

## **Policy for Evaluation of Productivity and for Assignment of Laboratory Research Space**

The missions of the School of Medicine include education, clinical care, and the acquisition of new knowledge through the conduct of research. Research is required by faculty to maintain leadership in basic and clinical disciplines at the local, national and international levels, and provides an essential mechanism for scholastic interchanges among faculty at Saint Louis University and faculty at other universities, the NIH, the NSF, foundations, and industry. Further, the education of students in the clinical and basic sciences requires faculty with the most up-to-date information, and this is best provided by having a faculty who conduct research and maintain an active scholarly life.

Space is assigned to departments and programs by the Dean. The leader of each department/program is responsible for efficient and effective use of the space assigned to his/her department/program, and in most locations can reallocate space based on individual productivity and departmental/program goals. Only the Dean can allocate space in the Doisy Research Center. Over time, however, some departments and programs naturally develop research programs more effectively than others, creating the need to reconsider space assignments to departments/and programs, and to individuals within departments/programs. To this end, the Saint Louis University School of Medicine Research Planning Committee in cooperation with representatives of the basic and clinical science departments developed the following policy for evaluation of research productivity and for possible reassignment of research space in the School of Medicine.

Medical research ranges from laboratory bench research to clinical research involving human subjects and record keeping of new treatments, and all degrees of research between these two poles. The areas of research focus emphasized by the Research Planning Committee provide broad opportunities for the School of Medicine to invigorate its research programs.

The following sections of this policy discuss the criteria used in evaluating research productivity, the annual process of evaluating research productivity, and the criteria that might exempt a principal investigator from reassignment of research space.

### **A. Criteria for Evaluating Research Productivity**

Three criteria for evaluating research productivity are listed below *in descending order of importance*:

1. total direct research expenditures per net square foot of research space
2. total indirect cost recoveries per net square foot of research space
3. research-related scholarly activity

In each case, the need for research space must be justified based on the quality of the principal investigator's research program as well as the current level of funding.

### **A.1. Total Direct Research Expenditures per Net Square Foot of Research Space**

This evaluation criterion is applied to all principal investigators, and each researcher evaluated using this criterion must demonstrate that research space is required. Although the amount of grant or contract support for a research project is neither the exclusive nor even the major criterion for evaluating worthiness or productivity of the research, it is the criterion that is most easily evaluated. Furthermore, extramural support assures that the research was evaluated by experienced investigators outside the institution and that funding has withstood widespread competition among investigators nationally or regionally.

Therefore, a principal measure of productivity is the principal investigator's total direct research expenditures divided by the principal investigator's total net square feet of research space, excluding the principal investigator's office (DIR\$/NSF). For this initial measurement of productivity, total direct research expenditures is defined as all research expenditures attributed to a principal investigator from ledger 3 (Sponsored Programs) accounts reported through the University's financial record system (Banner). Reasons for focusing on ledger 3 expenditures for this initial measurement of productivity include: 1) ledger 3 extramural funding sources provide additional indirect dollars important for paying overhead for research space, and 2) the vast majority of these extramurally awarded funds support research that requires wet bench laboratory space, the focus of this research space policy. Expenditures from ledger 2 (Designated) or other accounts may be associated with legitimate needs for wet bench laboratory space, and although they will not be included in the initial measurement of productivity outlined above, can be considered later in the process of research space evaluation.

If a principal investigator's DIR\$/NSF is at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile or above compared with all other principal investigators assigned wet bench research space, or is at or below \$100 DIR\$/NSF, the Research Space Utilization Committee will complete a more detailed analysis as outlined in Section B below to determine whether either an increase or decrease in space assignment should be recommended to the Dean.

### **A.2. Total Indirect Cost Recovery per Net Square Foot of Research Space**

This evaluation criterion is applied to all principal investigators, and each researcher evaluated using this criterion must demonstrate that research space is required. Although the amount of grant or contract support for a research project is neither the exclusive nor even the major criterion for evaluating worthiness or productivity of the research, in common with direct cost recovery, indirect cost recoveries are also an important parameter.

A principal measurement of productivity will be the principal investigator's total indirect cost recovery divided by the principal investigator's total net square feet of research space (IC\$/NSF). Indirect cost recoveries are defined as those funds reported through the University's financial record system (Banner) on research expenditures from all ledger 3 extramural sources. If the IC\$/NSF is at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile or above compared with all other principal investigators assigned wet bench research space, or is at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile

or below, then the Research Space Utilization Committee will complete a more detailed analysis as outlined in Section B below to determine whether either an increase or decrease in space assignment should be recommended to the Dean.

### **A.3. Research-Related Scholarly Activities and Non-traditional Funding**

This criterion is applied to individual research programs that are directly and negatively impacted by space reassignment, and not to entire departments. Each researcher wishing to be evaluated using this criterion must demonstrate that research space is required. Its purpose is to allow the evaluation of the research space needs of a principal investigator who is at or below \$100 DIR\$/NSF or at or below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile on IC\$/NSF as described in Sections A.1 and A.2 above. The evaluation is based on productivity as measured by non-traditional funding sources, such as research involving clinical trials or industry-sponsored research (ledger 2 funds), that were not subjected to conventional peer review such as an NIH study section. Other criteria that may be evaluated when considering laboratory research space reassignments are scholarly parameters such as patents and royalties, or the number and quality of current publications related to work performed in the research space under consideration.

## **B. Evaluation Procedure**

Evaluations will be conducted by a standing Research Space Review Committee (RSRC) appointed by the Dean with three members from the basic science departments, three members from the clinical science departments, a committee chairperson selected at large from the senior faculty, the Associate Dean for Finance and Administration (ex-officio, non-voting), the Associate Dean for Research (ex-officio, non-voting), and the Senior Planning Associate (ex-officio, non-voting). Department chairpersons are not eligible for membership. The RSRC chairperson will serve a term of two (2) years, is expected to alternate between the basic and clinical sciences, and is not eligible to serve continuous terms longer than two (2) consecutive years. The term for each committee member is three (3) continuous years, maximum. Appointments on the RSRC are staggered, so that there are no more than two or possibly three new members each year. The RSRC reports directly to the Dean and acts in an advisory capacity to the Dean.

### **B.1. Annual Analysis**

On an annual basis, the Senior Planning Associate will analyze the productivity of the research space for all principal investigators according to Criteria A.1. and A.2., and report the findings to the RSRC. The direct and indirect recoveries per net square foot of research space are calculated for principal investigators in every department. The chairperson of each department is given the opportunity to review their faculty space assignments and expenditure information prior to its communication to the RSRC to assure its accuracy. At this point the chairperson can report additional extramural sources of direct and indirect funds (non-ledger 3 funds) used by individual faculty for legitimate wet bench laboratory research projects. Internal funding, defined as funding from bridge grants, seed grants, residuals from clinical trials, startup packages, etc., is not to be included in the initial sorts reviewed by the RSRC (however, is recognized as potentially

important for considerations later in the review process). Fund 3 direct expenses or indirect costs that do not require wet bench laboratory research space, also should be identified and expenditure totals reduced appropriately.

In the case of multiple investigators funded from a single grant or contract, credit is distributed to each individual investigator based on information agreed upon by the co-investigators. The amount of funding attributed to each co-investigator is deducted from the principal investigator's portion of the grant. After receiving input from the chairpersons, two rank listings of faculty are created, one based on DIR\$/NSF and another based on IC\$/NSF. Faculty members above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for either DIR\$/NSF or IC\$/NSF, or at or below \$100 DIR\$/NSF or at or below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile for IC\$/NSF are identified. Faculty members who fall into these categories for two consecutive years are discussed in detail by the RSRC. Prior to RSRC discussions of these faculty members, the appropriate chairpersons are asked to provide any additional information relevant for consideration of research productivity (e.g., additional funding that requires wet bench lab space, recent grant submissions and scores, recent publications).

## **B.2. Recommendations Regarding Increased Space for Productive Principal Investigators**

Principal investigators who are identified as being in the top 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for \$/NSF of total direct or indirect support and who are identified as having too little space based on their research productivity are considered for increased space allocation. The RSRC makes recommendations to the Dean after conferring with the department chairperson and the principal investigator, and after determining whether an actual need for additional space exists. The decision of the Dean is final.

## **B.3. Reassignment of Principal Investigator Space and Description of the Appeals Process**

Research space assignments to principal investigators who are below the thresholds as defined in Section A for two consecutive years are further scrutinized by the RSRC.

**B.3.a.** The RSRC evaluates the principal investigator according to the criteria stated in Section A and meets with the principal investigator's chairperson. If the RSRC is satisfied with the explanation by the chairperson, then the Dean is informed of the RSRC's recommendation for retention of space. The decision of the Dean is final.

**B.3.b.** In the event that the RSRC finds that there are grounds for recommending reassignment of space, this recommendation is forwarded to the principal investigator and the chairperson. The principal investigator and chairperson may ask for a meeting with the RSRC within 30 days to appeal the decision and request retention of space. If this is done, then it is the responsibility of the principal investigator and chairperson to provide the RSRC with any new and relevant data to support the request. The RSRC will make a recommendation to

the Dean. Before space is reassigned to a principal investigator in another department, the chairperson is given the opportunity to make a case to the Dean for reassignment or retention of space within the department. The decision of the Dean is final.

**B.3.c.** The Dean may temporarily exempt a principal investigator from further review on the basis of institutional priorities, as discussed in C.1.

## **C. Exemptions from the Reallocation Process**

### **C.1. Institutional Priorities**

A principal investigator may be allowed to retain, temporarily, more space than permissible under Criteria A.1., A.2., and A.3. during a reasonable period of program development (a maximum of three years, but reviewed no less often than annually) if such retention is in accordance with the School's overall academic plans (see C.2.). For example, under-utilized space might provide the opportunity for a department to attract new leadership or to launch a new program. Therefore, departmental or School of Medicine plans for such new ventures are considered by the Dean before reallocation of space.

### **C.2. Special Circumstances**

The Dean may reassign or approve retention of space for an individual principal investigator or department under special circumstances.

Revised 03/06/06  
Revised 06/07/2010