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3.5% decrease from FY2011

Externally Funded Research Expenditures

$I_{629.9M}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ithaca</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>WCMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>down 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sponsored Funding by Division - Constant $ (2013)
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Total Sponsored Funding - Constant $ (2013)
Distribution of Cornell Sponsored Research

- Medical Sciences: 40%
- Biology: 17%
- Multidisciplinary: 9%
- Agriculture: 8%
- Physics: 5%
- Comp Sci: 3%
- Chem: 2%
- Astronomy: 2%
- Mat'l Sci: 1%
- Mechanical Engineering: 1%
- Economics: 2%
- Other: 8%
Sponsored Research Funding by Source

- DHHS: 27%
- NSF: 16%
- Institution Funds: 18%
- Other Non-Fed: 1%
- Non-Profit: 1%
- State & Local Gov.: 8%
- Industry: 4%
- Foundations: 10%
- Other Fed & Fed App.: 2%
- AID: 1%
- NASA: 1%
- DOE: 3%
- USDA: 4%
- DOD: 4%
Research Expenditures by Major Area

Environmental sciences
Life sciences
Physical sciences
Psychology
Social sciences
Sciences, other
Engineering
All non-S&E fields

- All Institutions (Ave.)
- Cornell
Sponsored Research Funding by Source

Cornell #2 University in NSF Research funding – FY13
Sponsored Research Funding by Source

Cornell 26th in business funding of research—FY12
National Science Foundation Budget

Budget Authority in billions of constant FY 2013 dollars

Source: National Science Foundation budget requests. FY 2013 figures are latest estimates and FY 2014 figures are President’s request.
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$7.172 B omnibus bill
National Institutes of Health Budget
Budget authority in constant FY2013 dollars

$29.93 B omnibus bill
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Technology Transfer Metrics

CCTEC FY2013 Annual Report:

Comparison with peers – AUTM 2012 report

Ivy+, 12 institutions: (including Chicago, JHU, MIT, Stanford, Wash U.)

Licenses & options (per $1M RE): rank - 4

Disclosures (per $1M RE): rank - 4

Patents Issued (per $1M RE): rank - 3

License Income: ($9.6M): rank - 9 (65% not from running royalties)

Startups (7): rank - 6

First half FY14: similar pace as FY13 – perhaps a record year for revenue
Research Compliance

◆ Research portfolio is strong

◆ Recent successful audits of the Animal Program, the Biosafety Program and the Select Agent Program by the USDA, NYSDOH, NIH & APHIS

◆ Research Related Conflicts of Interest
  ◆ 100% compliance with Annual reporting
  ◆ 44 active management plans- mostly for faculty start ups

◆ Research Ethics Training
  ◆ Focus on prevention of Research Misconduct (plagiarism, data falsification and fabrication) and Authorship disputes
NSF Audit (FY08-FY11)

• Audit report issued in September 2013.
• We disagreed with many of the findings.
• In dispute is the auditors taking issue with costs specifically authorized in awards or expended consistently with our disclosed practices.
• The largest area of dispute is the direct charging of computers to sponsored awards.
• Currently working with the Cost Analysis and Audit Resolution branch of the NSF, to determine the allowability of the disputed items.
• Additional training of PIs and more (petty) record-keeping now necessary.
New “Uniform Guidance”

• OMB has issued “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards” replacing OMB Circulars A21, A110, and A133.

• Cornell, along with other research institutions, is evaluating the impact of the new requirements.

• Some of the new language will be good for Cornell.

• Other changes, such as more proscriptive procurement requirements, will increase administrative burden.
New “Uniform Guidance”

• Pluses:
  – Voluntary committed cost sharing is not expected in research proposals
  – Computers costing less than $5000 are clearly identified as allowable direct costs, to the extent they are essential to the research, and allocable.

• Minuses:
  – Requirement to provide cost information to demonstrate cost effective practices
  – Prescriptive methods of procurement – more burdensome