Review and Submission of Research Proposals

Statement: Principal investigators or ensuring that proposals are complete when they arrive at the HYPERLINK "https://researchfoundation.odu.edu/"Research Foundation or or HYPERLINK "https://www.odu.edu/research"Office of Research for signature. To be complete, the_full proposal and all required documentation should be in final form and accompanied by a completed and signed Proposal Transmittal Form that contains:Office of Research for signature. To be complete, the_full proposal and all required documentation should be in final form and accompanied by a completed and signed Proposal Transmittal Form that contains: proposal and all required documentation should be in final form and accompanied by a completed and signed Proposal Transmittal Form that contains:Office of Research for signature. To be complete, the_full proposal and all required documentation should be in final form and accompanied by a completed and signed Proposal Transmittal Form that contains: Description of Research for signature. To be completed and signed Proposal Transmittal Form that contains:

- A named source and associated signature of approval for any proposed matching funds and/or cost-sharing;
- Any required approvals from the Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, Radiation Safety Committee, and/or Institutional Biosafety Committee as relevant based on the subject area and activities proposed;
- 3. Signatures of the appropriate director(s), chair(s), dean(s), and the VP for the Division of Research and Economic Development. The Department chair approval covers:
 - Academic Alignment ensuring the project fits within departmental goals and faculty expertise
 - Resource Availability confirming the availability of departmental resources such as space and personnel
 - Budget Review assessing the appropriateness of budget items, including release time, graduate research assistant and teaching assistant support
 - Compliance verifying adherence to departmental policies and any potential conflicts of interest.

The Dean/VP approval covers:

- Strategic Fit ensuring the proposal aligns with college/unit-level strategic objectives
- Resource Commitment authorizing commitments like cost-sharing, space allocation, and faculty/staff time
- Financial Oversight reviewing the financial implications for the college/unit, including indirect cost waivers or reductions
- Risk Assessment evaluating potential risks associated with the project, including secured research, conflict of interest and commitment, and ensuring mitigation

Commented [A1]: Deans Policy Review Complete

Gail discussed a couple points with Shannon. Robinson, which resulted in some wording changes. It was then reviewed by the Deans Policy Committee again.

AALT review complete Ready for Faculty Senate Review

Commented [A2R1]: we are OK with this

Commented [A3]: Department Chairs and Deans do not see the entire proposal—we see the transmittal form only. Unless the system is changed so that we see the final proposal—there is no ways to adhere to this policy.

Deleted: , department are responsible

Deleted: a

Deleted: narrative

Deleted: forms

Commented [A7]: Use new title

Commented [A8R7]: agree

Deleted: a

Deleted: narrative

Deleted: forms

Deleted: narrative

Deleted: forms

Deleted: narrative

Deleted: forms

Deleted: signatures

 $\label{lem:commented} \textbf{Commented [A9]:} \ \ \text{This section contains new wording to} \\ \ \ \text{capture what the chair, dean and VP are actually reviewing.} \\$

Deleted: <#>An abstract describing the project;¶

Deleted: <#>

Deleted: <#>and

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.6"

August 2024 27-

strategies are in place.

 Explicit allocations of credit for portions of the project when multiple investigators are collaborating.

> Approved by the president December 1, 1988 Revised July 17, 2006

Deleted: <#> assuring the merit and quality of the proposal as well as assurance that the PI is authorized to submit a proposal and that the chair and dean have the opportunity to review the proposal submissionthe project can be carried out should an award be made; should an award be made; \$\\$

Commented [A10]: For Shannon to review; in relation to the budget and budget justification.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Commented [A11R10]: point 4 is OK. That is included on the ePTF. \end{tabular}$

point 5 does not belong here. This is a list of items in teh ePTF. the fact that the other parts of the proposal must be delivered is part of the first statement. I suggest eliminating #5

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Commented [A12R10]:} we agree and Gail will check with Shannon \end{tabular}$

 $Commented\ [A13R10]$: Shannon agrees. I deleted 5 and left 4.

Deleted: For electronic submission, Tthe principal investigator will be expected to upload the final proposal narrative and including all required forms and documents into electronic submission mechanism, with the exception of except for the budget and/or other documents that are within the purview of the authorized institutional administrator/official or the Research Foundation staff. A completed proposal transmittal form is required for electronic submissions and as well as those in hardcopy formall proposal submissions. The Research Foundation is not authorized to submit incomplete proposals to the sponsor unless they are complete.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.81", No bullets or numbering

August 2024 274