

November 8, 1995

## DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS INITIATIVES

### INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Major universities must engage in general planning as an on-going process, but periodically they need to reconsider seriously their priorities and reflect on what changes are needed to meet new challenges and opportunities. For Indiana University, the recent Strategic Directions planning discussions have been a crucial first step in the process of examining priorities and identifying new areas for future emphasis. It is now time for the various groups within the university to think about their goals in terms of their own missions and the Strategic Directions Charter (SDC). These self-studies will likely result in some refocussing of effort and ideas for new plans and initiatives. Those groups identifying new initiatives will naturally provide the majority of the resources necessary to implement them, and this is consistent with providing a sense of ownership and the on-going commitments required for the success of individual initiatives. However, in some cases, additional resources may be required to launch these new initiatives, and this request for proposals (RFP) has been created to allow groups to compete for funds designated for this purpose. These additional resources, available only through this RFP process, should also provide an incentive for various units to discuss the implications of the charter in terms of their own priorities. The real gains to the university will come from the new ideas and commitments resulting from the planning process by the individual units. Significant opportunities would be lost if the emphasis is solely in terms of what ideas are likely to attract funds from this RFP process. The vast majority of the human and financial resources required for success will come from the local campuses, schools, departments, etc.

### PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

We invite the submission of proposals that will have significant impact on students, staff, and faculty, and improve the university's ability to meet its diverse missions in the directions outlined in the SDC. Any individual or group within the university can submit a proposal, and it will be reviewed by the RFP panels. We encourage wide discussion and collaboration in the proposal writing phase. In some cases, collaboration with external partners may be appropriate.

If the proposal is to have a major influence on the future, it will probably need the resources and support of some community within the university. Therefore, the formation of proposal writing teams from various sub-units will often be a useful first step. The input and general priority given the proposal by appropriate policy and advisory committees, as well as administrators (Directors, Chairs, Deans, Chancellors, etc.) directly impacted by the proposed initiative, will be taken into account in the review process. However these bodies will not act as a filter. All proposals submitted will go through the review process unless they are withdrawn. The RFP review process encourages more feedback and collaboration than is characteristic of funding competitions at the federal level. This is consistent with the desire to help the IU family generate exciting new ideas and facilitate their implementation.

### FUNDING

President Brand and the Trustees have created a fund to support the strategic directions initiatives from three sources, the first two of which are continuing monies: 1) an additional one percent tuition increase was approved for the 1995-96 fiscal year that has created an estimated \$2.8 million, 2) \$2 million of the funds appropriated by the legislature for university-wide initiatives has been designated for this purpose; 3) President Brand has identified sources of one-time funds (~\$15 million) that will be available over the next few years. Sources one and two involve base funding; however, proposals should not generally anticipate utilizing these funds for the long-term sustenance of the proposed initiative. Rather, these base funds should remain available for the funding of future initiatives. There will be several rounds of funding, and we have enclosed a draft timetable for allocations for the first three rounds (attachment 1).

Matching funds will be an important part of the program. Although a one-to-one match may not be appropriate in all situations, matching funds or in-kind resources will be considered an important commitment on the part of the unit submitting the proposal. The one percent tuition funding from each campus will be used to fund projects for that campus, and it will remain committed to that campus. However, all proposals will be evaluated by the review process described below.

## GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSALS

Requests for one-page preproposals will be sent out early in the fall and spring semesters each year; however, proposals may be submitted at other times if it can be demonstrated that the projects involved are of a sufficient emergency that they cannot wait for normal proposal deadlines. The first pre-proposals should be circulated during the month of January for comments for proposals to be submitted by March 1, 1996.

Preproposals should be limited to one page and include a project title, the unit requesting the funds, approximate time period of the project, the amount requested, and a one- to two-paragraph summary of the proposed project, and the numbers of the specific Strategic Directions Charter initiatives the project will address. The purpose of the preproposal submission is to allow for the possibility for some initial constructive feedback. These preproposals should be circulated to the various local units that will be involved in the later routing process (school deans, local advisory committees, chancellors, vice presidents, etc.). This part of the process is informal and is included to facilitate communication and cooperation. A copy of the preproposal should also be sent to RUGS. We plan to make a copy of all preproposals available electronically throughout the University. There will be approximately a two-week interval between preproposal feedback and the solicitation of full proposals. Proposals for consideration in the first funding cycle should be submitted by March 1, 1996. Units will be permitted to submit a full proposal without submitting a preproposal; however, the advantage of the feedback that can be gained through the preproposal process should be taken into consideration.

Full proposals will be limited to 15 pages in length. An abstract or executive summary and table of contents are helpful on proposals of more than 5 pages. Proposals should include the following:

- Introduction and statement of the problem and importance of solving it;
- An explanation of the proposed activity and its relationship to the SDC;
- What has been done previously;
- What this proposal will accomplish and how;
- A budget narrative outlining the resources requested and their source, what resources will be provided in addition to the SDC funding, and how the project will be supported after the initial SDC funding has been exhausted;
- A standardized budget sheet (attachment 2) showing the budget in traditional categories (i.e., salaries, fringe benefits, supplies, equipment, etc.); and the amount and time requirements of all sources of funding (this information should be clearly explained in the budget narrative);
- The method to be used to assess the success of the project.

Proposals should also clearly identify local resources ("matching" funds) and contain evidence of support and involvement of appropriate local faculty, staff, and administrative leadership.

A Project Director (or co-directors) should be designated who will be in a position to act as the contact person(s) and spokesperson(s) for the project and be responsible for overseeing the project and serving as account manager.

Some initiatives may require multi-stage proposals. Such proposals should clearly outline the multi-stage plan with emphasis on the stage being proposed for funding in the current competition.

Full proposal review turn-around time should be approximately 4-6 weeks after the full proposal submission deadline. Proposals will be routed with a route sheet similar to that used for external programs (attachment 3). This will involve obtaining signatures from relevant campus chancellors, school deans and/or service offices (such as computing, physical plant, space management, etc.) to ensure that all areas that might be involved or responsible for the project are provided an opportunity to comment. Detailed procedures may vary from campus to campus, but it is generally expected that school and campus faculty governance or policy advisory committees will be consulted before the school or campus signs off on the proposal. As noted earlier, every proposal will be reviewed, even if the comments from the units signing off

on it are not completely positive.

## FUNDING AREAS

Proposals should be written to show how the project will advance one or more of the three major areas identified in the October 2 draft of the SDC (below). The final version of the Charter may differ from the October draft in some of its rationale and emphases, but the principal purposes of the Strategic Directions initiative, founded as they are in the reports of the eight task forces originally charged to set a course for the university, should remain the same.

### I. *The Responsibilities of Excellence*

1. Support the improvement of teaching, service, research, and creative work
2. Increase access to the university's traditional academic programs for all who are qualified by talent and motivation
3. Increase access to university through non-traditional programs and courses
4. Develop a university-wide associate degree program
5. Strengthen existing partnerships and create new partnerships with public schools, businesses, government agencies, and other external groups
6. Establish a research foundation and increase external research collaboration
7. Reconceive traditional categories of teaching, research, creative work, and service to reflect new patterns of faculty effort and measures of excellence
8. Strengthen international programs in teaching and research
9. Support programs that have national distinction and special importance for the future

### II. *The Community of Learning*

10. Place student learning, intellectual exploration, persistence and attainment at the center of the university's missions
11. Prepare a description of the qualities and capabilities that should define a graduate of Indiana University
12. Encourage and support excellence in learning through the use of new technologies and traditional teaching methods
13. Promote honors programs, internships and other special opportunities for learning
14. Support students' success through student-oriented policies and practices, special tutorial programs, and expanded mentoring and advising
15. Ensure that Indiana University reflects the diversity of American society and supports the achievements of minorities in all aspects of university life
16. Ensure that women are encouraged to enter all academic fields, and are recruited, appointed, and retained in all areas of the university
17. Improve the learning environment of campuses by adding student centers, student housing, and child care centers
18. Increase the connections among campuses, bringing faculty members together to improve teaching and facilitate transferability of credits
19. Attract and support outstanding graduate students and professional students, and provide mentorship and guided experience in classroom teaching
20. Increase the opportunities for alumni to engage in lifelong learning

### III. *Accountability and Best Practices*

21. Articulate the mission of each campus and school
22. Improve assessment in all areas of university life and educate members of the university community in the uses of self-assessment
23. Address issues of centralization and decentralization in academic and organizational matters to promote flexibility and effective coordination
24. Refine Responsibility Centered Management and expand accounting systems that provide precise data about costs
25. Create additional sources of revenue through technology transfer and other opportunities
26. Reassess tuition pricing and financial aid policies

27. Study efficient use of human and financial resources, and explore new flexible benefits packages for employees
28. Identify and promote Strategic Educational Units that reflect the excellence of Indiana University in distinctive ways
29. Develop a comprehensive strategy for marketing the university and undertake rigorous market research
30. Ensure a consistent system for reporting to the public on the university's success in matters central to our missions

We encourage those contemplating submission of a proposal to study the reports of the original Strategic Directions task forces as well as the Strategic Directions Charter.

### **PROCESS FOR ALLOCATING STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS CHARTER FUNDS**

The enclosed diagram (attachment 4) illustrates the RFP review process. As mentioned above, the preproposal stage is not required, but the feedback obtained should be helpful to the groups preparing full proposals. Proposals submitted by groups reporting through academic responsibility centers or academic administrative units will follow the process of evaluation on the left side of the diagram; those submitted through administrative responsibility centers or service units will follow the right side. If the proposal is a collaboration of academic and administrative units, it will proceed through both sides of the diagram simultaneously. Please contact the RUGS office if further clarification of the routing process for your given proposal is needed. The number of individuals or groups submitting the proposal may also expand or otherwise change during the process.

After the proposal has been evaluated by campus chancellors and/or appropriate vice presidents, it should be submitted, with the signed route sheet, to the Office of Research & the University Graduate School, Bryan Hall 104, IUB.

At this stage the proposal will be evaluated by one or more of the three review panels (composed primarily of faculty). The UFC Budgetary Affairs Committee, in cooperation with the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, will also provide input to the review panels on the appropriateness of the proposal budget. This budgetary evaluation will be based on experience in budgetary matters for initiatives or university efforts in similar areas or requiring similar resources to those proposed.

After the proposal has been evaluated by the panel on the basis of its relationship to the SDC, the positive impact on the area being addressed, likelihood of success and advancement of the university, it will be forwarded to the UFC Agenda and SDC Steering Committees for a priority recommendation from their perspectives.

Finally the proposal will be forwarded to the President's office for a final funding decision. Those projects that are approved will then be implemented by the unit (or units) who submitted the proposal. A very important part of the process will be a follow-up report and assessment of the goals achieved. The due date for the follow-up report will be determined (with input from the Review Panel, and the UFC Agenda or SDC steering committees) by the President's office at the time the funding decision is made.

### **REVIEW PANELS**

Panels will be made up of IU faculty and staff. Nominations for panel members have been solicited from various areas within the university, including the Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Deans, Directors and UFC. Each panel will be composed of 7-9 people chosen for their expertise in the areas associated with the particular panel on which they will serve. Other specialists may be invited to provide information to the panels to help in the evaluation of a specific proposal if the need arises. The review panel will provide a rating and comments, so that proposers of unfunded projects may be able to revise their proposals to better meet criteria or strengthen future proposals. Some proposals may be interdisciplinary and a joint meeting of a sub-group from more than one panel may be appropriate for reviewing these. Situations may arise that will lead to a conflict of interest among the members of the review panels, e.g., if a proposal is submitted by a panelist's department. The panel convener will determine the degree of potential conflict and bring it to the attention of the Vice President for Research. The panel member involved may be asked to abstain from discussing or voting on a proposal if the conflict of interest is judged to be significant. Proposal rating scores by individual panel members will be kept

confidential.

DRAFT

**FOLLOW UP**

Attachment 1

Each unit receiving funds will be required to write a report that identifies the accomplishments of the initiative during the funding period using the assessment plan included in the original proposal.

Round	FFY's	Proposal Due	Funding Decisions	Maximum Available Funds
Round 1	5/1/96	3/1/96	4/15/96	\$1.40 million* \$0.25 million* \$3.00 million*
Round 2	5/1/96	3/1/96	10/30/96	\$1.40 million* \$1.00 million* \$7.00 million*
Round 3	1/1/97	3/1/97	5/1/97	\$0.75 million** \$2.00 million**

Funding will not be available until after January 1998  
 \*Subject to revision based upon actual enrollments  
 \*\*President's one-time funds  
 Funds appropriated by legislature for university initiatives  
 funds from one percent tuition increase

DRAFT

## Attachment 1

## Timetable for Allocating Strategic Directions Charter Funds

---

	<u>RFP's</u>	<u>Proposal Due</u>	<u>Funding Decisions</u>	<u>Maximum Available Funds</u>
Round 1		3/1/96	4/15/96	\$1.40 million <sup>1</sup> \$0.25 million <sup>2</sup> \$3.00 million <sup>3</sup>
Round 2	5/1/96	9/15/96	10/30/96	\$1.40 million <sup>1*</sup> \$1.00 million <sup>2</sup> \$7.00 million <sup>3</sup>
Round 3	1/10/97	3/15/97	5/1/97	\$0 <sup>1</sup> \$0.75 million <sup>2</sup> \$2.00 million <sup>3**</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>funds from one percent tuition increase

<sup>2</sup>funds appropriated by legislature for university initiatives

<sup>3</sup>President's one-time funds

\*Subject to revision based upon actual enrollments

\*\*Funding will not be available until after January 1998

DRAFT

Attachment 2

**Strategic Directions Initiative  
Proposal Budget**

YEAR\_\_ one, \_\_ two, \_\_ three, \_\_ cumulative (check one)

A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PI/PD, Co-Pi's, Faculty and Other Senior Associates  (List each separately with title, A.7.show number in brackets)	Strategic Directions Request	Match
1.	\$	\$
2.	\$	\$
3.	\$	\$
4.	\$	\$
5.	\$	\$
6. ( ) OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUAL ON BUDGET EXPLANATION PAGE)	\$	\$
7. ( ) TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1-6)	XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
<b>B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)</b>	\$	\$
1. ( ) POST DOCTORAL ASSOCIATES	\$	\$
2. ( ) OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)	\$	\$
3. ( ) GRADUATE STUDENTS	\$	\$
4. ( ) UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	\$	\$
5. ( ) SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL	\$	\$
6. ( ) OTHER	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)</b>	\$	\$
<b>C. FRINGE BENEFITS (show calculations)</b>	\$	\$
	\$	\$
	\$	\$
<b>C. TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS</b>	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)</b>	\$	\$
<b>D. PERMANENT EQUIPMENT</b> (List item and dollar amount for each item exceeding \$500)	XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
	\$	\$
<b>TOTAL PERMANENT EQUIPMENT</b>	\$	\$
<b>E. TRAVEL</b>	XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
	\$	\$
<b>F. OTHER DIRECT COSTS</b>	\$	\$
1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES	\$	\$
2. PUBLICATION COSTS/DOCUMENTATION/DISSEMINATION	\$	\$
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES	\$	\$
4. SUBCONTRACTS	\$	\$

5. FEE REMISSIONS	\$	\$
6. OTHER	\$	\$
TOTAL OTHER COSTS	\$	\$
G. TOTAL COSTS (A THROUGH F)	\$	\$

DETAIL AND APPROVAL OF MATCH

Line Item	Amount	Account Number	Approved by
*	\$	*	*
*	\$	*	*
*	\$	*	*
*	\$	*	*

Notes:

PROJECTED SDI EXPENDITURES BY QUARTER (for each year of funding)				
	FIRST QUARTER	SECOND QUARTER	THIRD QUARTER	FOUR QUARTER
Total				
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

DRAFT

**Attachment 3**  
**INDIANA UNIVERSITY**  
**Route Sheet for Strategic Directions Implementation Proposals**

Research and the University Graduate School  
 Bryan Hall 104 (812) 855-6153

University RFP# \_\_\_\_\_

Campus \_\_\_\_\_

Project Director \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name Rank Submitting Unit Phone # Social Security #

Project Director e-mail and mailing address \_\_\_\_\_

Co-director(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name Rank Submitting Unit Phone # Social Security #

Project Title \_\_\_\_\_

Amount and dates first budget period \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Amount and dates project period \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Brief layman's description of project:

Nature of Project:

- Instructional
- Research
- Training
- Other Activity

Submitted to SDI Review Panel(s): \_\_\_\_\_

WILL CONDUCT OF THIS PROJECT REQUIRE:	Yes	No	DOES THIS PROJECT INVOLVE:	Yes	No
Additional Space on or off Campus?	_____	_____	Use of Human Subjects?	_____	_____
Alterations or Renovations?	_____	_____	Use of Vertebrate Animals?	_____	_____
Conference Facilities?	_____	_____	Biohazards?	_____	_____
Technology Transfer Considerations?	_____	_____	International Activities?	_____	_____
Major Computer Use?	_____	_____	Sub-contracting of Activities?	_____	_____

APPROVALS:	Date:	Comments:
Project Director _____	_____	_____
Chair or Unit Director _____	_____	_____
Administrative Advisory Committee _____	_____	_____
Dean _____	_____	_____
Budget Advisory Committee(s) _____	_____	_____
Chancellor or Vice President _____	_____	_____

**Attachment 4  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
PROCESS FOR ALLOCATING STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS CHARTER (SDC) FUNDS**

