UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

Research & Innovation

Policy: Research Institutes — Purpose, Affiliated Faculty, and Credit Attribution

1. Executive Summary

This policy governs how UTEP's Research Institutes function under the Office of Research and Innovation (R&I), how faculty affiliate with them, and how credit for sponsored research is attributed and shared. The policy ties recognition, both intellectually and monetary, directly to documented effort. When an Institute leads a sponsored award, F&A recoveries are split 50% to the Institute, 30% to Named Investigators, 10% to home departments, and 10% to home colleges or school, each proportional to locked effort percentage recorded at submission.

Per this policy, faculty affiliation with an Institute is voluntary and does not affect tenure, promotion, or the primary employment relationship with a faculty member's home department. Submitting proposals through an Institute is appropriate when the Institute adds distinctive value: for example, it leads the project, it is the main organizing entity in response to a funding opportunity, it contributes unique infrastructure, or the work spans multiple colleges with no natural lead unit. The policy also establishes guidelines for intellectual property arising from institute-affiliated research and requires transparent annual reporting of all F&A distributions.

2. Purpose and Scope

The University of Texas at El Paso houses Research Institutes within the Office of Research & Innovation (R&I) to advance interdisciplinary, externally funded research that cuts across colleges and disciplines. This policy defines how those Institutes operate, how faculty engage with them, how credit for research contributions is determined and shared, and how intellectual property arising from Institute-affiliated work is managed.

The policy applies to the Institutes administratively housed within R&I. The policy applies to current and future R&I administered institutes and to faculty across all UTEP colleges and departments who are affiliated with the R&I institutes.

3. Role of R&I Research Institutes

3.1 Defining Characteristics

R&I Research Institutes are cross-cutting, multi-college entities built on the combined strengths of UTEP faculty across departments and colleges. These institutes are not academic departments, they hold no instructional mission, and no faculty member's tenure home resides within them. What distinguishes an R&I Institute is its capacity to:

- Draw affiliated faculty from across UTEP, assembling expertise and capabilities that no single college could sustain independently.
- Pursue major externally funded, applied, and translational research at disciplinary intersections, aligned with national priorities, regional needs, and UTEP's strengths and strategic directions.
- Provide shared infrastructure that lowers barriers for individual investigators, e.g., - administrative support, compliance resources, external partner networks, high-performance computing, and collaboration spaces.
- Serve as the university's bridge to government agencies, industry, and community partners who seek interdisciplinary solutions.

3.2 Complementary, Not Competitive

R&I Institutes exist, in part, to strengthen UTEP's colleges/school, departments, and centers, not to compete with them. Institutes build on the research strengths of faculty housed in colleges/schools and create opportunities that those units could not independently access and/or compete for. An Institute should not pursue sponsored programs that duplicate the strategic scope of an existing college or center without explicit coordination with the relevant academic unit. In practice, this means:

- Institutes convene and coordinate; colleges and departments produce and deliver scholarship.
- Institutes create value by integrating expertise across disciplines, opening doors to external partnerships, and providing shared infrastructure and translational capacity.
- Institutes contribute specialized grant-seeking expertise through the experience of Institute leadership and through Regents Research Excellence Program (RREP) faculty hires affiliated with the Institute, whose research profiles and national networks strengthen the competitiveness of interdisciplinary proposals.

4. Affiliated Faculty: Definition, Roles, and Benefits

4.1 Definition

Affiliated Faculty are UTEP faculty members whose primary appointment resides in a department within a college or school, and who have formally aligned a portion of their research, with an R&I Research Institute. Affiliation is voluntary but formal. It does not transfer a faculty member's employment, tenure, promotion review, or primary administrative relationship away from their home unit.

Upon request, Institute leadership may provide affiliated faculty with a formal written account of their contributions to Institute research activities, including proposals developed, awards secured, partnerships established, and students supported through the Institute - for use as supporting evidence in annual performance evaluations and promotion and tenure reviews. Such documentation reflects the Institute's perspective on the faculty member's contributions and complements but does not replace the evaluation conducted by the home department and college.

4.2 Roles

Affiliated Faculty contribute meaningfully to the Institute's mission across research, student development, external engagement, and responsible conduct. Core responsibilities of an institute’s affiliated faculty mimic those expected of UTEP’s tenured and tenure-track faculty, in the context of the research institute. Affiliated faculty are expected to contribute to institutes in some of the forms described in Table 1.

Table 1. Affiliated Faculty Responsibilities

Responsibility	Description
Strategic Alignment	Align related work with the Institute's mission and focus areas. Represent the Institute professionally in academic, government, industry, and community contexts when participating in Institute-sponsored activities.
Scholarly Contribution	Maintain an active research agenda relevant to the Institute's scope and contribute to interdisciplinary collaboration across UTEP and with external partners.
Proposal Development	Lead and participate in Institute-led sponsored proposals.
Student Development	Advance the research talent pipeline through mentorship, graduate and undergraduate research supervision, and connections to Institute-affiliated projects, internships, and partner opportunities.
Community Participation	Participate in Institute meetings, working groups, and programmatic activities. Provide input on priorities, program design, and partnership development.

Compliance & Stewardship	Adhere to all applicable UTEP and sponsor policies on research integrity, conflicts of interest, IRB, export controls, cybersecurity, data governance, and intellectual property. Escalate risks to Institute leadership promptly.
Reporting	Provide annual activity updates to the Institute covering proposals submitted and awarded, publications, students trained, partner engagements, and technology transfer activities.

4.3 Benefits of Affiliation

Affiliated faculty receive the following benefits from their Research Institutes:

- Access to Institute-curated funding intelligence, including targeted alerts on federal, state, and private opportunities aligned with Institute focus areas.
- Proposal development support, including idea and narrative development, reviews, budget preparation, compliance review, and letters of institutional support for external submissions.
- Priority consideration for Institute-specific seed funding and pilot project support.
- Access to shared research infrastructure, e.g., high-performance computing, laboratory and collaboration spaces, research support staff, and advanced computing facilities and support.
- Introductions to Institute industry and government partners for research collaborations and sponsored engagements.
- Visibility through Institute communications, faculty profiles, and public-facing materials.
- Access to Institute-sponsored professional development, including skills training, research methods workshops, and leadership programs.

4.4 Affiliation Process

The following process governs how faculty affiliations are established, maintained, and terminated:

1. Institute leadership identifies faculty whose work aligns with Institute priorities and extends a formal written invitation, copied to the relevant Department Chair and College Dean.
2. Faculty may self-nominate by submitting a brief statement of interest (500 words maximum) and a current CV, followed by a meeting with Institute leadership.
3. Prior to granting, renewing, or terminating an affiliation, Institute leadership consults with the home Department Chair and College Dean, allowing a reasonable period for any concerns to be raised.
4. Affiliations are granted for two-year terms, renewable based on continued alignment and active engagement.

5. Proposal Submission: Routing and Coordination

5.1 Why Submit through an Institute

The default submission path for most UTEP faculty is through their home department and college. That default reflects the fact that most sponsored research is disciplinary in nature, the faculty member's tenure and professional identity reside in their home unit, and colleges or school carry the primary responsibility for supporting faculty research activities by providing facilities, management, and budget oversight.

Submitting through an R&I Research Institute is appropriate, and in some cases necessary, when the Institute adds value that the home department or college cannot provide on its own. The following table provides illustrative examples of scenarios where submitting through an institute is likely the logical choice. These scenarios are not meant to be exhaustive, nor do they create an obligation to submit through an Institute. Instead, they are intended as guidance to help faculty and Institute leadership identify situations where Institute submission is a reasonable and well-warranted option

Table 2. Sample Scenarios Where Submission Through an R&I Research Institute May be Appropriate

Condition	Description
Institute Leadership as Project Lead	The Institute's Executive Director or another member of the Institute’s leadership serves as the lead (e.g., Principal Investigator, Director). In this case, the Institute is the administrative home of the award, the lead's primary professional affiliation

	with the Institute is the basis of the project, and submission through a college or school would misrepresent the organizational relationship.
Multidisciplinary Proposals Spanning Multiple Colleges and or Disciplines	The proposal requires sustained intellectual contributions from faculty across two or more colleges/schools, and no single college or can credibly serve as the lead without marginalizing the others. Routing through the Institute provides a neutral, cross-cutting administrative home that reflects the collaborative structure of the project and avoids creating an artificial hierarchy among participating units.
Opportunity Originated Through the Institute	The funding opportunity was identified, developed, or brokered by the Institute through its partner network, government relationships, industry contacts, or strategic intelligence activities. When the Institute is the source of the opportunity and has invested effort in cultivating it, Institute submission is appropriate regardless of which faculty member ultimately serves as the lead.
The Institute Contributes a Significant and Distinctive Capability	The Institute brings something material to the proposal that the participating colleges do not independently possess, for example, unique laboratory or testing facilities, high-performance computing infrastructure and allocations, established data-sharing agreements with government or industry partners, existing regulatory approvals, specialized administrative capacity for large or complex awards, or seed funding. When that Institute-held capability is central to the technical approach, submission through the Institute reflects where the core enabling resource resides.

An R&I Institute may still be acknowledged as a collaborating unit and may still receive F&A credit for documented contributions (see Appendix A for future consideration of that mechanism). These scenarios are not mutually exclusive. Many Institute-led proposals will satisfy more than one; for example, a multidisciplinary AI health proposal that originated through an AAII industry partnership and leverages AAII's HPC infrastructure satisfies conditions 2, 3, and 4 simultaneously. The presence of any one scenario may provide a reasonable basis for submission through the institute, though the final decision remains with the PI in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

5.2 Collaboration Without Institute-Led Submission

It is important to note that this proposed policy ***does not require*** a faculty member, department, or center to submit through an Institute simply because Institute personnel are involved in a proposal. Faculty and centers may include Institute leadership, research faculty, or other Institute-affiliated personnel as named contributors on proposals submitted through their home college or department, under the standard submission and F&A distribution model that applies to that unit. In such cases, the participating Institute personnel's effort and compensation are budgeted as with any other collaborating investigator. The decision of whether to submit through an Institute or through the home college or department rests with the PI, guided by the scenarios in Table 2, and should not be presumed based solely on Institute involvement.

5.3 The Submission Decision

The organizational unit through which a sponsored proposal is submitted determines the administrative home of the resulting award, governs which unit receives F&A distributions (more on this later in the document), and establishes the reporting relationship for the project. All proposals are submitted through UTEP's Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). The routing guide below governs routing decisions for proposals that involve affiliated faculty and R&I Research Institutes.

Note: This is a guide only, and ultimately PIs have the final decision to submit through an Institute or home department.

Table 3. Proposal Submission Routing Guide

Scenario	Recommended Submission Route
Institute leadership (e.g., Executive Director) serves as PI, or the opportunity originated through the Institute's network or partnerships	Submit through the Institute (R&I). Affiliated faculty serve as Co-PI or Senior Personnel. College(s) and department(s) receive F&A credit per Section 5.
Proposal is multidisciplinary, spanning two or more colleges with no clear lead unit, or the Institute contributes a significant and distinctive capability central to the technical approach	Submit through the Institute (R&I). Route is confirmed jointly by the Institute Director and relevant Dean(s) in writing before submission to OSP.
Sponsor or funding opportunity specifically requires a cross-cutting entity or Institute as the lead applicant	Submit through the Institute. Documentation of the sponsor requirement is retained in the proposal file at OSP.

6. Credit Attribution: Intellectual and Financial

Credit attribution is the operational core of this policy. It determines whether the faculty members who conceive, develop, and execute sponsored research receive meaningful recognition, both intellectual and financial, within their home departments and colleges. It determines whether the colleges and departments that house, mentor, and support those faculty see a tangible return on their investment. Credit attribution also determines whether R&I Research Institutes retain the resources necessary to maintain the infrastructure, external partnerships, and proposal development capacity that enable interdisciplinary research at scale.

The framework in this section is grounded in proportionality where credit follows contribution. Faculty who commit their expertise and effort to Institute-affiliated work should see that contribution reflected in their professional record and their discretionary research resources. Departments and colleges that develop research talent and provide the environments in which scholarship is produced should see that reflected in their financial returns. Institutes that invest in identifying opportunities, cultivating external relationships, and reducing barriers to faculty participation should be able to sustain and expand those capabilities over time. The sections that follow establish the mechanisms through which these outcomes are achieved consistently, transparently, and in proportion to documented effort.

6.1 Intellectual Credit

The principles below govern how intellectual credit is attributed across all forms of scholarly output arising from Institute-affiliated research, including authorship, inventorship, research metrics, and institutional reporting. In all cases, attribution reflects actual, documented contribution.

- Faculty retain authorship credit affiliated with their home unit and acknowledge Institute affiliation when the Institute made a meaningful contribution to the work through resources, convening, partner development, infrastructure, or co-development.
- Dual attribution, listing both home college/department and Institute affiliation, is encouraged and consistent with professional norms for institute-affiliated scholars.
- Institute Directors do not claim or report research outputs of affiliated faculty as Institute productivity unless the Institute makes a substantive, documented contribution to that specific work.
- The Vice President for Research & Innovation develops annual reporting templates that capture affiliated faculty contributions to Institute activity separately from home-unit reporting to prevent double-counting in institutional research metrics.

6.2 Financial Credit: F&A (Indirect Cost) Distribution

The distribution of Facilities and Administrative (F&A) cost recoveries from Institute-affiliated sponsored awards is the primary mechanism for sharing financial credit across contributing units. The framework below governs **F&A distribution for awards submitted through an R&I Research Institute** as the Lead Administrative Unit.

Standard F&A Distribution — Institute-Led Awards

When an R&I Research Institute is the Lead Administrative Unit for a sponsored award, realized F&A recoveries are distributed as follows:

Table 4. Standard F&A Distribution — Institute-Led Awards

Recipient	F&A Share	Rationale and Permitted Uses
Institute (R&I)	**50%**	Sustains Institute core operations, shared infrastructure, compliance systems, proposal development support, and strategic bridge funding. This share is fixed regardless of the number of Named Investigators or participating units.
Named Investigator(s) (PI, Co-PI, Senior Personnel)	**30%**	Allocated to discretionary research accounts of all Named Investigators to support seed funding, next-proposal development, research travel, equipment maintenance, and other activities that advance the research program. Each investigator receives a share proportional to their effort as documented at submission (see Section 5.2.2).
Department(s)	**10%**	Allocated to home department(s) of contributing investigators to support research administration, shared instrumentation, bridge funding, and departmental research capacity. Apportioned in proportion to investigator effort (see Section 5.2.2).
College(s)	**10%**	Distributed to home college(s) of contributing investigators to support faculty development and college-level research infrastructure. Apportioned in proportion to investigator effort (see Section 5.2.2).

The named investigator share is the highest of the non-Institute shares because the faculty members who conceive, develop, and execute an award — whether as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel — should receive the most direct benefit.

Effort-Proportional Distribution — Named Investigators and Locked Effort Percentages

For the purposes of this policy, "Named Investigator" includes all individuals formally listed on the proposal as Principal Investigator (PI), Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI), or Senior Personnel. These roles are treated equivalently in the F&A distribution framework and there is no distinction in return rate between a PI, a Co-PI, and a Senior Personnel member. Each receives a proportional share of the 30% investigator pool, the 10% department pool, and the 10% college pool based on their documented effort.

The Institute's 50% share is fixed and is not effort weighted. The remaining 50% - investigator, department, and college shares — flows to each Named Investigator in direct proportion to their percent effort as recorded on the Proposal Routing and Credit Attribution Form at the time of proposal submission. Those effort percentages are locked at submission and do not change regardless of post-award scope adjustments, personnel changes, or no-cost extensions. Effort locking is necessary to preserve predictability and fairness across units. Post-award effort changes affect project management and salary charging, but do not retroactively alter institutional credit attribution. The formula for each Named Investigator is:

- Investigators' return = Investigator's % Effort × 30% of total F&A recovered
- Department's return = Investigator's % Effort × 10% of total F&A recovered → credited to the investigator's home department
- College's return = Investigator's % Effort × 10% of total F&A recovered → credited to the investigator's home college

Where a Named Investigator holds appointments in more than one department or college, their share is credited to the unit designated as their primary home on the Proposal Routing Form. Changes to this designation require written agreement between the relevant units, filed with OSP before submission.

Illustrating Example

Scenario: An award submitted through AAII generates $100,000 in total F&A recovery. Three Named Investigators are listed at submission: a PI from Computer Science / Engineering (60% effort), a Co-PI from Physics / Science (30% effort), and a Senior Personnel member from Chemistry / Science (10% effort). These effort percentages are locked at the time of OSP submission.

Table 5. Illustrating Example: F&A Recovery Distribution ($100,000 of F&A)

Recipient	Effort	Investigator Return (30%)	Dept. Return (10%)	College Return (10%)
PI — CS / Engineering	60%	0.60 × $30,000 = $18,000	0.60 × $10,000 = $6,000 (CS Dept.)	0.60 × $10,000 = $6,000 (Engineering)
Co-PI — Physics / Science	30%	0.30 × $30,000 = $9,000	0.30 × $10,000 = $3,000 (Physics Dept.)	0.30 × $10,000 = $3,000 (Science)
Sr. Personnel — Chemistry / Science	10%	0.10 × $30,000 = $3,000	0.10 × $10,000 = $1,000 (Chem. Dept.)	0.10 × $10,000 = $1,000 (Science)
Institute (AAII / R&I)	—	Fixed 50% share = $50,000 (not effort-weighted)		
Total: $50,000 (Institute) + $30,000 (Investigators) + $10,000 (Depts) + $10,000 (Colleges) = $100,000 ✓				

Permissible Uses of Distributed F&A Funds

F&A funds distributed under this policy support the research enterprise and may be used for:

- Faculty research incentives, professional development, and retention.
- Graduate student and postdoctoral fellow support.
- Research-related equipment, software, datasets, and materials.
- Cost-sharing or matching on strategic research proposals.
- Bridge funding to sustain research continuity between awards.
- Research-related travel and dissemination.

F&A funds distributed under this policy may not be used for instructional purposes, administrative overhead unrelated to research, or any purpose inconsistent with UTEP's sponsored programs cost principles.

6.3 Proportionality and Documentation

Consistent application of the credit-sharing framework requires documentation completed prior to proposal submission. All proposals involving R&I Research Institutes require:

- A completed Proposal Routing and Credit Attribution Form developed by OSP specifying the submission route, each Named Investigator's role (PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel), their percent effort, and the resulting F&A distribution amounts per unit. Effort percentages recorded on this form are binding and may not be revised after OSP submission.
- Written acknowledgment from the Institute Director and the relevant Dean(s) confirming the credit agreement before OSP submission.
- For proposals with multiple Named Investigators, a complete contribution table listing all PI, Co-PI, and Senior Personnel participants, their home department and college, and their locked effort percentages, confirming that efforts sum to 100%.

OSP retains these records. Distributions are based on actual realized F&A revenues and reconciled annually.

6.4 Dispute Resolution

Disputes over credit attribution or F&A distribution that the Institute Director and relevant Dean(s) cannot resolve are escalated to the Vice President for Research & Innovation, whose determination is final. The Vice

President resolves escalated disputes within fifteen (15) business days and files a written record of the resolution with OSP.

The most effective way to prevent disputes is a documented conversation between Institute leadership and college Deans at the proposal development stage. Institute Directors and Deans are expected to communicate early and collaboratively.

7. Intellectual Property

Governing Framework. Institute-affiliated research is subject to UTEP's IP Policy and UTS Rule 90101. This section adds Institute-specific guidance only and does not supersede existing University policy.

Ownership. The UT System Board of Regents owns IP created by affiliated faculty using University or Institute resources. Two Institute-specific points apply: 1) affiliated faculty must disclose IP arising from Institute-affiliated work to OTC promptly, and 2) the Institute's contribution (seed funding, infrastructure, partner introductions) is noted in the disclosure and considered by OTC in its commercialization strategy.

Revenue Sharing from Commercialized IP. Revenue from licensed IP follows UTEP's standard sharing policy. Two Institute-specific points apply:

1) Where the Institute provided seed funding or direct support, OTC and the VP for Research & Innovation will recognize that contribution within the existing revenue-sharing structure.
2) Faculty inventors retain their standard inventor share under UTEP's IP policy, unaffected by Institute affiliation. Contact OTC early when a potentially protectable invention arises.

Sponsor Obligations and IP Agreements. Industry-sponsored projects may include IP provisions (e.g., publication delays, background IP licenses). Two requirements apply:

- Any sponsored research agreement, contract, or industry partnership with IP terms is reviewed and executed by OSP and OTC before the project begins. Affiliated faculty do not independently execute agreements with IP implications.
- The Institute ensures that IP provisions in Institute-facilitated partner agreements are consistent with UTEP policy and do not unreasonably restrict affiliated faculty's ability to publish, train students, or pursue independent follow-on research.

Startups and Entrepreneurial Activity. Affiliated Faculty are encouraged to pursue startups and entrepreneurial activity arising from Institute-affiliated research. The Institute connects faculty with UTEP's entrepreneurship ecosystem and regional networks. Any equity, consulting, or sponsored research relationships involving a startup that has licensed UTEP IP must be disclosed through UTEP's conflict of interest process.

8. Additional Policy Provisions

8.1 Institute Sustainability and Internal Seed Funding

A portion of the F&A returned to the Institute shall provide internal seed grants and bridge funding that help affiliated faculty develop competitive external proposals. Institutes shall publish annual seed funding guidelines that are reviewed by a standing institute committee with cross-college representation to all affiliated faculty on a competitive basis. Seed funding decisions are documented and reported to the Vice President for Research & Innovation annually.

8.2 Faculty Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Review

Institute affiliation does not negatively affect a faculty member's tenure, promotion, or annual performance review within their home unit. Deans and Chairs are encouraged to recognize Institute-affiliated activities, such as proposals developed, partnerships established, and external visibility gained as evidence of scholarly activity and service where appropriate. The credit attribution framework in Section 5.1 ensures that home-unit metrics capture the faculty member's contributions regardless of Institute involvement.

8.3 Avoiding Credit Inflation and Double-Counting

UTEP is committed to accurate and defensible research metrics. R&I Institutes and colleges shall not report the same grant, publication, or student as their exclusive output when the work involved meaningful contributions from multiple units. The Vice President for Research & Innovation, working with the Provost's Office, shall develop annual reporting guidelines that allow appropriate shared credit in unit-level portfolios without inflating totals at the institutional level.

8.4 Transparency and Annual Reporting

The Office of Research & Innovation shall publish an annual report covering:

- F&A distributions made to Institutes, colleges, departments, and Named Investigators during the prior fiscal year.
- Active Institute-affiliated awards, including submission route and participating units.
- Institute seed funding awards and reported outcomes.
- Number and college distribution of affiliated faculty.
- IP disclosures and technology transfer activities arising from Institute-affiliated research.

This report shall be shared with the Deans' Council, and the Department Chairs Council.

8.5 Policy Review

This policy is reviewed every three (3) years by a working group convened by the Vice President for Research & Innovation with representation from Institute Directors, Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty. The review assesses whether the credit-sharing and IP frameworks are working as intended, identifies provisions that need adjustment, and determines whether new circumstances, such as the establishment of additional Institutes, require policy expansion.

9. Glossary of Key Terms

Table 6. Glossary of Key Terms

Affiliated Faculty	A UTEP faculty member who has formally aligned a portion of their scholarly activities with an R&I Research Institute while retaining their primary appointment in a college or department.
Credit Attribution	The formal recognition, both intellectual (authorship, metrics) and financial (F&A distribution), assigned to organizational units and individuals based on their documented contributions to a sponsored research activity.
F&A / Indirect Costs	Facilities and Administrative costs recovered from sponsored awards, reimbursing the University for shared infrastructure costs that cannot be assigned as direct project expenses.
Institute Director	The senior academic and administrative leader of an R&I Research Institute, responsible for strategy, operations, external partnerships, and affiliated faculty relationships.
Intellectual Property (IP)	Inventions, discoveries, software, data, creative works, and other protectable outputs arising from research activities, governed by UTEP's IP Policy and applicable law.
Lead Administrative Unit	The organizational unit through which a sponsored proposal is formally submitted and through which the resulting award is administered, determining the primary F&A distribution structure.
Named Investigator	Any individual formally listed on a proposal as PI, Co-PI, or Senior Personnel, all treated equivalently in the F&A distribution framework.
Office of Technology Commercialization (OTC)	The UTEP office responsible for IP disclosure, patent prosecution, licensing, and startup support.
Proposal Routing Form	A form completed by the PI and approved by relevant unit leaders prior to OSP submission, documenting the submission route, participating units, locked effort percentages, and agreed F&A distribution.

R&I	Office of Research & Innovation — the administrative home of cross-cutting Research Institutes at UTEP.
Seed Funding	Internal Institute-administered funds, sourced from F&A recoveries, supporting early-stage research, proposal development, and bridge funding for affiliated faculty.
Sponsored Program	Externally funded research, public service, or scholarly activity governed by a formal agreement with a sponsor, including grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

APPROVAL AND SIGNATURES

Vice President for Research & Innovation ________________________ Date: ________________________	*Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs* ________________________ Date: ________________________

This policy becomes effective upon approval by both signatories above.

APPENDIX A

Future Policy Consideration: F&A Credit for Institute Support of College-Led Research

Status: Not currently proposed. Presented for future deliberation.

Background and Rationale

The current policy addresses F&A distribution for awards where an R&I Institute is the Lead Administrative Unit. It does not address whether an Institute should receive F&A credit from awards led by a faculty member's home college or department, even when the Institute provided meaningful support to that proposal.

As Institutes mature and their services become more systematically valuable, seed funding, partner introductions, proposal development, and infrastructure access, a reasonable case can be made that a modest F&A share from college-led awards could appropriately compensate documented Institute investment. Several peer institutions have adopted similar provisions within their F&A distribution frameworks.

This appendix captures that concept for the policy review working group to consider. No action is required at this time.

Proposed Framework (For Future Discussion)

If adopted, the following principles should govern any Institute share of F&A from college-led awards:

- A minimum documented contribution threshold must be met before an Institute is eligible for any F&A share from a college-led award. Eligibility is not automatic.
- Qualifying contributions include: direct Institute seed funding used in support of the proposal or award; Institute-facilitated partner introductions material to award success; sustained Institute staff effort on proposal development beyond routine assistance; or Institute infrastructure that constitutes a substantial portion of the project's capability.
- The Institute's share from college-led awards should be modest, a suggested range of 5–15% of the college's F&A recovery, to preserve the principle that the college and Named Investigators are the primary drivers and beneficiaries of college-led research.
- Any Institute share from a college-led award is agreed upon in writing by the relevant Dean and Institute Director before proposal submission to OSP, with documentation filed in the routing record.
- Disputes over whether the threshold is met follow the same escalation process described in Section 5.4.

Recommended Next Steps

At the next policy review (within three years of adoption), the working group should:

- Survey affiliated faculty and Deans on the frequency and nature of Institute contributions to college-led proposals.
- Assess whether the current one-directional F&A flow has created unintended disincentives for Institute investment in faculty proposal development.
- Consult peer institutions that have implemented bidirectional F&A sharing to understand implementation challenges and outcomes.
- If adoption is recommended, develop specific threshold criteria and contribution documentation requirements before any implementation.