

CAMPUS REPORT SUPPLEMENT

NUMBER 1

OCTOBER 24, 1968

Published for Stanford University Faculty and Staff by the University Relations Office as an adjunct to the weekly *Campus Report*.

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Stanford Community
FROM: R. W. Lyman, Vice-President and Provost
W. F. Baxter, Chairman, Committee on Research Policy
SUBJECT: Sponsored Research at Stanford

THE PAPER ON "RESEARCH AT STANFORD" issued this week describes the policies that have been pursued at Stanford for a number of years in regard to sponsored research activities. Though this paper contains no new information, it does bring together in one document a number of policies, all of which relate to the University's research program. The paper has been reviewed by the President, the Research Administrator and by us.

RESEARCH AT STANFORD

THE PURPOSE of this paper is to describe the basis upon which research, education and training projects carried on with outside support are approved and conducted at Stanford.

All sponsored projects which are undertaken at Stanford with external financial support begin with faculty initiative. That is to say, sponsored projects are not undertaken at the request of an outside agency. When a faculty member wishes to undertake an externally sponsored project, he prepares a proposal setting forth the nature of the problem to be studied (e.g., a research project in the synthesis of alkaloids, or an educational project to train students in a foreign language), explains the significance of what it is that he proposes to undertake, and gives a general description of how he proposes to conduct the program. This includes a description of the facilities to be used and the significance of the work to be undertaken, the University faculty and staff involved, the duration of the project, and the sponsor or sponsors for whom the proposal is intended. Also included in the proposal is an estimate of the cost of the project, the amount of money requested from the potential sponsor and the amount of the cost if any to be borne by the University. The proposal is then submitted to the chairman of the faculty member's department who reviews and formally approves it. The approved proposal then goes to the appropriate school Dean's office where it is again reviewed and approved for academic propriety as a School project.

The approved proposal is then transmitted to the Research Administrator's office where it is again reviewed for University approval against a list of guidelines provided by the Provost. These guidelines are:

1. ACADEMIC PROPRIETY

- (a) *Principal Investigator*. Is the proposal submitted by a Stanford faculty member or Senior Research Associate as principal investigator?

Proposals for research, education and training are directed by an Academic Council member or Senior Research Associate as principal investigator, except in highly unusual circumstances, and then only with the Provost's approval.

- (b) *Educational Component*. Does the proposal in-

educational component usually through the training and support of graduate students.

- (c) *Presence at Stanford*. Does the proposal require faculty members to be away from the campus for extended periods of time? If so, what are the benefits accruing to Stanford and do they outweigh this disadvantage?

- (d) *Faculty Time Involvement*. Is the amount of effort committed to the research by each faculty member consistent with his other academic duties?

2. COMMITMENTS

- (a) *New Staff*. Are commitments for the acquisition of additional faculty or senior staff members consistent with school plans?

If the proposal requires additional staff which will result in an eventual charge to the academic budget, specific Provost's Office approval is required.

- (b) *Space*. Will the project require additional space? If so, are requirements for additional space consistent with school plans in the sense that they are a part of a construction program which has President's Office approval or of a minor remodeling nature for which funds have been approved?

- (c) *Cost Sharing (Federal Research Grants)*. Is the listing of the University contribution which may be included accurate, consistent with school plans and budget, and in accord with the guidelines issued by the Research Administrator's Office?

3. BUDGET

A detailed check of accuracy will be carried out by the Research Administrator's Office. The School review includes a check to see whether the following items are included where warranted: student stipends; travel; computer time; fringe benefits; and indirect cost

Particular emphasis in the review of proposals is placed upon the relevance of the proposals to the basic purposes of the University. That is to say, proposals for research projects are expected to be concerned with investigations which promise to make an application of or a contribution to fundamental knowledge. They also should provide an education component through the inclusion of opportunities for students to be actively involved in the work in a way which will hopefully lead to the basis for a dissertation, as well as providing a means of potential financial support through remuneration for the work the students perform.

In addition, should a proposal involve the use of human subjects (e.g., research projects involving in vivo studies using patients at the Medical School or psychological or sociological investigations in the School of Humanities and Sciences), the proposal is referred to one of the two University standing committees on the use of human subjects, to insure that the rights of the experimental subjects are protected under the Helsinki Declaration.

Exceptions in the review of a proposal on any of the above points are referred back to the school or department as appropriate for reconsideration. Any exceptions to the above criteria which the school recommends are referred to the Provost for his review and approval before the proposal is forwarded.

In the past year, the University faculty has submitted through this mechanism some 1,250 proposals to some 90 different foundations and government agencies for sponsorship.

One category of proposals for research and educational grants and contracts receives an additional review: proposals to undertake research which may involve classification of the contract or grant if the potential sponsor elects to make an award. It should be noted that of the 1,250 proposals submitted in the last twelve months, 20 involved the possibility of classification and of those sixteen resulted in awards. In cases where the Principal Investigator has reason to believe that the work he is proposing will involve the likelihood that some part of it will be classified, the proposal, after it is reviewed in the manner described above, is referred to the Subcommittee on Classified Contracts of the faculty Committee on Research Policy.

The Committee was created in June of 1966 as a standing committee of the Academic Council to review research policy in general and to review in detail and in depth the question of the propriety of classified research in a university setting. From the Committee's extensive deliberations emerged a set of rules, subsequently approved by vote of the Academic Council, that are applied by the Subcommittee in its review of each such proposal. The method used by the Subcommittee to conduct the review is to circulate the proposal in question to the members for reading in advance of the meeting at which it is to be taken up, and then to invite to the meeting the faculty member initiating the proposal so that he may discuss the proposal and the work to be performed. Under the Committee's definition, a proposal is considered to be classified if any one researcher to work on the project requires security clearance from the federal government. All proposals which appear before the Committee are reviewed in accord with the following general rules:

(a) No research on a thesis or dissertation should be undertaken if, at the time the topic is set, there is any substantial possibility that it will lead to a

(b) No classified thesis or dissertation should be accepted as the basis for a degree unless, in the judgment of the Committee on the Graduate Division, the imposition of classification could not reasonably have been foreseen until the work was so far advanced that modification of the thesis topic would have resulted in substantial inequity to the student; (c) Scholarly activities not accessible for scrutiny by the entire Advisory Board should not be considered in connection with appointments, reappointments or promotions;

(d) The University should enter no contract and accept no grant that involves the collection of social or behavioral data in a foreign country and requires the security clearance of any person involved in the project;

(e) The University should enter no contract and accept no grant to carry out research under circumstances that restrain the freedom of the University to disclose (1) the existence of the contract or grant or (2) the general nature of the inquiry to be conducted or (3) the identity of the outside contracting or granting entity; Provided, that clause (3) shall not apply either (a) to anonymous gifts or grants that do not call for the performance of specified lines of inquiry, or (b) to research grants or contracts from individuals or non-governmental entities who request anonymity out of a justifiable motivation to protect individual privacy.

In the case of the majority of proposals which do not involve classification, slightly in excess of one half of the proposals which are approved and forwarded to government and non-government potential sponsors result in awards, through the University, to the principal faculty investigator to undertake and carry out the project proposed. When a proposal is accepted for sponsorship, usually following sponsor screening for quality and importance of the work proposed (within the limits of the funds that are available to support such projects), the foundation or agency concerned then contacts the University and a grant or contract is negotiated. Any changes in the proposal as submitted which are requested by the sponsor are then reviewed by the principal investigator and the Research Administrator's office as to acceptability and an award is not accepted by the University in which any such differences cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

Once the award has been accepted by the University and the principal investigator, the principal investigator is then free to begin work on the project, with the University administration providing, other than required fiscal and property reports, only such services as are requested by the investigator (e.g., purchasing, facility maintenance). The investigator and his students, with any technicians that may be required, are then free to carry on their work as they see fit. The Research Administrator's Office is available, at the investigator's request, to assist with any problems that subsequently arise, but generally is not involved once the award has been accepted.

In the fiscal year ending last August, the University carried on approximately 1,600 externally sponsored research, education, and training grants and contracts which, excluding SLAC, expended \$65.4 million. The table below indicates the distribution of these expenditures by major sources of support.