



RUTGERS POLICY

Section: 10.1.13

Section Title: Academic Matters

Policy Name: Federal Directed Funding ("Earmarking")

Formerly Book: n/a

Approval Authority: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Responsible Executive: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Responsible Office: Office of Federal Relations and the Office of Academic Affairs

Originally Issued: September 14, 2005 (posted online March 21, 2006); 9/22/2009 (Updated titles)

Revisions: n/a

Errors or changes? fedrel@rutgers.edu

1. Policy Statement

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey supports scientific peer-review as the primary and preferred mechanism for allocating federal research support. However, in a small number of exceptional cases, the university will undertake efforts to secure directed funding ("earmarks") from Congress, particularly for compelling projects that fall outside the purview of peer-reviewed sources.

2. Reason for Policy

The policy has been established to provide an approval mechanism for those interested in seeking such funding and, importantly, a clear understanding of the university's earmarking procedure for our elected leaders in Congress.

3. Who Should Read This Policy

- Chancellors and vice presidents
- Deans, directors, chairs, and department heads
- University administrators
- All faculty

4. Related Documents

[Federal Directed Funding Proposal Form](#)

University Policy on Lobbying (currently in development)

5. Contacts

Office of Federal Relations: 202-220-1336 or <http://federalrelations.rutgers.edu>

Office of Academic Affairs 732-932-7821

6. Policy

10.1.13 FEDERAL DIRECTED FUNDING (“EARMARKING”) POLICY

I. Proposals for Directed Funding (“Earmarks”)

A. Overview

This policy describes the criteria and process for selection of proposals for the university’s federal directed funding initiatives, which are based on university priorities, the interests of our legislators, and university experience with federal directed funding.

B. Conditions for Consideration

The following conditions will be taken into account in selection of proposals to be submitted by the university for directed funding and to help assure their success:

1. The university will not seek directed (earmark) funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institute for Health (NIH), or other federal programs that support only competitive, peer-reviewed projects.
2. Principal investigators submitting requests for directed funding support must be able to demonstrate that all possible competitive options of support – both public and private – have been explored.
3. Projects should have a compelling state or national interest, and advance the strategic interests of the university, college, department or center.
4. Projects should have support or interest of the federal agency from whose budget the funding would be sought and should fit within the mission of the target program at that agency.

C. Approval Process

Requests for directed funding under university auspices require prior approval and authorization by the university. The following process is the approval mechanism for those interested in seeking such funding.

1. Chancellors, deans, and directors will receive a memorandum from the executive vice president for academic affairs each year requesting summaries of any projects in their unit for which their faculty would like to seek earmarked funding in the following federal fiscal year. Summaries must be submitted on project request forms to ensure that each request is reviewed using a consistent format, and that information required by our legislators for their evaluation has been provided.
2. Unit heads will be asked for their comments on and prioritization of projects submitted from their units.
3. Completed [project request forms](#) must be received by the executive vice president for academic affairs by November 15th. Review of the proposals and decisions regarding the university’s federal earmark priorities for the upcoming federal fiscal year will be made by January 15, and applicants notified of the decisions shortly thereafter.

These deadlines have been set to provide sufficient time for deans and directors to solicit responses from principal investigators in their unit, and to provide opportunity for soliciting additional information or consultation on the proposals, as necessary. They

also take into account the increasingly irregular time frame in which Congress makes decisions on current year appropriations (often much later than the start of the new federal fiscal year on October 1), and the congressional deadline for earmark requests for the following year (generally March 1).

4. Final decisions concerning the university's federal earmark priorities will be made by the president and executive vice president for academic affairs, in consultation with the director of the Office of Federal Relations.

II. Role of the Rutgers Office of Federal Relations

It should be noted that the federal earmarking process is quite uncertain. As more academic institutions seek earmarks in often shrinking budgets for supportive agencies, funding becomes increasingly competitive. The Rutgers Office of Federal Relations represents the university to our delegation and federal agencies and organizations, helps shepherd our proposals through the funding process, and continues to advocate aggressively in Washington for increases in merit-based federal programs to more generally support research, research facilities, and instrumentation.