Two Tier Internal Deadline Update-Lisa Jukkala
The two tier internal deadline piloted during the months of June and July has been extended to the month of October for National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) proposals. During the June and July pilot, twenty-one proposals were processed with a 75% success rate for meeting the first deadline and 100% success for the final deadline. Approximately 25-30 proposals are anticipated in the October pilot. The Sponsored Program analysts really appreciated the extra review time for documents, and allowed for an easier submission process. Feedback from faculty was also favorable, as they appreciated the extra time to develop science related documents. There was no review of the science documents by the analysts, however they did enter the proposal budgets into the NIH and NSF systems for faculty and initiated the cost share forms as well. The Research Advisory Council (RAC) supported the roll-out of this two tier deadline, as a new process with communication to the campus community happening by December 1, 2017. The NSF rolling deadline pilot system was also discussed, and it was suggested to have the current cycle information provided to the faculty, encouraging them to work closely with their program manager. Lisa Jukkala will continue to update the council on this new processing practice.

Research Data Working Group - Dave Reed
A group has been formed to examine issues around research data. The group membership consists of staff from the university library, information technology, graduate school, vice president for research and Shane Mueller of RAC. Some universities have become very integrated, and this group will review opportunities to streamline our processes. It was noted that content of PhD thesis papers are always a concern as the data can be shared worldwide and used by others. The first meeting will be held on October 20, and Dave will update the council in future meetings.

Vice President for Research (VPR) Strategic Plan - Dave Reed
The VPR directors have met to discuss development and implementation of electronic processes for proposal submission. To assist with this effort, the VPR is supporting a position in Enterprise Application Services (EAS) to assist with the implementation of new online forms. The cost share form is now available electronically, and we will continue to develop other electronic forms to improve the proposal submission process. The sponsored programs satellite office was implemented to assist with improving connections with the faculty. The faculty have been expressing a need for additional administrative support, and now there are two VPR staff members located on campus to meet with and assist faculty with proposal processing, and award management. The VPR also reviewed the organizational structure, and currently Dave
has fourteen direct reports, and reorganization was discussed, to prevent system failures. A draft organizational structure was drafted, and a goal of July 1, 2018 implementation was established. Dave Reed will meet with the college deans to discuss, and updates to the RAC will be provided as the implementation date nears.

**Satellite Office Update - Lisa Jukkala** In July, offices were staffed in the Dow building. This is a six month pilot, and might be extended if successful. The department coordinators have been the highest volume of customers on the post award side of the process, and customer metrics will be available upon completion of the pilot. The program has been successful thus far, and issues are being resolved and process improvements implemented as we try out this new form of customer support.

**Graduate Assistant Cost Share (GACS) update-Pushpa Murthy**
In June the GACS policy changed. A memo outlining the changes was sent out June 6th, and the response has been very enthusiastic. There has been an increase in GACS support included in proposal budgets and the program will be monitored over the next three months to determine if it should become the standard. The changes to the program from the June Memo are highlighted below:

1) GACS will be available even if cost share is not mandatory
2) GACS support will depend on the average annual direct costs (not including overhead) of the proposal.
3) GACS support for proposals with average annual direct costs between $25K to $100k will be eligible for 100% of tuition support (approximately $19K, 19 credits; 9+9+1); proposals must include full-time year-round stipend support from sponsor so that students receive continuous support.
4) GACS support for proposals with average annual direct costs between $101K to $200k will be eligible for 50% of tuition support (approximately $9.5K, 8.5 credits); proposals must include full-time year-round stipend support from sponsor.
5) GACS support for proposals with mandatory cost-share and large proposals (>350k annual average direct costs) will also be in the form of tuition support. Details are included in the attachment.

**Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) - Jason Carter**
An agency update handout was provided. The third version of the faculty workload survey is being developed and we will participate again. Information about data collection will be sent in late January with reminders during the month of February, and data collection will close on March 1, 2018. Please encourage our faculty to participate.

**Board of Trustees Research Reports - Dave Reed**
The research data was provided to the council. Since the meeting the research expenditure handout has been updated, and the correct version will be saved to the RAC Google Site.
For Proposals Submitted in June, July, and August 2017

Graduate Assistant Cost Share (GACS)

The Graduate School is able to provide cost share in the form of tuition support for proposals authored by members of the graduate faculty and submitted through Michigan Tech according to the following guidelines:

I. General Guidelines

- GACS support will be made available to support full-time graduate students pursuing the highest degree awarded by a particular program.

- Requested direct costs of $25k - $100k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS support is available to a PI with average requested direct costs of $25k - $100k/year:
  - GACS will provide 100 percent of tuition support (fall, spring, and summer semesters; 9 credits for fall and spring and 1 credit for summer).

- Requested direct costs of $101k - $200k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS support is available to a PI with average requested direct costs of $101k - $200k/year:
  - GACS will provide a maximum of 50 percent of tuition support (fall, spring, and summer semesters; 9 credits for fall and spring and 1 credit for summer).

- Proposals must include full-time, year-round stipend support for students so that students receive continuous support from the project.

- GACS tuition support will be available for a maximum of one full-time student per project year per project.

- Requested direct costs of $201k - $350k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS tuition support is available only if cost share is mandatory. See below for commitment guidelines.

II. Commitment Guidelines When Cost Share is Mandatory

- The Graduate School will provide up to a maximum of 50 percent of the total required cost-share in the form of tuition support.

- Funds committed by the Graduate School for graduate student tuition support must be used for tuition.
 If a PI is unable to use GACS funds to support graduate students, the contractual obligation for cost share will have to be met using other funds (e.g., departmental or incentive fund accounts).

- Once Michigan Tech’s commitment of graduate student support is disclosed in a proposal budget as cost share, Michigan Tech becomes contractually obligated at that level of support if the project is awarded.

- PIs who encounter difficulties in using GACS support should contact the Graduate School to renegotiate their cost-share agreement in a timely manner.
  - PIs who fail to use graduate student funds in an appropriate way will not be eligible to receive GACS support in the future.

III. Commitment Guidelines for Large Proposals, >350k/year (annual average direct costs)

- GACS support will be available for large proposals (>350k/year – annual average direct costs) that involve investigators from multiple units on campus and contribute significantly to the University’s mission.

- Requests related to large proposals should be submitted through the Graduate School finance coordinator.
  - Requests will be considered on an individual basis by the dean of the Graduate School.
  - Augmented GACS support for large proposals (>350k/year – annual average direct costs) will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

IV. Contact Person

- The Sponsored Programs Office can answer routine questions about budgets and assist PIs in the preparation of budgets that will include GACS support.

- The Graduate School finance coordinator (Heather Suokas) is the primary Graduate School contact for the GACS program.

V. Frequently asked questions (FAQ)

Q. Can I request GACS for my MS student?

A. If a graduate program only offers an MS degree, they would be eligible for GACS. If a graduate program offers a PhD degree in addition to an MS degree, GACS support will only be made available to support students pursuing the PhD degree.

Q. When cost share is mandatory, how much GACS tuition support will I receive?
A. You will receive up to 50 percent of the total required cost share. For example, if the total cost of a project will be $50k and a 1:1 match is required from Michigan Tech ($25k), the Graduate School will commit up to a maximum of $12.5k in cost share (50 percent of the total required cost share) in the form of tuition support.

Q. What if the sponsor provides a cost of education allowance?

A. If a sponsor provides a stated amount for cost of education, you should budget that amount to the sponsor.

Q. What if a sponsor does not allow graduate tuition to be charged?

A. See the Graduate School’s policy on the Graduate Tuition Support Pool (GTSP): http://www.mtu.edu/gradschool/policies-procedures/academic/support/

Q. How should tuition be handled with re-budgeting or reallocation of graduate stipend after an award is made?

A. If you re-budget or reallocate graduate student stipend, GACS tuition support will be proportionately changed.

Q. What is the difference between direct costs and indirect costs?

A. Direct costs are costs that can be specifically linked to your project. Indirect costs are costs that cannot be attributed to a specific project. Indirect costs are also charged using a negotiated rate approved by the federal government in accordance with Michigan Tech’s facilities and administrative cost agreement.
GACS Pilot Extended

Graduate Assistant Cost Share (GACS)

The Graduate School is able to provide cost share in the form of tuition support for proposals authored by members of the graduate faculty and submitted through Michigan Tech according to the following guidelines:

I. General Guidelines

- GACS support will be made available to support full-time graduate students pursuing the highest degree awarded by a particular program.

- Requested direct costs of $25k - $100k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS support is available to a PI with average requested direct costs of $25k - $100k/year:
  - GACS will provide 100 percent of tuition support (fall, spring, and summer semesters; 9 credits for fall and spring and 1 credit for summer).

- Requested direct costs of $100,001k - $200k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS support is available to a PI with average requested direct costs of $100,001k - $200k/year:
  - GACS will provide a maximum of 50 percent of tuition support (fall, spring, and summer semesters; 9 credits for fall and spring and 1 credit for summer).

- Requested direct costs of $200,001k - $350k/year (annual average direct costs): Annual GACS tuition support is available only if cost share is mandatory. See below for commitment guidelines.

- Proposals must include full-time, year-round stipend support for students so that students receive continuous support from the project.

- GACS tuition support will be available for a maximum of one full-time student per project per year.

- PIs who encounter difficulties in using GACS support should contact the Graduate School to renegotiate their cost-share agreement in a timely manner.
  - PIs who fail to use graduate student funds in an appropriate way will not be eligible to receive GACS support in the future.

- Unspent GACS funds will be returned to the Graduate School.
II. Commitment Guidelines When Cost Share is Mandatory

- The Graduate School will provide up to a maximum of 50 percent of the total required cost-share in the form of tuition support.

- Funds committed by the Graduate School for graduate student tuition support must be used for tuition.
  - If a PI is unable to use GACS funds to support graduate students, the contractual obligation for cost share will have to be met using other funds (e.g., departmental or IRAD fund accounts).

- Funds committed by the Graduate School cannot exceed the requested direct costs of a project.

- Once Michigan Tech’s commitment of graduate student support is disclosed in a proposal budget as cost share, Michigan Tech becomes contractually obligated at that level of support if the project is awarded.

III. Commitment Guidelines for Large Proposals, >350k/year (annual average direct costs)

- GACS support will be available for large proposals (>350k/year – annual average direct costs) that involve investigators from multiple units on campus and contribute significantly to the University’s mission.

- Requests related to large proposals should be submitted through the Graduate School finance coordinator.
  - Requests will be considered on an individual basis by the dean of the Graduate School.
  - Augmented GACS support for large proposals (>350k/year – annual average direct costs) will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

IV. Contact Person

1. The Sponsored Programs Office can answer routine questions about budgets and assist PIs in the preparation of budgets that will include GACS support.

2. The Graduate School finance coordinator (Heather Suokas) is the primary Graduate School contact for the GACS program.

V. Frequently asked questions (FAQ)

1. Q. Can I request GACS for my MS student?
A. If a graduate program only offers an MS degree, they would be eligible for GACS. If a graduate program offers a PhD degree in addition to an MS degree, GACS support will only be made available to support students pursuing the PhD degree.

2. Q. When cost share is mandatory, how much GACS tuition support will I receive?  
   A. You will receive up to 50 percent of the total required cost share. For example, if the total cost of a project will be $50k and a 1:1 match is required from Michigan Tech ($25k), the Graduate School will commit up to a maximum of $12.5k in cost share (50 percent of the total required cost share) in the form of tuition support.

3. Q. What if the sponsor provides a cost of education allowance?  
   A. If a sponsor provides a stated amount for cost of education, you should budget that amount to the sponsor.

4. Q. What if a sponsor does not allow graduate tuition to be charged?  
   A. See the Graduate School’s policy on the Graduate Tuition Support Pool (GTSP): http://www.mtu.edu/gradschool/policies-procedures/academic/support/

5. Q. How should tuition be handled with re-budgeting or reallocation of graduate stipend after an award is made?  
   A. If you re-budget or reallocate graduate student stipend, GACS tuition support will be proportionately changed.

6. Q. What is the difference between direct costs and indirect costs?  
   A. Direct costs are costs that can be specifically linked to your project. Indirect costs are costs that cannot be attributed to a specific project. Indirect costs are also charged using a negotiated rate approved by the federal government in accordance with Michigan Tech’s facilities and administrative cost agreement.

7. Q. What is the dollar amount for cost share if I qualify for 100% GACS?  
   A. GACS will provide 9 credits of tuition for the fall and spring and 1 credit of tuition in the summer. For Engineering and Computer Science departments the dollar amount is $20,482. For Non-Engineering and Non-Computer Science departments the dollar amount is $18,050. Incremental increases for multiple year projects will not be budgeted.

8. Q. What is the dollar amount for cost share if I qualify for 50% GACS?  
   A. GACS will provide 4.5 credits of tuition for the fall and spring and .5 credit of tuition in the summer. For Engineering and Computer Science the dollar amount is $10,241. For Non-Engineering and Non-Computer Science the dollar amount is $9,025. Incremental increases for multiple year projects will not be budgeted.

9. Q. What happens if I do not spend my GACS allocation in its entirety?  
   A. Unspent GACS funds will be returned to the Graduate School.
TO: Deans, Department Chairs, Graduate Program Directors  
CC: Graduate Program Assistants  
FROM: Pushpa Murthy, Dean of the Graduate School  
DATE: October 19, 2017  
SUBJECT: Graduate School Academic Excellence Award

The Graduate School is pleased to announce that the GAEA will continue for Spring ’18. The goal of this award is to incentivize and reward top Michigan Tech undergraduate students to pursue an accelerated master’s degree. Nominated students will receive a one-time $4,500 tuition award for the Spring 2018 semester.

For students to be eligible for the Graduate School Academic Excellence Award, they must:

- Be nominated by their academic program
- Be a first-time accelerated master’s student for the Spring 2018 semester
- Be enrolled as a full-time on-campus student (online students are not eligible)
- Not be receiving funding from another source at Michigan Tech for their first semester of enrollment (e.g. assistantships, fellowships, or tuition support)

Jacque Smith will be in contact with Graduate Directors and Graduate Assistants with a list of students accepted to your accelerated master’s program. Please let us know if you would like to nominate any of these students for a GAEA. We plan to make about 30 awards; our intent is to distribute the awards widely across all programs. Please do not delay sending your nominations as we would like to make the awards early in the admission cycle.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call Jacque Smith (jacque@mtu.edu; 7-1434) or me.

We look forward to hearing from you.
TO:       Deans, Department Chairs, Graduate Program Directors
CC:       Graduate Program Assistants
FROM:     Pushpa Murthy, Dean of the Graduate School
DATE:     October 19, 2017
SUBJECT:  Graduate Recruitment Tuition Award

The Graduate School is pleased to announce that the GRTA will continue for Spring '18. The goal of this award is to attract bright and talented students to Michigan Tech and provide them an extra incentive to choose our graduate programs.

Nominated PhD students who meet the criteria listed below will receive a one-time $9,000 tuition award for the Spring 2018 semester.

Nominated MS students who meet the criteria listed below will receive a one-time $4,500 tuition award for the Spring 2018 semester.

For students to be eligible for the Graduate Recruitment Tuition Award, they must:

- Be nominated by their academic program
- Be a first-time PhD or MS student for the Spring 2018 semester
- Be enrolled as a full-time student
- Not be receiving an assistantship or fellowship for their first semester of enrollment

Both domestic and international students are eligible for the award, preference will be given to domestic students.

Heather Suokas will follow up this email with the name(s) of accepted students for Spring '18 in your department. Send your nominations to Heather Suokas (hlsuokas@mtu.edu).

If you have questions, please contact Heather Suokas (hlsuokas@mtu.edu).

We look forward to hearing from you.
AGENCY UPDATES

NSF
- 2017 Proposal & Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG) released to public; implementation Winter 2018. Significant changes to PAPPG include:
  - Revised eligibility standard to include Institutions of Higher Education as subcategory. Also a revision on eligibility of foreign organizations.
  - Implements on-going pilot of Collaborators and Other Affiliations template
  - Clarifies that the 5-yr period of support in results from prior NSF support means “an award with an END date in the past 5 years or any current funding, including no-cost extensions.”
  - Reminds organizations that it is their responsibility to define and consistently apply the term “year” in the senior personnel salaries and wages policy section.
  - New language that reflects the new award-specific condition on organizational responsibility on animal coverage for life of the grant. Also states that “additional IACUC approval must be obtained if the protocols for the care and use of vertebrate animals have changed substantively from originally proposed and approved.” Similar new language for IRBs.
- NSF in process of physically relocating from Arlington to Alexandria; expected completion end of October.
- See attachments on 1) NSF Proposal and Award Policy Newsletter and 2) NSF Grants Conference.

NIH
- Presentation focused on Clinical Trials Reform Policy (see attached slides).
  - There was considerable discussion and concerns expressed after presentation. While there is a push from scientific community and various societies to delay, this is doubtful and institutions need to prepare these new policies and grant requirements (which takes effect January, 2018).

NIFA
- Be sure to download new grants.gov forms; old forms (or mixing old and new forms) will result in submission errors
- Modifications made to streamline matches
- Moving towards ezFedGrants for pre- and post-award processes

ONR
- Notable changes in the preamble of the DoD R&D general terms and conditions include:
- Language on additional grace year for using pre-UG procurement standards (provided by OMB through Federal Register notice at 82 FR 22609, 17 May 2017).
- New paragraph on Award Acceptance.
- Added context to “Reserved” sections/paragraphs so that recipients and DoD Components know what is expected (e.g. reserved paragraph/section doesn’t apply to awards using these general T&Cs, applies but will be in DoD Component addendum, or is an optional paragraph/provision that applies only if included in DoD Component addendum or award-specific T&Cs).

- New document entitled “ONR Addendum to the DoD R&D General Terms and Conditions and ONR Programmatic Requirements” replaces what used to be called Agency Specific T&Cs.

---

**Faculty Workload Survey III (FWS3)**

*FDP is getting ready to launch the third version of the faculty workload survey that has garnered national attention.* The survey is undergoing final modifications and beta-testing, with the following tentative schedule for deployment:

- Eligible PI’s for the survey include:
  - All University faculty personnel serving as PI on federally-funded research projects during 12-month period in 2016-17
  - No pass-through awards
  - 12-mo range to be determined by the institution, but applied consistently
- Institutional commitments to participate
  - Institutional guide distributed (end of September)
  - Priority deadline for commitment (end of October)
  - Final deadline for commitment (mid-November)
  - Request for admin reps to send email to potential institutional participants (early January)
- Data collection
  - Initial emails sent of eligible participants (late January)
  - Email reminder #1 (early February)
  - Email reminder #2 (mid-February)
  - Final email reminder (late February)
  - Data collection closed ~ March 1, 2018

*Please encourage everyone who receives an invite to participate. If we reach an adequate threshold of respondents, we can request our institutional data. This was done last time, and proved to be valuable in local discussions and decision making.*

---

**Faculty-Administrator Collaboration Taskforce/Team (FACT)**

This is an emerging group within FDP that is drawing a lot of interest and attention. Larry Sutter has played a huge role in establishing this group within FDP. Essentially, the goal of the group is to better understand the academic structure and research administrative structure, and identify some potential demonstrations/activities that might be pursued. Michigan Tech is front-and-center in this group, and this past FDP
included a session in which Dave Reed and Jason Carter (as Larry’s alternate) as panelists.

- See attached PowerPoint slides from session.

SUBAWARDS: GENERAL SESSION

Summary submitted by Amanda Humphrey, Stephanie Scott, Amanda Hamaker
There will be two free webinars available to view the 2017 FDP subaward templates in detail in the coming weeks. Major changes document is new this year to help people navigate through all the changes. Additionally, a crosswalk will be available for use by institutions that program the templates into their templates. Attempt is to make this easier to ERA folks. Also releasing the fixed price templates along with the cost reimbursable templates. Additionally releasing the foreign templates (cost reimbursable and fixed price).

- Training in September and October for the new templates via Webinar.

- The FAQs have become just as important as the template. Very useful negotiating and training tool. Provides background on why things are the way they are within the templates. Up to 62 FAQs now, this is an addition of 20 new FAQs with 3 removed. An additional 20 were revised. Draft FAQs were sent out prior to the meeting for feedback. Requesting responses ASAP. FAQs targeted to be released after the templates, but hopefully before the webinars. Changes to FAQs a result of template changes, release of the RTCs, release of the DTUA and guidance docs, and other clarifications.
  - Don't revise the templates or you must remove the FDP logo and moniker.
  - Discourage use of attachment 2 to add additional generic terms
  - Unilateral mod language

SUBAWARDS: FIXED PRICE/CLINICAL TRIALS

Summary submitted by Jennifer McCallister, Duke University
During this session, we reviewed the regulations surrounding the requirement to obtain prior approval for fixed price subawards and the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (SAT) cap for fixed price subawards. After reviewing the regulations, we discussed the draft guidance created for both pre-award proposal submission and post-award prior approval requests, which includes multi-site clinical trials. During open discussion, attendees discussed the differences between fixed price and cost reimbursement, practices in contracting for fixed price subawards, clinical sites and the differences from traditional subawards, and feedback received from sponsors on prior approval requests. Next steps include continuing to reach out to get clarification from OPERA on NIH’s position on the topic and creating a white paper to move the topic forward with federal agencies. In addition, any FDP members that have asked for prior approval and received a sponsor response are asked to forward those to Jennifer.mccallister@duke.edu in order to be included in the white paper data.

PIPELINES WORKING GROUP
Summary submitted by Michele Masucci, Temple University

The pipelines group is reviewing a final manuscript of a report on work-life-balance satisfaction approaches at member institutions, which can serve as an inventory of programs as a resource for FDP institutions. The key decision made was to circulate to participating members of the committee to complete the tasks of updating the literature cited as appropriate, reviewing the methodology, and formatting the document. The group aims to review the document during the time prior to the next meeting so that the report can be presented to the communication meeting.

eRA FEDERAL AGENCY MATRIX WORKING GROUP

Summary submitted by Lynda Wolter, Northwestern University

This group is striving to establish a summary of federal agency systems used throughout the life cycle of sponsored activities.

- Version 1 of the Summary of Systems is near complete. Goal to have data entry done by the end of September with an initial release in mid-October/early November.
- Develop a systems used summary by the project life cycle time points and a summary of systems by agency.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING

Summary submitted by Katherine V. Kissmann, Texas A&M University

- Membership Participation Guide – Recommendation to create a membership participation guide that will clearly articulate the definitions and roles of each type of institutional representative and committee, workgroup, membership, etc. and what the expectations are for each.
- Member Attendance and Engagement – Membership has grown to >400 in attendance at the meetings. Original intent was for attendees of the meetings to get involved in the demonstrations and participate and serve on committees. Due to increased attendance it is hard for everyone to be engaged in all activities and/or know how to become engaged. Communications regarding the working groups and pilots has also become complicated with the increased number of attendees. Much discussion regarding how to keep members engaged when they leave the meetings and the use of the website and listservs. Also discussed the option of a more formalized process for joining committees and for providing status of committee work to the membership. Previous meeting’s recommendation to update the meeting summaries to include a section for volunteer opportunities and a contact for each opportunity will be implemented with this meeting.

GRANTS.GOV WORKSPACE WIZARD

Summary submitted by Ed Tan, Grants.gov

Grants.gov demonstrated how to apply using Workspace and the ease of using online webforms. Grants.gov plans to phase out the Legacy PDF on December 31, 2017, so please join us to receive helpful tips and answers to your questions about Workspace.

- Full PowerPoint on presentation available on FDP website
CONTRACTS (INCLUDING DATA STEWARDSHIP)

Summary submitted by Melissa Korf, Harvard University
Session organizers plan to work with FDP leadership to propose and plan a more formal pilot of the DTUA template. Any interested institutions should email Melissa and Jill. The working group will also consider an email to Admin Reps formally requesting feedback on what each institution would need in order to adopt the templates. We will also look into posting information on which institutions have agreed to use the templates.

- Several member institutions are interested in hearing more about JHU’s approach/documentation with respect to the Mexico City Policy changes.
- Several attendees are interested in re-invigorating the Troublesome Clauses project and/or developing a set of FAQs to facilitate conversations between institution negotiators and contracting officers regarding the new CUI-related contract clauses.

EXPANDED CLEARINGHOUSE

Summary submitted by Lynette Arias, Pamela Webb, Jennifer Barron
The pilot was completed on June 30th, and the final report was delivered to the FDP Executive Committee. Possible future enhancements include: pull data from other systems, as feasible (SAM); automatic notifications to POC for expired information; APIs (Application Program Interface); additional reports and data output. Working group for non-single audit organization financial questionnaire and integration with RAQ continues work. Executive Committee is currently considering the following recommendations included in the Final Report:

- Recommendation 1: Invite the remainder of FDP to join, on a one-by-one basis at whatever point of time they wish, from September 15, 2017 – December 31, 2017.
- Recommendation 2: At the start of the next FDP phase, make participation in the Expanded Clearinghouse mandatory for FDP members.
- Recommendation 3: For a fee, invite non-FDP members who are also single audit recipients to join beginning October 1, 2017, on a one-by-one basis.
- Recommendation 4: At a future time and for a fee, invite non-FDP members who are not single audit recipients to join the Expanded Clearinghouse on a one-by-one basis.
- Recommendation 5: Allow the FDP Executive Committee to determine use of revenue from non-members to support the following (listed in priority order): 1) Expanded Clearinghouse maintenance, 2) Continued enhancements, 3) Other FDP pilots or projects
- Recommendation 6: Allow FDP Expanded Clearinghouse working group to continue their development and enhancement work, including:
  - Development of an API
  - Determination of how the data might be used to inform future federal decision-making processes
  - Development of section of Clearinghouse for non-Single Audit financial questionnaire type info
  - Assess feasibility and impact of vendors having access to the Expanded Clearinghouse data or being able to access via the API
Assess feasibility of merging FCOI Clearinghouse or other areas of FDP data into the Expanded Clearinghouse

**PLENARY: DATA ACT PROGRAM**

In May 2014, Public Law 113-101 Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014 (DATA Act) was signed into law with the purpose to establish “government-wide financial data standards and increase the availability, accuracy, and usefulness of Federal spending information.” This session provided an overview of DATA Act. Some key points highlighted the following:

- There is a new and transparent website linking accounts to awards information. This can be searched a number of ways (i.e., agency, institution, investigator, etc.)
- The DATA Act pilot program report is available at OMB website. There are three recommendations:
  - Pursue further standardization to streamline reporting
  - Seize opportunities to use information technology that can auto-populate reporting fields
  - Leverage information technology open standards to rapidly develop technology
NSF IS MOVING – WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

- NSF is moving from Arlington to Alexandria.
- Phased move from late August to early October

National Science Foundation
2415 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22314

*Beginning October 2, 2017*
• Quarterly newsletter

• Stay abreast of policy and procedural developments

• Latest version is the August/September issue.
NSF GRANTS CONFERENCE

- November 13-14 in Phoenix, AZ
  - Proposal Preparation
  - Merit Review Process
  - Award Management
  - Proposal & Award Policy Update
  - NSF CAREER Program Overview
  - Breakout sessions by NSF Directorate
- Registration opens today at Noon!

To learn more visit https://nsfgrantsconferences.com/
Clinical Trial Reform Policy Reminders
Good Clinical Practice Training Requirement

Effective January 1, 2017 – NIH expects all NIH-funded clinical investigators and clinical trial staff who are involved in the design, conduct, oversight, or management of clinical trials to be trained in Good Clinical Practice (GCP)

Good Clinical Practice training establishes:

- Standards for clinical trial implementation, data collection, monitoring, and reporting
- Responsibilities of investigators, sponsors, monitors, and institutional review boards

See NOT-OD-16-148 for additional information.
Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs) for Clinical Trials

Effective for due dates on/after January 25, 2018 - All grant applications involving one or more clinical trials must be submitted through an FOA specifically designated for clinical trials.

Clinical Trial-specific FOAs allow NIH to:

- identify proposed clinical trials
- ensure that key pieces of clinical trial-specific information are submitted with each application
- uniformly apply clinical trial-specific review criteria

Learn more at https://grants.nih.gov/policy/clinical-trials/specific-funding-opportunities.htm

See NOT-OD-17-043 for additional information.
A primary component of NIH’s clinical trial reform is the creation of a new application form that:

- **Consolidates** human subjects, inclusion enrollment, and clinical trial information into one form
- Collects information at the **study-level**
- Uses **discrete form fields** to capture clinical trial information and provide the level of detail needed for peer review
- Presents key information to reviewers and staff in a **consistent format**
- **Aligns** with ClinicalTrials.gov (where possible) for future data exchange with ClinicalTrials.gov

See [NOT-OD-17-062](#) for additional information.
Single Institutional Review Board (sIRB) Policy for Multi-site Research

Effective for due dates on/after January 25, 2018 – NIH expects that all multi-site studies which involve non-exempt human subjects research funded by the NIH, will use a single Institutional Review Board (sIRB) to conduct the ethical review required for the protection of human subjects.

sIRB policy aims to:

✓ Streamline IRB review process to enhance research efficiency
✓ Reduce unnecessary administrative burdens and inefficiencies


See NOT-OD-17-076 for additional information.
NIH Policy on Dissemination of NIH-Funded Clinical Trial Information

Effective January 18, 2017 – All NIH-funded awardees and investigators conducting clinical trials must register and report the results of their trial in ClinicalTrials.gov

NIH dissemination policy:

✓ Extends previous HHS policies to apply to all NIH-funded clinical trials instead of defining a subset of “applicable clinical trials”

✓ Increases the availability of information to the public about clinical trials

Learn more at https://grants.nih.gov/policy/clinical-trials/reporting/index.htm

See NOT-OD-16-149 for additional information.
Faculty/Administrator Collaboration Taskforce (FACT)

Moderator
Lynette Arias, University of Washington

Panel
Jason Carter, Faculty; Dave Reed, Administration; Michigan Technological University
Kelly Shaver, Faculty; Susan Anderson Rivaleau, Administration; College of Charleston
David Budil, Faculty, Northeastern University

FDP Meeting – September 2017
Agenda

• Background and motivation
• Panel introductions
• Issues
  • What will FACT do?
  • How will FACT operate?
  • What will be its status within FDP?
• Perspective from a private research university
• Audience input and open discussion
• Where we go from here
Current FACT Steering Group

Faculty/Administrator Partner Members

Lynette Arias & Mark Haselkorn—University of Washington
Larry Sutter, Jason Carter, Dave Reed—Michigan Tech University
Susan Anderson Rivaleau & Kelly Shaver—College of Charleston
David Budil & Joan Cyr—Northeastern University
J.R. Haywood & Laura McCabe—Michigan State University

Red = On today’s panel
Some questions from last meeting

- What is the relationship between academic structure and research administration structure?
- How does the structure embrace faculty needs in addition to ensuring compliance?
- What gets done because it enhances the institution’s research enterprise?
- How do faculty and administration engage?
- What is the institution’s culture for enacting change?
- Who is responsible for forming policies & procedures?
- Who is responsible for success?
Other potential issues

• Do we need to understand faculty/administration research partnerships in the context of relevant differences in university research environments?
• If so, what are those relevant differences?
  • By size?
  • By public versus private?
  • By other factors to be discovered and explored (e.g. Organizational structures? Policies? Goals? Partnerships?)
• How do we currently work together? What are common strengths and weaknesses? Are there shareable best practices?
• Other?
Issues for establishing and maintaining FACT

• How should FACT function within FDP?
• What type of entity should FACT be? Standing or given a specific timeframe to address a specific issue?
• What would constitute “membership” in FACT? A faculty/administrator pair willing to work together with the group?
• How will FACT operate?
• Other structural and operational issues?
FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PARTNERSHIP

2018 FDP Faculty Workload Survey Participating Institution Guide
October 2018

Dear FDP Member Institution,

On behalf of the FDP Executive Committee and the Faculty Workload Survey Working Group, I want to thank you for your help – your participation makes this project successful. This study continues our work in investigating the effects of mandated administrative additions to Federal grant requirements: Collecting data to understand and quantify these effects is critical to our efforts to influence policy and practices from a well-informed perspective.

Our first two faculty surveys revealed that researchers report that roughly 42% of their research time spent on federally-funded projects was committed to administrative tasks associated with their grant(s) rather than the actual science. The results of the survey have been cited by groups such as the National Science Board and the National Academies, and have contributed to a section of recent legislation (i.e., 21st Century Cures Act) aimed at reducing research-related administrative burdens. Individual institution-level reports were also made available to interested participating institutions. Information gained from this new survey will allow us to update those findings, and be in an even stronger position to continue the ongoing work of the FDP to improve research efficiency without compromising responsibility.

The survey team is working very hard to make this process as straightforward as possible for you, and to minimize as much of the burden on you as we can. This packet is provided to answer many of the questions you may have, and give you an idea of how the survey will unfold. In addition, I will always be available for you to contact as well, please do not hesitate to reach out to me with any questions or concerns.

Thank you again for all of your hard work!

Sincerely,

David Wright
Executive Director
Federal Demonstration Partnership
Introduction

The Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) is administering a Web-based Faculty Workload Survey to explore the impact of federal requirements on the time faculty have available to actively conduct research. This survey is a follow-up to similar surveys conducted in 2005 and 2012. The data collected from this survey will be used to inform the future direction and projects of the FDP. FDP has once again contracted with SoundRocket (SR; formerly Survey Sciences Group, LLC) of Ann Arbor, Michigan to carry out the survey administration. As the FDP administrative representative, the FDP needs you to assist in the preparation of this study by acting as a liaison between your institution and the FDP/SR research team.

Specifically, as FDP administrative representative of your institution, we ask that you assist us by obtaining a list of federally-funded researchers at your institution. We will also rely on your assistance to navigate any institutional approval required to obtain the list and participate in this survey. To help facilitate this process, we have developed this guide for participating institutions. *(Within your institution, you may also want to enlist the help of your FDP faculty representative to assist in answering general questions about the survey or generating support for participating in the survey.)*

This study has been submitted for review by the University of South Florida’s AAHRPP-accredited Institutional Review Board (IRB; Federal Demonstration Partnership 2018 Faculty Workload Survey), and is currently pending approval. As soon as the approval is received, copies will be provided to all institutions who agree to participate in the study. In previous approvals, the position of the USF IRB has been that participating universities are asked only to facilitate recruitment, thus, IRB approval from your institution is not required to conduct the study. It is anticipated that this same position will apply with this current review and approval. However, it is important to consider your institution’s IRB policies and requirements. It is our experience that – because this study is not being conducted by or in collaboration with any local researcher at your institution – most institutions find that they do not require their own IRB approval to participate. If your IRB does, however, we encourage you to act swiftly to initiate that process.

Please use this guide as a reference. It includes: background information about this study, a summary of what can be expected throughout the survey implementation, Checklist/Key Dates that outline your Institution’s responsibilities and provides important deadlines, and a Frequently Asked Questions section that will help guide you through answering questions that may come up about the study within your institution.

Please pay special attention to the List Instructions section, as it outlines the procedure and format for submitting your Institution’s list of federally-funded researchers.

It is our hope that this guide will provide a basic understanding of the Federal Demonstration Partnership 2018 Faculty Workload Survey. If you have any questions after examining this guide, please do not hesitate to reach out to one of the research team contacts listed on page 4.

**FDP 2018 Workload Study Website**

Please visit the FDP Workload Study website for information about FDP and the current study, as well as to access a copy of this Institution Guide and other useful resources:

http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/fdp/PGA_181909
**Research Team Key Contacts**

For questions regarding the content of the Faculty Workload Survey:
Sandra L. Schneider  
FDP Faculty Workload Survey Principal Investigator and Working Group Chair  
*Sandra@usf.edu*  
813-974-9168

For more information about the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP):
David Wright  
Executive Director, Federal Demonstration Partnership  
*DWRight@nas.edu*  
202-334-1495

For inquiries regarding the data collection process or how to submit your faculty list:
Julie Smith  
Research Consultant, SoundRocket  
or  
Robert Young  
Research Programmer, SoundRocket  
*FDP@ssgresearch.com*  
734-213-4600

For inquiries regarding USF IRB:
University of South Florida Division of Research Integrity & Compliance  
Weldon George, IRB Manager (Social/Behavioral Research)  
* wageorge1@usf.edu*  
813-974-8360

**Primary Institution Contact**

The primary contact that the Faculty Workload Survey (FWS) team will use for each institution will default to the FDP Institution Administrative Representative. If someone other than yourself should be considered the primary contact for this effort, please contact us as soon as possible. It is important that the liaison join the study as early as possible so that s/he will have a full understanding of the process.

If you would like to change the primary contact, please contact David Wright (email and phone listed contact information listed above).
Background

Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP)

Over 25 years ago, the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP), previously called the Federal Demonstration Project, surveyed faculty from FDP institutions to evaluate the worth of the “expanded authorities” that had recently been negotiated between the FDP universities, participating federal agencies and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The principal focus of the survey was to determine whether changes in the regulations affecting prior approvals, pre-award costs, no-cost extensions, and the carryover of unexpended funds had saved faculty time, and whether such saved time had been re-invested in research activities.

Over twenty-five hundred faculty responded to the survey indicating that the new, more flexible policies saved researchers significant time. Of this liberated time, 90% was refocused toward scholarly activity and of that 90%, 73% was spent directly conducting research. These observations implied that the research productivity of FDP faculty would be increased by changes in federal grant policies. However, anecdotal comments from some surveyed faculty indicated that much of the free time resulting from the implementation of the “expanded authorities” was likely to be re-allocated to other research administrative duties, such as IRB- or IACUC-related tasks and research safety issues.

During the decade following the early FDP survey, several new federal regulations were added to the faculty workload which further reduced the amount of time that faculty could allocate to active research. In 2005, FDP conducted the first Faculty Workload Survey (FWS), which estimated that as much as 42% of faculty research time on federal projects was spent completing administrative tasks rather than actively conducting research. This was followed by the 2012 FWS, which furthered understanding of how administrative tasks impact active research. Findings from these studies are available on the FDP website (Schneicer et al., 2012; Decker et al., 2007; thefdp.org) and have been a focus of attention in flagship journals of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS; Lane & Bertuzzi, 2011; Leshner, 2008) and the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA; Rockwell, 2009; Sedwick, 2009).

Goals of 2018 Faculty Workload Survey

The current study is a follow-up to the FDP 2012 Faculty Workload Survey (FWS). The 2018 FWS will re-assess estimates of federally-funded researchers’ administrative workload, and will extend the earlier survey findings by: (1) differentiating time required for administrative workload versus priorities for reducing specific aspects of administrative burden, (2) comparing administrative workloads as a function of institution characteristics and funding sources, (3) elaborating information on time commitments and burdens associated with proposal submission, and (4) increasing attention to perceived research climate and support within the institution. The results of the 2018 FWS study will provide the FDP with a better understanding of how to streamline research administrative burdens, make federally-funded research more efficient, and subsequently allow greater focus on the science of the research.
Faculty Workload Survey Working Group Regular Contributors

Richard Beaulaurier, Florida International University  Debra Murphy, Arizona State University
Lori Carter-Edwards, University of North Carolina  Robert Nobles, University of Tennessee
Neil Charness, Florida State University  Mary Ann Ottinger, University of Houston
Richard Costanzo, Virginia Commonwealth University  Aleister Saunders, Drexel University
Jonathan Kaye, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center  Sandra Schneider, University of South Florida
Cheryl Kitt, National Institutes of Health  Kelly Shaver, College of Charleston
Melissa Korf, Harvard University  Bettie Steinberg, Feinstein Institute for Medical Research
Jane McCutcheon, New York University  Larry Sutter, Michigan Technological University
Michele Masucci, Temple University  Ara Tahmassian, Harvard University
Eva McGhee, Charles Drew University  Alice Young, Texas Tech University

Implementation Plan and Schedule

For your Institution to qualify for participation in the FDP’s Faculty Workload Survey (FWS), we will need your help as we move toward the survey’s launch date. It is our hope that the administrative representative at each institution, or their designee, will act as the liaison between their Institution and the research team by coordinating efforts to complete the steps necessary for survey administration.

The FWS research team works to ensure that this process is as smooth as possible for all participating institutions.

- SoundRocket (SR) has been contracted to provide professional survey research services for implementing the 2018 FWS. SR is a full-service survey research provider located in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and also provided survey research services in the previous 2005 and 2012 Faculty Workload Surveys.
- IRB approval is pending at the University of South Florida, which has full AAHRPP accreditation.
  - USF is the home institution of Dr. Sandra Schneider, the principal investigator for the FDP on this survey.
  - IRB approval documents will be disseminated as soon as they are available.
  - The USF IRB has previously ruled that, because participating institutions are not directly involved in the research itself, no form of secondary approval from participating institutions is required. Thus, the FDP Faculty Workload Survey has not required that institutions obtain a local IRB approval.
  - It is the responsibility of each institution to ensure that they abide by any/all local policies when participating in the FDP Faculty Workload Survey; if you need any assistance in navigating your institution’s IRB approval process, please contact us.

Institutional Participation requirements focus on two key items/dates. Each institution is requested to:

1. **Confirm intent to participate** in the FDP Faculty Workload Survey via email to David Wright, FDP Executive Director, dwright@nas.edu by no later than **Friday, October 27, 2017**;

   *and*

2. **Provide a list of faculty/researchers**, no later than **Friday, November 17, 2017**. This involves following the instructions provided in this document to complete the necessary list preparation and provide approval for the FDP to use the list to contact faculty and conduct the survey.
Key Dates

The two critical dates on which to focus are Friday, October 27, and Friday, November 17, 2017. Providing your institution’s intent to participate and the list of your faculty/researchers will serve as confirmation that your institution has provided approval and that they will be included in the study. Receipt of these two items on or before the dates listed below will ensure that your faculty/researcher list will be used in the final sample design planning for the study, and therefore that your institution’s diversity is adequately represented in the survey effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task...</th>
<th>Due On or Before...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Confirm Intent of your Institution to Participate with FDP via email</td>
<td>Friday,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to David Wright</td>
<td>October 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide List of Faculty/Researchers (Sample File) to SoundRocket via</td>
<td>Friday,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP Website (see instructions on p. 9)</td>
<td>November 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the time needed to process multiple samples for the study, institutions will only be able to participate if their list of faculty/researchers is provided on or before November 17, 2017.

If any of the dates listed above pose a difficulty for your institution, please contact David Wright at dwright@nas.edu to discuss options.
Faculty List (Population File) Specifics

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE (STUDY SAMPLE DEFINITION)

To conduct the 2018 Faculty Workload Survey, it is necessary to receive a file containing the names and contact information for all faculty that are engaged in federally-funded research at your institution. For this study, eligibility is defined as:

- All Personnel who were serving as Principal Investigators (PI) on U.S. Federally Funded Research Projects (including both Contracts and Grants) that were active (including projects in no-cost extensions) at any point during the 2016-2017 Academic Year (AY). AY2016-2017 includes the 12-months that most closely corresponds to your institution’s academic calendar.
- Note. Projects that are not direct federal funding, such as pass-through awards, are ineligible.

HOW MANY

- A full population file is requested. After lists are obtained from all FDP institutions, the research team will check to ensure that all necessary variables are included. All individuals on the list provided will be invited to participate in the survey.

WHAT INFORMATION IS NEEDED

- The survey collection design requires only email communications to potential respondents; thus, to successfully connect with the appropriate individuals and collect needed responses, the following variables are requested from you to be included in the list of faculty/researchers you will be providing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES TO INCLUDE IN SAMPLE FILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Name*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI First Name*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Last Name*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Email Address (if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Salutation (i.e., Dr, Mr, Ms, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age or DOB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Variables marked with an asterisk * are required; communications to potential respondents will not be possible without this information.
- The remaining variables will add significant value to the outcomes of the study, and it is requested that as many of them as possible be included in the list provided.
  - The FDP strongly encourages providing all variables; however, if that is not possible, it will not impede your institution’s ability to participate, as long as the essential contact information has been provided.

To protect the confidentiality of your colleagues’ personal information, your list must be uploaded to the designated secure site as described below. Please do not email your list.
### Pre-Proposals Submitted

*Pre-Proposals Submitted\((excluded\ from\ Proposals\ Submitted\ figures\ below)\)*

Fiscal Year 2016: 63  
Fiscal Year 2017: 56

---

### Proposals Submitted and Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>FY '17 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY '16 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY '17 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY '16 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY '17 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY '16 as of 6/30</th>
<th>Variance $</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3,004,822</td>
<td>1,422,217</td>
<td>1,582,605</td>
<td>111.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11,268,683</td>
<td>7,363,202</td>
<td>3,905,481</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3,977,021</td>
<td>2,078,969</td>
<td>1,898,052</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Defense</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12,680,388</td>
<td>9,886,023</td>
<td>2,794,365</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>382,898</td>
<td>208,945</td>
<td>173,953</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,908,806</td>
<td>2,289,109</td>
<td>2,619,707</td>
<td>114.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of HHS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,703,759</td>
<td>3,203,615</td>
<td>-1,499,856</td>
<td>-48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Transportation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,264,556</td>
<td>1,834,601</td>
<td>1,429,955</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Agencies*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,722,642</td>
<td>2,591,175</td>
<td>131,467</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agency Total</strong></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>43,913,635</td>
<td>30,877,856</td>
<td>13,035,779</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,770,931</td>
<td>3,808,872</td>
<td>-2,037,941</td>
<td>-53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7,068,997</td>
<td>7,128,823</td>
<td>-59,826</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,184,275</td>
<td>857,054</td>
<td>327,221</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sponsors</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,570,066</td>
<td>1,523,010</td>
<td>47,056</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>872</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>55,507,904</td>
<td>44,195,415</td>
<td>11,312,489</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>4,179,577</td>
<td>7,439,801</td>
<td>-3,260,224</td>
<td>-43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26,902</td>
<td>26,602</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>872</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>59,714,383</td>
<td>51,661,818</td>
<td>$8,052,565</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**Gifts represent non-contractual funding from corporations, foundations, associations and societies in support of academic programs, scholarships/fellowships, student design & enterprise, research, youth programs and special programs.
### SPO & IIE Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
<th>College of Sciences &amp; Arts</th>
<th>Great Lakes Research Center</th>
<th>Keweenaw Research Center</th>
<th>Michigan Tech Research Institute</th>
<th>Pavlis Honors College</th>
<th>School of Business &amp; Economics</th>
<th>School of Forest Resources &amp; Env Science</th>
<th>School of Technology</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Fiscal Comparison</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Submitted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>7,651,048</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,408,688</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards Received</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>80,994</td>
<td>15,350,219</td>
<td>5,507,673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,026,786</td>
<td>2,550,760</td>
<td>97,521</td>
<td>4,806,827</td>
<td>149,184</td>
<td>33,569,964</td>
<td>24,339,847</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pass-Through</td>
<td>224,853</td>
<td>4,913,216</td>
<td>758,024</td>
<td>187,483</td>
<td>28,714</td>
<td>4,088,311</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td>164,720</td>
<td>10,343,671</td>
<td>6,388,009</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>887,161</td>
<td>197,114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,184,275</td>
<td>857,054</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>1,130,659</td>
<td>2,136,595</td>
<td>458,982</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>56,683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>311,583</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>34,825</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>4,179,577</td>
<td>7,439,801</td>
<td>-43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Funding</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>7,284</td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,902</td>
<td>26,602</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>162,478</td>
<td>3,096,250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,759</td>
<td>2,725,203</td>
<td>128,221</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>923,786</td>
<td>7,068,997</td>
<td>7,128,823</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>387,454</td>
<td>687,554</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>258,370</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>187,688</td>
<td>1,570,066</td>
<td>1,523,010</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of MI</td>
<td>797,149</td>
<td>771,030</td>
<td>37,364</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,770,931</td>
<td>3,808,672</td>
<td>-53.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $ by Division</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,408,688</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,549,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,651,048</strong></td>
<td><strong>211,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,842,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,095,662</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,283,234</strong></td>
<td><strong>184,684</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,714,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,661,818</strong></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Comparison</td>
<td>4,244,952</td>
<td>20,188,763</td>
<td>9,869,568</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,921,036</td>
<td>8,266,439</td>
<td>388,009</td>
<td>99,635</td>
<td>3,636,620</td>
<td>46,796</td>
<td>51,661,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>-43.3%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>-22.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>294.7%</td>
<td>294.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosures Received</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76.25%</td>
<td>18.47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondisclosure Agreements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents Filed or Issued</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Agreements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Royalties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>24.49%</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,04%</td>
<td>326,169</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Combined Metrics from both the Sponsored Programs Office (SPO) and Innovation & Industry Engagement (IIE)
2 Percentages reflect the proportional contribution from each Division (calculated by dividing the sum of the fractional contributions of all inventors for each unit by the total number of inventors).
### Sponsored Awards - Industry - COMBINED
#### Fiscal Year 2017
#### 4th Quarter
#### Ended June 30, 2017

**TOTAL: $15,930,364**

---

#### Proposals Submitted & Awards Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Segment</th>
<th>FY ’17 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY ’16 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY ’17 as of 6/30</th>
<th>FY ’16 as of 6/30</th>
<th>Awards Received ($)</th>
<th>Variance $</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7,396,022</td>
<td>4,834,597</td>
<td>2,561,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>458,269</td>
<td>191,355</td>
<td>266,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>708,046</td>
<td>608,002</td>
<td>100,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182,151</td>
<td>824,263</td>
<td>-642,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>744,384</td>
<td>989,961</td>
<td>-245,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense &amp; Space</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,939,662</td>
<td>1,687,208</td>
<td>1,252,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>724,092</td>
<td>735,900</td>
<td>-11,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>157,329</td>
<td>129,959</td>
<td>27,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>530,093</td>
<td>381,552</td>
<td>148,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>204,332</td>
<td>206,520</td>
<td>-2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>750,829</td>
<td>611,886</td>
<td>138,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Metals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>420,984</td>
<td>376,258</td>
<td>44,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>244,388</td>
<td>623,048</td>
<td>-378,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>469,783</td>
<td>343,036</td>
<td>126,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 282 244 526 536 15,930,364 12,543,645 3,386,819 27.0%

*Gifts represent non-contractual funding from corporations, foundations, associations and societies in support of academic programs, scholarships/fellowships, student design & enterprise, research, youth programs and special programs.

**Gift numbers include Industry gifts ONLY, not others including Association or Society gifts.
Michigan Technological University  
Total PRELIMINARY Research Expenditures by College/School/Division  
Fiscal Year 2017 & 2016  
As of June 30, 2017 and June 30, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School/Division</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration*</td>
<td>5,090,250</td>
<td>2,652,771</td>
<td>2,437,479</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>25,217,506</td>
<td>28,885,027</td>
<td>(3,667,521)</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science &amp; Arts</td>
<td>16,643,420</td>
<td>16,825,212</td>
<td>(181,792)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Research Center**</td>
<td>232,583</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>232,583</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlis Honors College</td>
<td>298,791</td>
<td>284,189</td>
<td>14,602</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw Research Center (KRC)</td>
<td>7,928,461</td>
<td>7,076,343</td>
<td>852,118</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech Research Institute (MTRI)</td>
<td>8,412,594</td>
<td>8,912,958</td>
<td>(500,364)</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>1,353,978</td>
<td>1,630,253</td>
<td>(276,275)</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Forest Resources &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>5,894,354</td>
<td>5,508,378</td>
<td>385,976</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Technology</td>
<td>557,241</td>
<td>760,637</td>
<td>(203,396)</td>
<td>-26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,629,178</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,535,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>(906,590)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the Vice Presidents, Provost, and others who report to a VP, Provost or the President. Except for the research institutes that report to the VPR.

**Includes GLRC department (non-academic researchers) expenditures only. All other GLRC center expenditures are shown in the researchers' respective colleges.