catherine Cox. Details of the meeting will be sent to the Graduate Deans' Group via email.

New curriculum is scheduled to be in Banner by Fall 2010 for Spring 2011 registration.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gay Henegar
Secretary to Graduate Deans' Group

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (\$787B)

STIMULUS “*FRENZY*” ---- to ---- STIMULUS “*ENVY*”

Allocations:

- 288B Tax Cuts
- 144B State Governments “*Prevents cuts in health and education programs and tax increases*”
 - * Tennessee’s Share (if fully accepted): \$4.3B
- 111B Infrastructure and Science (\$21.5B in Federal R&D)
 - 81B Social Services
 - 59B Health Care
 - 53B Education
 - 43B Energy
 - 8B Other

Federal Agencies (selected):

USDA:

- USFS - \$1.15B for capital improvements and deferred maintenance
- Rural Utilities Service - \$2.5B for broadband access and distance learning

Commerce:

- National Telecommunications & Information Admin - \$4.7B for competitive grants for broadband infrastructure and use (including distance education)

Defense:

- Rapid Technology transition & demonstration of energy efficiency - \$300M

Education:

- State Allocations - \$48B (formula based) - 81.8% for program and services shortfalls
 - 18.2% for public and governmental services
- Higher Education Teacher Quality Enhancement - \$100M
- Student Financial Assistance (Pell, work-study, etc) - \$15.84B
- Statewide Data Systems - \$250M

Energy:

- Science Programs - \$1.6B
- Defense Environmental Cleanup - \$5.1B
- Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) - \$400M
- Fossil Energy Research and Development - \$3.4B
- Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy - \$16.8B (\$2.5B for research and communications)

HHS:

- Community Health Centers - \$2B
- Biomedical Research - \$8.2B
- University Research Facilities - \$1.3B (help them compete for biomedical research)
- Agency for Healthcare Research / Comparative Effectiveness - \$1.1B
- Health Information Technology Grant - \$2B (training, infrastructure, communications, etc)
- Prevention and Wellness - \$1B (\$650M for clinical/community-based prevention and wellness)

NIST:

- Competitive Construction Grants - \$180M
- Competitive Fellowships and Equipment Grants - \$220M

NSF:

- Programmatic Research - \$2B
- Major Research Equipment – \$300M

Academic Facilities Modernization - \$200M
Construction and Development of Major Research Equipment - \$400M
Education and Human Resources - \$100M

Distributions:

- State - Legislative process (with some restrictions, e.g. higher education requirement = \$170M/yr)
- Federal - Major institutional-level projects (new RFAs)
 - Center and individual investigator plus-ups and awards

Timeline:

- March: Agencies begin reporting use of funds
- May: Performance plans announced
Financial reports available
Competitive grants and contracts RFAs published
- July: Recipient organizations report use of funds

Transparency and Reporting:

- Major Communications. Beginning immediately, agencies receiving Recovery Act funds should determine which major communications are appropriate for posting on Recovery.gov.
- Formula Block Grant Allocation Reports. As soon as information becomes available, Federal agencies are required to provide details on the allocations made for each formula block grant.
- Weekly Updates. Starting March 3rd, agencies must submit weekly reports providing a breakdown of funding, major actions taken to date, and major planned actions.
- Monthly Financial Reports. Starting May 8th, agencies must provide monthly financial reports providing obligations, expenditures, and other financial data by Treasury Account, vendor, and award number, as well as information on allocations of mandatory and entitlement programs by State, county, or other appropriate geographical unit.
- Award Transaction Data Feeds. Starting on May 5th, agencies must provide all Recovery Act assistance transactions (primarily grants, loans, and loan guarantees) in the standard format currently provided to USASpending.gov. Agencies must also begin planning now for how they would provide this information on a more frequent basis if a decision is made to do so.
- Agency Recovery Plan. No later than May 1st, agencies must provide their “Agency Recovery Plan” that describes both broad recovery goals and the agency’s coordinating efforts.
- Recovery Program Plans. No later than May 1st, agencies must provide a separate “Recovery Program Plan” for each Recovery Act program named in the legislation. Agencies should work with their OMB representative to set an appropriate submission date and review process.

Information Collection and Dissemination:

- Starting immediately, agencies must ensure all funds provided by the Recovery Act are clearly distinguishable from non-Recovery Act funds in all agency financial systems, business systems (i.e., grant and contract writing systems), and reporting systems.
- To support reporting requirements, agencies need to have the appropriate contract/grant/loan number recorded on the obligation, expenditure, and other transactions in their financial system.
- Starting immediately, agencies must have all award documents and related communications include the clauses and provisions necessary to clarify that award recipients are legally obligated and must meet their reporting requirements under the Recovery Act and this Guidance.
- To facilitate transparency and reporting, agencies should establish a page on their existing website dedicated to the Recovery Act (i.e., www.agency.gov/recovery), which will link to Recovery.gov and will provide a single portal for all agency-specific information related to the Act.
- For each government contract or order (or modification to an existing contract or order) over \$500,000, agencies should provide a summary of the contract or order (or modification to an existing contract or order), including a description of the required products and services, which will be made available publicly and linked to Recovery.gov.
- A summary of any contract or order (or modification to an existing contract or order), including a description of the required products and services, using Recovery Act funds shall be posted in a special section of the web site

Recovery.gov unless the contract or order is both fixed-price and competitively awarded.

- By March 15th, each agency should begin identifying to OMB's E-Gov Office current agency systems that collect or will collect significant Recovery Act program information from recipients, but are currently unable to make this information available to the public.
- Within one week of issuing this guidance, agencies must establish a dedicated page on their website for recovery efforts. Appendix 2 describes agency website requirements, guidelines, and best practices.

Grant and Cooperative Agreement Awards, agencies must:

- Request an expedited "Recovery Act" Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for new Recovery Act programs or existing programs for which the Recovery Act provides for compliance requirements that are significantly different for the Recovery Act funding;
- Provide notification of existing CFDA program descriptions that will be modified during the next CFDA update cycle to reflect Recovery Act authorities, financial information, etc.;
- Within twenty (20) days after enactment of the Recovery Act, agencies shall post funding opportunity announcements (i.e., "synopses") to Grants.gov;
- Within thirty (30) days of enactment, the Grants.gov synopsis shall link to the full announcement on the agency website;
- Include prominent labels and tags in funding opportunity synopses, full funding opportunity announcements, and award notices that clearly distinguish them as "Recovery Act" actions;
- Begin outreach efforts with potential applicants to create or update their profiles in Dun and Bradstreet Universal Numbering System (DUNS) and Central Contractor Registration (CCR);
- Provide their Weekly Report allocations for each formula grant award; Include terms and conditions in award documents necessary for effective implementation of Recovery Act data collection and accountability requirements; and
- Identify opportunities to streamline data collection to help alleviate reporting burden on funding recipients.

Omnibus FY 09 (\$410B): Includes 9 of 12 appropriations bills (DoD, HS, Vet Affairs passed).

Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Bill:

NASA: \$17.7B (\$380M increase)

NSF: \$6.5B (\$425M increase, 7%)

\$845M for Education & Human Resources (\$119M increase)

\$152M Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction (\$68M decrease)

NIST: \$819M (\$63M increase)

Manufacturing Extension Partnerships (\$100M)

High-Risk/High-Rewards Research (\$65M)

Competitive Construction Grants (\$30M)

NOAA: \$4.3B (\$376M increase)

Energy and Water Appropriations Bill:

DOE: \$4.7B (\$754M increase, 19%)

High Energy Physics (\$107M increase)

Nuclear Physics (\$70M increase)

Biological and Environmental Research (\$57M increase)

Basic Energy Research (\$249M increase)

Advanced Scientific Computing (\$17M increase)

Fusion Energy Science (\$118M increase)

Interior Appropriations Bill:

USGS: \$1B (\$37M increase)

NEH: \$155M (\$10M increase, 7%)

NEA: \$155M (\$10M increase, 7%)

Labor, Health & Human Services, Education Appropriations Bill

NIH: \$30.3B (\$938M increase, 3.2%)

Bell Grants: \$17.3B (\$3B increase, 22%)

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need: \$31M (\$1M increase)

Work Study: \$980M

Perkins: \$67M

TRIO: \$848M

Cross-Cuts:

Global Climate Change Research:

NASA - \$150M for science missions and climate change measurement

NOAA- \$394M for computer models, sensors, and data accessibility

NSF- \$230M for research on impacts of human activities

Proposed FY10 Budget (Issued on 26 February) and Beyond

Non-Defense Discretionary Spending:

“ Increase to \$675B in FY10 and then declines to a bottom of \$621B in FY13 and does not again reach FY10 levels until FY19.”

NIH: \$6B for Cancer Research (multi-year plan to double cancer research)

NSF: \$7B (\$510M increase, 7.9%)

- Begin the process of doubling the funding for basic research over 10 years.

- Substantial increases for NSF's prestigious Graduate Research Fellowship and Faculty Early Career Development programs.
- Increases support for the Advanced Technological Education program, which focuses on two-year colleges and supports partnerships between academic institutions and employers to promote improvement in the education of science and engineering technicians.
- Increases support for exploratory and high-risk research proposals.
- Increases research to improve our ability to predict future environmental conditions and to develop strategies for responding to global environmental change and establishes a climate change education program to help develop the next generation of environmentally engaged scientists and engineers.

DOE: Increases in Basic Sciences and Graduate Fellowship Programs

NASA: \$18.7B (\$918M increase, 5.2%)

DoEd: Increase Pell Grants to \$5,550 max (Convert to a mandatory program indexed to CPI)
Access and Completion Incentive Fund (\$500M/yr) – Support innovative state efforts to help low income students complete college.

Federal S&T Budget Outlook

Omnibus FY 09 (\$410B): Includes 9 of 12 appropriations bills (DoD, HS, Vet Affairs passed).

Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Bill:

NASA: \$17.7B (\$380M increase)
NSF: \$6.5B (\$425M increase, 7%)
 \$845M for Education & Human Resources (\$119M increase)
 \$152M Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction (\$68M decrease)
NIST: \$819M (\$63M increase)
 Manufacturing Extension Partnerships (\$100M)
 High-Risk/High-Rewards Research (\$65M)
 Competitive Construction Grants (\$30M)
NOAA: \$4.3B (\$376M increase)

Energy and Water Appropriations Bill:

DOE: \$4.7B (\$754M increase, 19%)
 High Energy Physics (\$107M increase)
 Nuclear Physics (\$70M increase)
 Biological and Environmental Research (\$57M increase)
 Basic Energy Research (\$249M increase)
 Advanced Scientific Computing (\$17M increase)
 Fusion Energy Science (\$118M increase)

Interior Appropriations Bill:

USGS: \$1B (\$37M increase)
NEH: \$155M (\$10M increase, 7%)
NEA: \$155M (\$10M increase, 7%)

Labor, Health & Human Services, Education Appropriations Bill

NIH: \$30.3B (\$938M increase, 3.2%)
Bell Grants: \$17.3B (\$3B increase, 22%)
Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need: \$31M (\$1M increase)
Work Study: \$980M
Perkins: \$67M
TRIO: \$848M

Cross-Cuts:

Global Climate Change Research:
 NASA - \$150M for science missions and climate change measurement
 NOAA - \$394M for computer models, sensors, and data accessibility
 NSF - \$230M for research on impacts of human activities

Proposed FY10 Budget (Issued on 26 February) and Beyond

Non-Defense Discretionary Spending:

“Increase to \$675B in FY10 and then declines to a bottom of \$621B in FY13 and does not again reach FY10 levels until FY19.”

NIH: \$6B for Cancer Research (multi-year plan to double cancer research)
NSF: \$7B (\$510M increase, 7.9%)

- Begin the process of doubling the funding for basic research over 10 years.
- Substantial increases for NSF's prestigious Graduate Research Fellowship and Faculty Early Career Development programs.
- Increases support for the Advanced Technological Education program, which focuses on two-year colleges and supports partnerships between academic institutions and employers to promote improvement in the education of science and engineering technicians.
- Increases support for exploratory and high-risk research proposals.
- Increases research to improve our ability to predict future environmental conditions and to develop strategies for responding to global environmental change and establishes a climate change education program to help develop the next generation of environmentally engaged scientists and engineers.

DOE: Increases in Basic Sciences and Graduate Fellowship Programs

NASA: \$18.7B (\$918M increase, 5.2%)

DoEd: Increase Pell Grants to \$5,550 max (Convert to a mandatory program indexed to CPI)
 Access and Completion Incentive Fund (\$500M/yr) – Support innovative state efforts to help low income students complete college.

Advice to Faculty

NSF Research: Individual researchers with existing relationships with NSF program officers should check in on which mechanisms their programs are considering using to distribute funds, whether additional information is needed on past highly-rated but not funded proposals, and what future submission opportunities may exist.

DOE Office of Science Research: In addition to the stimulus funding, the DOE Office of Science is scheduled to receive a significant increase (approximately \$650 million) in funding in the FY 2009 Omnibus Appropriations bill to support basic research across its programs. Researchers may want to consider preparing short white papers (1 to 2 pages) for DOE that outline their capabilities in basic energy research so they can take advantage of any new funding solicitations DOE may issue and use in conversations with agency personnel. New emphasis will be on tackling the technical barriers to the creation of new energy sources.

DOE Other Research Programs: In addition to the stimulus funding, the DOE Office of Science received a significant increase (approximately \$650 million) in funding in the FY 2009 Omnibus Appropriations bill to support basic research across its programs. Individual researchers and groups of researchers should review current or potential industry collaborations, as DOE applied research program awards often go to industry-led partnerships. In addition to the focus on technology transition in these programs, there is a statutory requirement for 20 percent non-federal matching funds. Researchers with programs and plans in the above targeted areas can also reach out to program staff in the DOE applied research offices to provide ideas on the new solicitations and raise awareness of ongoing campus programs.

NIH Research: NIH is beginning to unveil funding solicitations. On March 4, 2009, NIH released the “Challenge Grant” solicitation. A detailed description (52 pages) of specific high priority challenge topics and program officer contacts is posted. The full NIH omnibus packet, which includes additional challenge areas of interest to the specific institutes and centers of NIH (a total of 175 pages of topics).

Beyond Challenge Grants, researchers can also contact NIH to find out what processes might be used to request supplemental funding support. In all cases, researchers should keep in mind that, although follow-up funding can be applied for, the focus must be on projects that will be completed in two years.

NSF Instrumentation and Infrastructure: Individual researchers should work with campus leadership to offer information on ongoing, ready-to-start, and near-term planned renovation projects for scientific facilities in which research relevant to the NSF mission is conducted and begin to prioritize the projects, as institutions are likely to be limited in the number of applications they may submit to the program. For the instrumentation program, past unsuccessful MRI applications and potential applications should be reviewed in preparation for resubmission or expanded submission of new proposals.

NIH Instrumentation and Infrastructure: NIH released three new RFAs issued by the National Center for Research Resources. The agency will distribute \$1 billion for instrumentation and infrastructure. Faculty should work with their leadership if there is a relevant grant opportunity they are interested in:

- Shared Instrument Grant Program (S10 mechanism)
- High-end Instrumentation Grant Program (S10 mechanism)
- Extramural Research Facilities Improvement Program (C06 mechanism)
- Core Facility Renovation, Repair, and Improvement (G20 mechanism)

NSF Education and Training: Individual researchers currently funded by or applying to the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship program or the Math and Science Partnerships program should contact the program officers for information about opportunities for supplements or expanded proposals.

National Science Foundation-Research

The stimulus legislation provides \$2 billion for the National Science Foundation (NSF) research directorates and offices. NSF is directed to use this funding to support all research divisions, although it is not obligated to distribute the funds evenly or proportionally among those divisions. While the funding is available through September 30, 2010, NSF is under Congressional pressure to obligate as much of it as possible to multi-year grants by September 30, 2009.

Mechanisms that NSF has stated could be used to distribute the stimulus funds include:

Increasing Success Rates: This funding will primarily go to increasing success rates in planned fiscal year (FY) 2009 competitions and may fund good proposals back to 1 October. Many of those competitions are already underway, with due dates past, although some core programs have upcoming due dates. Because NSF is able to forward fund grants (unlike NIH), they can provide funding for an array of grants two, three, four, and five years in duration to spread out the proposal pressure on NSF when the grants conclude.

Focus on the Pipeline: As part of the effort to raise success rates, NSF will be focusing particularly on “early career” researchers. They are also concerned about support for undergraduates, graduate students, and postdocs. This emphasis reflects Congressional concern about the pipeline for the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics workforce, as well as jobs in general. The number of CAREER and IGERT awards will increase. Underrepresented groups are a priority.

No Supplements with Stimulus Funding: NSF will not be using the stimulus money to make supplemental awards to current grants. This decision reflects the intensive tracking and reporting requirements that agencies and stimulus funding recipients will have to meet. However, the stimulus funding will take some of the pressure off of the FY 2009 funds, and program officers will be able to use those funds for supplements, if they so desire.

Small and Medium Infrastructure Projects: Some of the funding in individual programs and divisions is likely to be used to support already-planned small and medium-sized infrastructure projects (such as research vessel upgrades, supercomputing hardware purchases, seismic network improvements, and upgrades to the Antarctica research stations). Funding may also be directed to ongoing discipline-specific instrumentation programs.

Distribution of Funds among Programs: The distribution of NSF's \$2 billion among NSF's research directorates, divisions, and programs is being set internally. The additional funding may be distributed proportionally to the FY 2009 request levels, but that has not been confirmed.

Department of Energy: Office of Science-Research

The stimulus package provides \$1.6 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science. There is no specific directive on the expenditure of these funds for research or on laboratory or scientific infrastructure. DOE officials indicate that at least 50 percent of the \$1.6 billion will go to facilities to accelerate ongoing projects, to address the backlog of general plant projects, and to operate facilities at the Department of Energy National Laboratories (e.g. work on the National Synchrotron Light Source II at Brookhaven National Laboratory). This use of funds, by supporting construction projects in various states, would be consistent with the stimulus focus on creating jobs, particularly blue-collar jobs. The remaining 50 percent or less of the stimulus funding is proposed to go to research, including the funding of new Energy Frontier Research Centers (EFRCs); to computing, including advanced networking and partnerships; and to fellowships in universities and the laboratory system.

The review of the Energy Frontier Research Centers (EFRC) proposals concluded in February. Congress has approved \$100 million in FY 2009 funding to establish this program. The level of proposal pressure is certainly high enough to absorb additional funding from the stimulus bill; DOE received 260 applications (approximately 71 percent from universities), requesting a total of \$4.9 billion over 5 years. The awards would be \$2 to \$5 million per year over a five-year period, and DOE plans to make only between 20 and 30 awards with the existing FY 2009 funding level.

Department of Energy: Other Programs-Research: The stimulus package includes a significant investment to develop new, clean, renewable energy sources to reduce the nation's dependence on foreign oil. The final bill includes approximately \$30 billion for investments in applied research, loan guarantees and grants to develop new technologies in partnership with industry, and energy efficiency and conservation activities. Universities will be interested in the applied research and development funding in the bill, including potential partnerships with industry to develop the next generation of renewable energy technologies. Specific areas of potential relevance include renewable energy technologies, carbon capture and sequestration, and the "smart" electric power grid.

Many of the programs funded in the stimulus package were previously authorized by Congress but never funded. In a number of cases, the budgets of the organizations managing the programs will have grown dramatically overnight. Therefore, DOE, while it has some Congressional direction on the programs' shape, will still need some time to develop new solicitations.

DOE Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Research and Development: The final bill includes \$2.5 billion for applied research, development, demonstration and deployment of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. Within this amount, \$800 million is for biomass projects and \$400 million is for geothermal activities and projects. Also within the available funds is an allocation of \$50 million for research to increase the efficiency of information and communications technology and to improve standards. With the remaining \$1.25 billion, support could also be made available by DOE for wind, solar, water power, hydrogen, and vehicles, industrial and buildings technologies activities.

DOE Fossil Energy Research and Development: The final bill includes \$1 billion for existing fossil energy research and development programs. An additional \$1.52 billion is directed to a competitive solicitation for a range of industrial carbon capture and energy efficiency improvement projects, including a small amount for innovative concepts for beneficial CO₂ reuse. To further the development of carbon capture and storage technologies, DOE will also receive \$50 million for a competitive solicitation for site characterization activities in geologic formations; and \$20 million for geologic sequestration training and research grants.

ARPA-E: A longer term potential opportunity is the \$400 million in the final bill to establish the Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy (ARPA-E), as authorized in the America COMPETES Act (P.L. 110-069). This organization, within DOE but outside both the Office of Science and the applied research programs, is legislatively directed to support novel early-stage energy research, development of technologies, research and development of manufacturing processes, and coordination for technology demonstration and facilitation of technology transfer. Currently ARPA-E does not exist, so a director and staff will have to be put in place to determine and execute programs with the stimulus funding.

National Institutes of Health-Research

The stimulus legislation provides a total of \$10.4 billion to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) of which \$8.2 billion is available for research projects. Of that amount, the Office of the Director will retain \$800 million, within which Congress directs priority to be placed on short-term grants that focus on specific

scientific challenges, new research that expands the scope of ongoing projects, and research on public and international health priorities. The remaining \$7.4 billion will be distributed among the Institutes and Centers of NIH and the Common Fund (NIH Roadmap and other trans-NIH activities) in proportion to the usual appropriation allocations for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009. The funding is available through September 30, 2010.

Mechanisms that NIH has stated will be used to distribute the stimulus funds include:

"Challenge Grants" -On March 4, 2009, the National Institutes of Health released a Request for Applications (RFA) for its new Challenge Grants program. Challenge Grants would support investigators working on new ways to attack seemingly intractable problems and/or jump-start a particular area of research. NIH is allocating at least \$200 million for these Challenge Grants, and the RFA provides details on submission and evaluation processes and topics of interest for the program. Each project award will be \$1 million in total costs over two years. There are no limits on the number of applications per individual investigator or per institution. Grant applications are due April 27, 2009. Applicants will have 12 pages to describe their research proposal. New review and scoring criteria will be used in this competition.

High Priority Challenge Topics: A detailed description of 15 specific high priority challenge topics and program officer contacts is posted. Of particular interest to individuals with little previous NIH experience might be the following areas:

- Bioethics: 02-OD(OSP)-101
- Unique Ethical Issues Posed by Emerging Technologies Enabling Technologies: 06-GM-101
Structural analysis of macromolecular complexes 06-GM-102
- Chemist/biologist collaborations facilitating tool development 06-GM-103
- Development of predictive methods for molecular structure, recognition, and ligand interaction 06-HG-101
- New computational and statistical methods for the analysis of large data sets from next-generation sequencing technologies 06-HG-103*
- Methods to sequence highly variable, repeat-rich regions of complex genomes 08-HG-101
(Technology and resources for high-throughput functional analysis of functional elements in genomic sequences)

Full Solicitation and Additional Topics: The funding solicitation (RFA-OD-09-003) is posted. The full omnibus packet, which includes additional challenge areas of interest to the specific institutes and centers of NIH (a total of 175 pages of topics).

R01s and Related Research Mechanisms to Support Scientifically Meritorious Projects: There are currently 14,000 R01 proposals that have been approved through the peer review process, but have never been funded. In general, the Institutes and Centers will be looking to fund the proposals that lend themselves well to two year goals, are in line with the Institutes and Centers' priorities (as laid out in their strategic plans), and have been deemed scientifically meritorious by the peer review process. They may also look for some geographic distribution of the awards. As peer review is a lengthy process, the focus will be on previously reviewed proposals; grant renewals may also be eligible for stimulus funding. However, NIH has not ruled out the possibility of accepting some new grant proposals with 2-year goals. Projects that cannot be completed in two years will not be considered.

Supplemental Funding to Existing Grants: This supplemental funding will go to already funded science projects to expand research related to a project's original goals. For example, this funding could go towards creating training positions or purchasing equipment. Although most of these awards will be administrative, some will be competitive. The funds are not to restore cuts made in original proposals or awards.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND INSTRUMENTATION

National Science Foundation-Infrastructure and Instrumentation:

Facilities and Infrastructure: The stimulus package provides \$200 million to restart an old NSF program to repair and renovate science and engineering research facilities at institutions of higher education and other research institutions. To implement this provision, NSF will have to prepare and issue a new solicitation. The size and uses of the potential awards under this program are not yet known (in the 1990's, awards were capped at \$2 million and new construction was not supported). Information that is likely to be sought in the applications includes: the impact of the renovation project on future research and research training and improving the quality or effectiveness of the nation's research capabilities; the need of the facility for renovation; and the quality of project and management plans and budget and funding.

Instrumentation: NSF plans to do a new solicitation for the Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) program (the current solicitation closed in January). The new solicitation is likely to reflect increased flexibility on NSF's part to raise the maximum award (from \$4 million to \$6 million) and potentially waive some cost sharing requirements (currently 30 percent). The stimulus bill includes \$300 million for MRI; how much of this funding will go to the current competition and how much to the new one is not yet known.

National Institutes of Health-Infrastructure and Instrumentation: On March 5, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) released several Requests for Applications (RFAs) for infrastructure and instrumentation grants that would be funded by the stimulus package. NIH is allocating \$1 billion for facilities improvement programs and \$300 million for instrumentation. The programs are listed below in order of their proposal due dates.

Shared Instrument Grant Program (S10 mechanism): For shared instruments in the range of \$100,000 to \$500,000, eligible organizations should apply under this ongoing competition. This solicitation was posted in November; applications are due on March 23, 2009. Program announcement web site

High-end Instrumentation Grant Program (S10 mechanism): Support for groups of NIH-supported investigators to purchase a single major item of equipment for use in biomedical research with a direct cost between \$600,000 and \$8 million per application. Examples of equipment that could be supported include: structural and functional imaging systems, macromolecular NMR spectrometers, high-resolution mass spectrometers, cryoelectron microscopes, and supercomputers. No cost sharing requirement, and no limit on number of applications per institution. Letters of intent are due April 6, 2009, and applications are due May 6, 2009.

Extramural Research Facilities Improvement Program (C06 mechanism): Support for alterations, renovations, or additions to existing facilities, completion of uninhabitable shell space in existing facilities, or construction of new facilities. Applications may be for direct costs between \$2 million and \$15 million. Use of "green"/sustainable technologies and design approaches is expected. No cost sharing or cost matching requirement. Each institution is expected to submit no more than three applications under this solicitation. Application due dates are divided by project cost: May 6, 2009 (for projects between \$2 -5 million); June 17, 2009 (for projects between \$10-15 million); and July 17, 2009 (for projects between \$5-10 million).

Core Facility Renovation, Repair, and Improvement (G20 mechanism): Support to alter and renovate the core facility and to improve general equipment in the core facility or to purchase general equipment for specialized groups of researchers. Applications may be for direct costs between \$1 million and \$10 million. Use of "green" technologies and design approaches is expected. No cost sharing or cost matching

requirement. Each institution is expected to submit no more than two applications under this solicitation. Applications are due September 17, 2009.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

National Science Foundation-Education

The final bill provides \$100 million for three education programs at NSF. There are funds for two existing programs: the Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship program (\$60 million) and the Math and Science Partnerships program (\$25 million). For these programs, the funding is likely to go to increase the success rate in the FY 2009 competitions and to supplements for existing awards.

GOVERNMENT-WIDE PROCESSES AND REPORTING

The stimulus bill has general reporting provisions to ensure transparency and accountability in how the funds are spent and that projects are consistent with the legislation's goals, including job creation and preservation. Therefore, funds received from the programs described above will have reporting requirements above and beyond the reports usually provided to these agencies and the awards will have rigorous tracking requirements. Funding added to existing grants and projects will have to be tracked and reported on separately from the base grant.

Quarterly reports will be required from the recipients of the funds to the granting agency. These reports will require a variety of information, including data on the amount of recovery funds expended or obligated, a description and an evaluation of the completion status of all projects supported, information on any subcontracts or subgrants, and an estimate of the number of jobs created and the number of jobs retained. Additional reporting for infrastructure investments made by State and local governments is also required. It is likely that most information provided by awardees to funding agencies will be made publicly available in some form; materials should be prepared with this in mind.

Government-Wide Timeline: All agencies are under significant pressure to begin distributing the funding in the stimulus bill to States, organizations, and individuals as quickly as possible. The overall timeline announced by the Administration for the next few months is:

February 19, 2009: Federal agencies to begin reporting their formula block grant awards.

March 3, 2009: Federal agencies to begin reporting uses of funds.

May 3, 2009: Federal agencies to make performance plans publically available; to begin reporting on their allocations for entitlement programs.

May 15, 2009: Detailed agency financial reports to become available.

May 20, 2009: Federal agencies to begin reporting their competitive grants and contracts.

July 15, 2009: Recipients of Federal funding to begin reporting on their use of funds.

In addition, the Office of Management and Budget has set targets for implementation of programs by the agencies. Individual agencies have additional deadlines; for example, NSF, NIST, and NASA have been directed to deliver a spending plan to Congress by April 18, 2009.

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT - ANNUAL REVIEW

Exhibit EFaculty member: _____
Rank: _____Department: _____
Evaluation Period: _____

Areas to be evaluated and rated are (1) teaching, (2) research/scholarship/creative activity, (3) service, and (4) overall performance.⁹ In each area, the department head rates faculty performance on a scale of 1 to 5, as set forth below, relative to expectations for his or her rank, based on previously established objectives for that faculty member (including goals for the previous year and each of the preceding two years in the Evaluation Period) and departmental bylaws (including the department's criteria for the various ratings at the different ranks).

- 5 – **Outstanding (Excellent):** Far exceeds expectations
 4 – **More Than Expected (Very Good):** Exceeds expectations
 3 – **Expected (Good):** Meets expectations
 2 – **Less Than Expected (Fair):** Falls short of meeting expectations¹⁰
 1 – **Unsatisfactory (Poor):** Falls far short of meeting expectations²

	Unsatisfactory				Outstanding	
Teaching	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Service	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Overall	1	2	3	4	5	NA

The department head's Progress and Performance Narrative shall be attached to this Report. Other supporting materials also may be attached. For tenured faculty in Good Standing,¹¹ the department head is required to attach a Progress and Performance Narrative only every three years, unless the faculty member asks the department head to draft and attach a narrative for that year.¹² In years for which a Progress and Performance Narrative is not attached, the faculty member's Faculty Activity Report for that year is attached to this Report in lieu of the Progress and Performance Narrative.

For purposes of merit and performance-based salary adjustments, this faculty member:

- ____ Exceeds expectations (is eligible for significant merit/performance pay adjustments)
 ____ Meets expectations (is eligible for minimum merit/performance pay adjustments)
 ____ Needs improvement (is not eligible for merit/performance pay adjustments)²
 ____ Unsatisfactory (is not eligible for merit/performance pay adjustments)²

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have participated in the review process and have received a copy of this review (without implying agreement or disagreement). I understand that I have the right to respond in writing to this form within two weeks from the date I received this form in accordance with Part II.B. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

Department Head: _____ Date: _____

Dean:¹³ _____ Date: _____Chief Academic Officer:⁴ _____ Date: _____

⁹ Procedures and standards are set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*, and the departmental bylaws.

¹⁰ An improvement plan is required.

¹¹ A tenured faculty member is in "Good Standing" if he or she (a) receives an overall rating in this annual review indicating that his or her performance meets or exceeds expectations for his or her rank and (b) is not under a Cumulative Performance Review.

¹² A department head may also voluntarily attach a Progress and Performance Narrative in any year in which it is not required.

¹³ Attach rating and rationale, as necessary.

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT - RETENTION REVIEW

Faculty member: _____ Department: _____
Year of appointment: _____ Tenure consideration scheduled for AY: _____
Assigned mentor(s): _____

Retention reviews specifically address (among other things) the faculty member's (a) establishment and development of (1) teaching methods and tools, (2) program of disciplinary research/ scholarship/ creative activity, and (3) record of institutional, disciplinary, and/or professional service, as well as (b) progress toward promotion (where applicable) and tenure.

For retention reviews prior to the enhanced retention review¹⁴ (i.e., typically in the second and third year of the probationary period), the tenured faculty's retention vote shall focus primarily (but not exclusively) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to sustain a level of teaching, research /scholarship/creative activity, and service that comports with the unit's expectations for faculty members at the rank of the faculty member under review.

The enhanced retention review⁵ (i.e., typically in year four) reflects a comprehensive, substantive evaluation based upon a file prepared by the faculty member, in accordance with requirements set forth in the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* as a preliminary draft of the faculty member's tenure dossier. Beginning in the year of the tenure-track faculty member's enhanced retention review (and beginning with the first retention review for each faculty member exempt from the enhanced retention review), the tenured faculty's retention vote shall focus primarily (and increasingly, in succeeding years) on the tenure-track faculty member's ability to meet the requirements for tenure in the department, college, campus, and University.

1. **Review by the tenured faculty.** The narrative of the tenured faculty is attached and the vote recorded below.

Vote of the tenured faculty: For retention _____ Against retention _____ Abstain _____

2. **Review by the department head.** The report of the department head is attached.

The department head recommends: Retention _____ Termination as of _____

3. **Review by the faculty member.** By signing below, I acknowledge that I have participated in the review process and have received a copy of this review (*without implying agreement or disagreement*). I understand that I have the right to respond in writing to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the department head, and/or to any dissenting statements within two weeks from the date I received this form in accordance with Part I.B. of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

4. **Review by the dean.**¹⁵

The dean recommends: Retention _____ Termination _____

Dean: _____ Date: _____

5. **Review by chief academic officer.**¹⁶

The chief academic officer recommends: Retention _____ Termination _____

Chief Academic Officer: _____ Date: _____

¹⁴ The enhanced retention review process is provided for in paragraph A.2.a. of Part I of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

¹⁵ A dean's statement should be attached when his or her recommendation "differs from that of the department head or tenured faculty or stating any other concerns the dean might wish to record, as appropriate," as provided in paragraph B.2.a. of Part I of the *Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

¹⁶ The chief academic officer's statement may be attached when appropriate.