NORDP Conference Roundtable Summary

With multiple roundtables happening concurrently, NORDP attendees have to choose, and may miss out on a topic that is of interest to them, as well.

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief review of the highlights of the oral presentation you're attending. Please answer the questions below and return this completed form to the Registration Desk at your convenience. NORDP bloggers will post your summary at nordpnews.org for all conference attendees to view.

Please don't worry about eloquence. The blog team will edit for grammar and brevity as needed. You may also keep it brief – a typical blog post is about 300 words. You may use the back of the page for your responses, as well.

Roundtable Title:	Limited Submissions
Facilitator:	Kimberly P. Littlefield, Ph.D.
Scribe	Kimberly P. Littlefield, Ph.D.
Participants:	Susan Dubbs, U. Oklahoma Kate Herron, Florida State University Marie Grubbs, NC State Marley Bruce, Columbia University Jackie Stein, Old Dominion University Karen Kiapoho, U Utah Jason Charland, U Maine Mindali Dean, Texas Tech University Sarah O'Brien, U Chicago Kim Littlefield, U South Alabama
Do you want author credit on the NORDP blog for this summary? Choose one:	YES, please include my name as author of the post.
Please provide a bullet list of 5 key take away points:	Discussion focused on three areas: **Process Management** **Tools/Resources** **Strategy** **Overview of participants:** Limited Submissions (LS) constitute no more than 20% individual effort and for most equate to $\leq$ 10 / yr (although the U Utah does ~ 100 LS / yr. **Process Management:** All participants have standardized a process at their institutions that includes a formal announcement of the LS opportunity and internal competition guidelines. Announcing the institutional nominee- ~8 weeks ahead of the sponsor deadline is optimal; this requires significant

preplanning/staging. Most institutions assemble ad-hoc, expertise – based reviewer panels as opposed utilizing reviewers appointed to a reviewer pool for a fixed term. 2-3 reviews is standard; applicants generally receive comments back but not numerical rank/score. In one case, initial selections of applicants is completed at the College / School level and presented to the VPR for final decision.

Tools / Resources: Most institutions utilize some resource for finding limited submission announcements (Pivot, SciVal, Grant Forward) and post opportunities to a LS website or target directly to individuals. Three institutions utilize InfoReady Competition to management the entire process.

Strategy: All participants agreed that managing LS is, for the most part, reactive, not proactive. In rare instances, such as annually repeated opportunities (NSF MRI, NIH S10) the competitions can be staged ahead of time. Most agreed that a significant challenge is LS awareness – most research administrators will catch the qualification, but many PIs won't and begin/complete applications without notice to the institution. Late announcements of institutional nominee have the potential to harm relationships between a VPR office and PIs and can be especially devastating if there are multiple applicants and an impending deadline. In most cases applicants not selected as the institutional nominee for a LS opportunity receive "special services" to assist in finding an opportunity for their idea. In most cases the institutional nominee, when time permits, receives "special services" to ensure the best, most competitive application is submitted.

There was some discussion about strategies, especially in regards to putting LS staging / review effort towards competitions/opportunities that do not fund F & A. Are the significant resources that go into managing the selection of an applicant balanced by the high profile nature of winning a LS award that does not fund F & A? Finally, the group briefly discussed what to do when there is a lack of applicants for LS opportunity – is it better to appoint a PI to submit an application?
Contact Mr. Marley Bruce at Columbia University to discuss a process for managing LS opportunities from foundations that may not fund F & A. The consensus was that reluctant PIs (appointed to submit an application) are unsuccessful most of the time at winning LS awards.

Are follow up steps planned?	No formal follow-up is planned but the contact info. for the group will be sent out to the group participants by the facilitator so that individuals may contact each other.