IU INDIANA UNIVERSITY

16a – IT-related Grant Support

Action Item Template Response

General Action Item Information

Lead Division/Office: Pervasive Technology Institute
Action Item Number: 16a
Action Item Short Name: IT-related Grant Support
Dependencies with other EP Action Items: 3, 4
Implementation leader (name & email): Therese Miller (millertm@indiana.edu)

I. DESCRIBE YOUR PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THIS ACTION.

- Expand IU's capabilities to win and execute IT-related grant funding to support the mission of IU. This is to be achieved by enhancing the pre- and post- grant process so that UITS, PTI, and collaborators can more effectively submit proposals, receive funding for a higher percentage of proposals submitted, and manage the reporting requirements of success more effectively.

- Expand the capabilities and staffing of the OVPIT Finance Office to support drastically increased reporting requirements created by ARRA and an increased load in grants and contracts to manage. It is important to note that we do not propose a general grant writing assistance program to aid any and all researchers preparing grant proposals. The logic behind housing the grant preparation and reporting service within PTI is twofold: 1) PTI is naturally structured to foster collaborations that involve computational science and information technology; 2) there is particular content expertise within PTI as regards information technology, computer science, informatics, and computational science already demonstrated by our success in pursuit of external funding. We propose to expand the existing capabilities to be a service available to UITS, and collaborators with UITS and PTI.

In sum, we aim to improve and expand overall processes for supporting grants and contracts via the OVPIT Finance Office (FO) and the Central Supporting Services group of PTI. In so doing we can ensure that we are able to execute existing grant awards and obtain new ones effectively, continuing the growth already demonstrated in recent years. The added staff will support any and all staff and leaders working within UITS and PTI, and our collaborators, in the process of submitting grant proposals and adhering to reporting requirements when grants are awarded.

II. WHAT ARE THE POLICY AND PRACTICE IMPLICATIONS OF YOUR PLANS?

- PTI as a service delivery organization. A key policy aspect of the proposed service and PTI activities is that the initiative serves all grant preparation and execution by UITS, OVPIT, PTI, and our collaborators generally. This function is placed organizationally within PTI because of PTI's role, established in the 2008 proposal to the Lilly Endowment, as the primary venue for, and brand identity of, IU's information technology research and development activities. This is a change for PTI; it puts PTI in a position of being a service delivery organization, and everyone in PTI understands this. This proposal builds upon

the considerable expertise and staffing already built up within PTI and RT, exhibited by a string of wins in MRI grants, NIH core grants, and most recently by a successful NSF Track IID proposal (FutureGrid).

- Policies for building scalability in grant execution. We recommend a new policy (which reflects an increasingly common practice) to make at least some portions of the grant management process scalable. We propose as policy that every grant proposal prepared and/or submitted with PTI and/or OVPIT FO assistance includes explicit funding for an appropriate level of project management staff. Such funding could appear either as part of the requested funding or as part of the formal match, but in either event the project management function should be built into every grant proposal budget. In this way, project management staffing scales up with grant success, and the new staff working in the FO and PTI have appropriate levels of responsiveness from grant winning teams. This way post-award support from PTI and the FO becomes just that - support - not a replacement for functions that are essential but historically not accounted for explicitly in grant budgets. The historic approach to this issue was one thing when we had a handful of grants at a time. It's not sustainable when we have 25 or 50 at a time.

- Policies to clarify roles and responsibilities for well-refined grants - planning to submit excellent grants and manage workloads. We also recommend policies to formally define service levels and grant preparer responsibilities. We propose that any OVPIT, UITS, or PTI employee who qualifies to be a PI (via ORA guidelines) has equal access to this support function. If demand for resources exceeds availability, then we have the option of either having a small peer-review process run with the involvement of relevant staff and faculty leaders, or expanding staff. At the same time, to manage workload and ensure that effort is spent on maximizing the submission of high-quality proposals, guidelines need to be set for proposal preparation.

- Practice implications - building for success. The practice implications of these plans are that we will continue to succeed in the positive feedback cycle laid out and explained years ago by Brad Wheeler of winning awards, developing competencies, delivering results, and winning more grant awards. The point of this is not the money but the scholarly and artistic breakthroughs that the money enables.

I.
II.   **III. IDENTIFY STAKEHOLDERS.**

- UITS Divisions
    - RT/PTI
    - Networking
    - Finance Office
    - Learning Technologies
    - Enterprise Software
    - Support
    - Enterprise Infrastructure
- Administrative Units
    - VP for IT, Office of Research Administration
    - University Budget Office
- Academic Units
    - Informatics
    - COAS
- All IU departments and schools that include scientists who collaborate with the Networks Division, the Research Technologies Division, or PTI