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Terms of Reference

On February 18, 2015, the University Senate’s task force on research funding engaged BESAR to conduct surveys of the faculty and academic administration regarding the types and amounts of funding available for research at the University of North Dakota. The task force wanted the surveys to explore several key questions:

1. How much research funding is available from the various units of the University?
2. What kinds of funding, for what activities, are accessible to the faculty? Does this differ across departments?
3. To what extent is funding equitable and easily accessible for faculty across different departments?
4. Are existing funds adequate for the professional needs of faculty?

Methods

BESAR created three separate surveys that would collect information specific to the major academic levels of the University. One survey was sent to all faculty, one to department chairs, and one to deans. The surveys and all answer options were created only by faculty and BESAR graduate assistants.

The dean’s survey comprised one demographic question—college name. A second question asked what college-level resources were available for research, including grants and contracts assistance, writing and editing assistance, faculty committee on research with a budget to distribute, travel and research assistance for graduate students, technology specialist(s) onsite, dean’s discretionary funds for research, statistical or research design assistance, and/or other. Depending on answers to this question, the deans would be asked for approximate dollar amounts available. The maximum number of questions possible was five.

The chair’s survey was similar, with demographics for college and department. The second question asked for the same availabilities of research resources at the departmental level.
Also like the dean’s survey, some selections would have followup questions presented. Chairs also were asked to rate and comment on the availability of startup funds for new hires. In total, the maximum number of items a chair could encounter was seven.

The faculty survey took a largely different approach, focusing on travel funding. College and department demographics were collected. Faculty were then asked how many professional conferences they went to, how many they would prefer to go to, the amount they typically get from UND for travel, and the amount they tend to pay out of pocket each year. Open ended questions were presented to ascertain obstacles to faculty research and to ask for possible solutions.

Responses

Links to the surveys were sent by Senate leadership on April 10, 2015, with a deadline of April 17 given to respondents. A reminder E-mail was sent April 20 giving 24-hour notice of survey closure. All three surveys were closed to new participation on Tuesday, April 21. As is frequently observed, the reminder E-mail netted nearly 100 more participants in the faculty survey.

No dean fully responded to the dean’s survey in the first round. BESAR’s interim director and the Senate task force met with the deans on April 29, presenting the faculty and chairs results and asking for their feedback on how to get information from the colleges. Based on their feedback, BESAR graduate assistants directly contacted each College’s financial officers (or other person appointed by the specific dean) in May and June. By the deadline, all colleges except Nursing & Professional Disciplines responded to the survey.

Forty of about 65 department chairs responded to the chair survey. This represents a response of more than 60%, but BESAR believes that all departments need to have data represented in order to fully answer the Senate’s questions about consistency and equity. The trimmed mean for time required to fill out the survey was 3 minutes, with the mode at 2 minutes.

The faculty responded well, with 297 responses. That’s a response rate of about 33%, which we consider adequate overall representation. All colleges were represented. The trimmed mean for time required to take the survey was 5 minutes, with the mode at 3 minutes.

Results

Deans Survey

Chairs were asked to check off the research support services their colleges provided. Their responses can be seen in the table below.
All of the responding colleges, as might be expected, have funds for research that are at the dean’s discretion. The most common service provided to faculty is grants and contracts assistance (7 colleges). The least common is statistical and research design assistance, with only Education and Human Development providing this, and only in a limited capacity. Four colleges have faculty committees that have budgets to distribute, likely meaning that most research funding decisions are made by administration.

Across the colleges, faculty and students have extremely disparate access to funding from their colleges. As the tables below indicate, the Dean of Medicine and Health Sciences awarded $462,000 last year, whereas the Dean of Education and Human Development had a budget of $10,000. Funding specifically budgeted—not awarded—for student research varied from nothing (three colleges) to $150,000 (Medicine & Health Sciences).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Grants &amp; Contracts Assistance</th>
<th>Writing and editing assistance</th>
<th>Faculty committee on research with a budget</th>
<th>Travel &amp; research assistance for graduate students</th>
<th>Technology specialist(s) onsite</th>
<th>Dean’s discretionary funds for research</th>
<th>Statistical or research design assistance</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Sciences</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Public Administration</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Mines</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Health Sciences</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Professional Disciplines</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across the colleges, faculty and students have extremely disparate access to funding from their colleges. As the tables below indicate, the Dean of Medicine and Health Sciences awarded $462,000 last year, whereas the Dean of Education and Human Development had a budget of $10,000. Funding specifically budgeted—not awarded—for student research varied from nothing (three colleges) to $150,000 (Medicine & Health Sciences).
Chair Survey

Chairs were asked to check off the research support services they provided at the department level. There responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grants and contracts assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Writing and editing assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty committee on research with a budget to distribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Travel and research assistance specifically for graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Departmental technology specialist(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chair's discretionary funds for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statistical or research design assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The broadest availability of support at the departmental level, much as at the college level, is in terms of funding, both for faculty research and graduate student support. Still, fewer than half of the departments surveyed have these. Support mentioned in “other” included travel funds, professional development funds, and alumni funds. It is unclear whether other chairs lumped those sources into the other answer items.

Of the five departments with faculty committees that could distribute funds, four disclosed the amount of funds available, ranging widely from $500 to $10,000.

Of the 11 departments in which chairs had discretionary funds for research funding, 10 reported the amount. These range from $0 (clearly meaning the choice should not have been ticked on the survey) to $12,000. Removing the zero response, the average was $7500, but this shows a tremendous variance, with the standard deviation being $3840.

Only one department had both faculty-distributed and chair-distributed funds.

Thirteen departments answered that they had travel and research assistance for graduate students, but only 10 provided specific amounts. The average amount was $9325. Here again, though, the variance is tremendous, with a range from $250 to $72,000, making a standard deviation of nearly $21,000. It is possible that the department claiming $72,000 was erroneously including waivers or stipends, though, so I urge caution in interpreting this number.

The final set of questions for chairs concerned startup funding for new hires. We asked them to rate the amounts available, the ease of accessing funds, and the expectations that are attached (submitting grants, getting publications, giving talks, and so on). Their overall reactions are in the following charts:
Generally the chairs rate the amounts and ease of access as bad; 74% said the *amounts* were poor to bad and 50% thought ease of access was poor to bad. They have a much more positive appraisal of the requirements that are placed on startup funds. Not one chair answered “very good” for any of the dimensions of startup funds.

The open-ended question on start-up funding presents a view that startup funding could be inequitably distributed at the University. For example, a sample of respondents said

- “Social Sciences seems to rarely get such funds”
- “Start up funds are rare in the arts and usually not offered, however would be very beneficial to new faculty.”
- “none for us!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!…!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
And a slashed library budget!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!”
- “Monies tend not to be available to support social science faculty.”
- “Scholarly activity in our field does not use consumables, nor specialized high-cost equipment. It mostly requires time and interaction with other specialists. New faculty need reduced teaching/service loads to have sufficient time for scholarly activity. They also need easy access funds to get to conferences and workshops.”

Two chairs lauded the availability of EPSCOR funds, which they felt was the only thing keeping them competitive for the best candidates. Some of the chairs seemed to have “limited knowledge” of where startup funds could be found; this is a potentially damaging situation for the early careers of those faculty being hired into such departments.

### Faculty Survey

The main thrust of the faculty survey was determining the amount of money faculty get from UND, the amount they generally pay from their own personal funds, and the number of conferences they actually go to and how many they would attend with more funding. It is worth remembering that nearly all of the disciplines on campus, though to varying degrees, expect faculty to attend and present at conferences as part of evaluation, promotion, and tenure.
Conferences are also primary ways for higher education faculty to gain professional development, get feedback on their research, connect with collaborators, stay current in their fields, advance their reputations, recruit students and new faculty, serve their fields, and fulfill some external funding obligations for dissemination of findings. It is not a perk of academia but a necessary means of best fulfilling the institution's mission.

Quantitative Responses

The responding faculty were active in going to conferences. The following table shows the number generally attended annually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major mistake in the survey, not realized until it was launched, was failing to include “zero” as a choice for both conferences attended and conferences faculty would attend. Thus, the answer “1” should be read with caution because it might have been chosen by those who would otherwise answer “zero.” It is likely, though, that many faculty would also choose “1.” Regardless, 56% of the respondents say that they go to more than one conference per year.

To ascertain whether funding were holding respondents back from attending more conferences, we asked in the survey how many more conferences they would attend if there was more funding available. This table shows the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here again, even with the lack of zero as an option, 65% responded that they would go to more than one extra conference with the availability of more funds, so a small minority would have chosen zero, especially given that some of the remaining 35% would likely have chosen “one.”

The Senate task force wanted to know how much faculty actually receive to travel to conferences. Travel funding that 260 answering faculty report getting annually from UND sources totals $366,480. The average faculty member receives $1409 from UND sources each year. A wide variation exists generally (with a range of $0 to $13,000) and patterns are evident between Colleges (see Appendix A).

The sampled faculty, on average, pay a good amount of money out of pocket to attend professional conferences. The variance is once again tremendous, with a range of out-of-pocket expenses from $0 to $7500. Overall, the 259 faculty who answered this question reported spending a combined total of $309,760 (only slightly less than UND gives). That makes an average of $1195 each faculty member, each year. If the survey comprises a representative sample, then faculty at UND are spending nearly $1 million each year out of their own pockets for conference travel.

Faculty were asked about the kinds of expenses for which their college or department would pay. For the overall faculty, the following table shows the percent of faculty who have particular expenses covered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional memberships</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conference registration fees</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Attending conference for paper or poster presentation</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attending a conference without presenting</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Convening of journal editors or directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leadership training</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continuing education credit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Publication costs for proceedings</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naturally, for many disciplines some of these categories are not applicable. For example, not all faculty pay publication costs or require continuing education credits. Some faculty reported in the “other” category that they received a certain dollar amount and could use it as they saw fit, while others had discipline-specific costs (art exhibitions, for example) that were covered. Nevertheless, the preceding table shows that a number of types of cost, many of which are requirements of faculty evaluation, tenure, and promotion, are frequently paid out-of-pocket by faculty.

Faculty were provided with a list of possible research resources and asked to select the ones they thought they would actually use, if available. The following table shows the results:
More than half the faculty believe they would use grants and contracts assistance, a one-stop service for internal funding, and assistance for graduate students. Large numbers would use the others. Faculty also wrote in suggestions in the “other” category, which included publication fees (x 3), help with typing (x 2), help creating graphics, release time, graduate assistants, bioinformatics, and mentoring. We would note that some of the suggestions under “other” are already available on campus, so making sure that faculty are aware of support options remains a vital mission.

Qualitative, Open-Ended Answers

A significant amount of qualitative data was obtained from the open-ended questions about barriers to research and ideas faculty have for improving research. More focused analysis could be done, but some preliminary themes show that faculty have concerns and that they have good ideas for helping improve research at the University.

**Barriers to Research.** To the right is a simple code frequency table that shows how often particular themes were mentioned by respondents. I would caution readers not to take the leap that the number of times a theme arose has anything to do with its importance; some very insightful comments were said only once or twice. Also see Appendix B for some preliminary theme clusterings based on possible responsibility areas for fixing the issue; these clusters contain all codes generated.

The two major concerns were time and funding. Time was often related to concerns about job responsibilities, usually teaching, but also noting heavy service and administrative loads. Funding was overwhelmingly related to travel, but a significant number of codes involved purchasing basic equipment, software, and data sets. A notable number of respondents expressed concerns about being able to access participants for their research, such as through a standing research pool.
Faculty also expressed concerns about lacking types of research infrastructure, like grant assistance, statistical support, editorial assistance, and tech support. A lack of research space and storage was mentioned frequently. Administrative policies were noted as a barriers in a number of instances, including difficulties with accounting, the IRB, and the Office of Instructional Development. Several faculty mentioned that the administration was not doing enough to advocate for and encourage research, including not having articulated a clear vision of research for the university, the public, and legislators.

There were also, finally, numerous comments about feelings that the university’s priorities excluded many. Respondents from the arts, humanities, and social sciences seem to feel alienated, under-appreciated, and without funding opportunities comparable to others. Many of these scholars noted that release time for writing was a great need that was largely overlooked as a research support.

Ideas for Addressing Barriers. To the right is a code frequency table for themes mentioned by faculty respondents when sharing their ideas for fixing the barriers to their research. Again, no correlation should be inferred between frequency and importance. One immediate observation is that the themes were more plentiful (107) and therefore individual ideas were not mentioned as often.

Coding was done largely on statements that involved ideas for fixes that are external to the individuals themselves. In the spirit of North Dakotan self-reliance, many respondents put onus upon themselves to change and improve. While everyone could improve their practices, I did not code these because the task force was looking for programmatic or systemic change possibilities. I also coded six instances in which faculty seemed “resigned” to nothing being able to change.

To organize the ideas generated, I clustered the codes into rough groups that suggest the areas of responsibility for the ideas. These include (a) administrative changes, (b) culture, (c) suggestions for funding/staffing sources, (d) hiring/personnel issues, (e) new or improved support services, (f) priorities, (g) saving time and effort, (h) small fixes, and (i) suggestions for where to invest funding. All ideas (codes) within these groups are listed in Appendix C. Please note that I allowed ideas to be part of more than one group.

I would urge the task force to pay special heed to faculty ideas. While many are quite general (e.g., “more funding”) some are quite clever, easily implemented, and relatively low cost. At the same time, the committee will note
that many of the faculty’s suggestions require careful thought, long-term commitment, open and honest communication, and serious efforts at compromising between conflicting priorities and disciplinary differences. Looking at this data closely, I have the general sense that there is deep frustration with research infrastructure at the University of North Dakota. This very vital part of the University’s mission should be addressed promptly to ensure the continuance of our economic, cultural, social, and humanitarian impact.

The Bureau of Educational Services and Applied Research (BESAR), a unit within UND’s College of Education and Human Development, has a mission to provide state-of-the-art research design, collection, analysis, and reporting services to the education and human development organizations of North Dakota, so that they can make decisions that best meet the needs of the citizens they serve. We also assist in training the next generation of the state’s researchers through students’ supervised research for clients.
Appendix A: Faculty Travel Funding from UND, by College
Appendix B: Code Groups for Barriers to Research Reported by Faculty

Support Infrastructure
- editorial assistance
- access to participants
- grant support & management
- general lack of support
- Lack of statistical support
- library assistance
- research space
- personnel
- tech support

Administration & Access
- inefficiency
- systems
- policies
- reimbursement processes
- restrictions on money usage
- having to go to multiple places for funding
- IRB
- accounting practices

Faculty role pressures
- Equipment expenses
- research funding
- bringing in speakers/experts
- computer
- animal costs
- funding
- data sets and stats software
- software
- preliminary data
- travel funding
- Library resources
- Summer research compensation
- vehicle expense

Institutional priorities
- lack of institutional support for experiments
- arts, performances not valued or funded
- Clinical faculty not supported for research
- feel unappreciated
- focus on new research rather than continuing
- humanities not funded
- Research is not rewarded
- incentive

Location-related?
- Cost of travel from Grand Forks
- finding/working with collaborators
- lack of a clearly articulated vision of UND as a research university

Limited time
- administrative tasks/service
- competitive funding environment
- lab management
- lack of knowledge about getting funding
- unfilled faculty positions
- having to pay for research/travel out of pocket

Low funding
- lack of a departmental Ph.D. program
- lack of clinicians with research experience
- start up funding
## Appendix C: Code Groups for Ideas for Addressing Barriers

### Groups: List of Code Groups and their Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Group</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Changes</strong></td>
<td>Reduce administrative bloat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strict measures of accountability for the administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communicate with faculty about funds availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change the leadership at G&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find more space/build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public relations effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration should invest in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a real faculty conversation about priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stop hiring so many consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparency in how funds are spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VPR should fund raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replace the current administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger IRB membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate better with legislature about research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stop expanding the administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Culture**                 | talk to each department to see what they need in terms of research   |
|                             | strict measures of accountability for the administrators              |
|                             | communicate with faculty about funds availability                    |
|                             | More incentives/punishments                                           |
|                             | Improve internal understanding of international collaboration         |
|                             | Have a real faculty conversation about priorities                     |
|                             | mentor                                                                |
|                             | transparency in how funds are spent                                   |
|                             | resigned                                                              |
|                             | change priorities                                                     |
|                             | mentor students to apply for their own funding                       |
|                             | Create a dedicate research time each week                             |
|                             | mentoring program for researchers (like Alice Clarke)                 |

| **Funding/staffing sources**| Reduce administrative bloat                                        |
|                           | Foundation should contribute more                                    |
|                           | Utilizing more students in writing and preparing publications.       |
|                           | Stop taxing those with funding to support those without.             |
- dedicate more of the Provost's budget to research
- stop hiring so many consultants
- VPR should fund raise
- Apply for national training grants
- stop expanding the administration
- Reallocation money from non-academic parts of University
- reduce money for new buildings
- Get community volunteers

### Hiring/Personell Issues
- Get community volunteers
- stop hiring so many consultants
- hire research development staff
- Make GRA and waiver decisions based on data
- hire tech support
- higher salaries for support staff
- more teaching assistants
- increase in faculty lines
- stop expanding the administration
- hire better faculty
- improve evaluation and training of staff
- hire more instructors
- recruitment of graduate students

### New or Improved Support Services
- hire tech support
- improve evaluation and training of staff
- Larger IRB membership
- editing assistance
- more support for qualitative research
- statistical/research design support
- need to have an electronics technician available for departments in the College of Arts and Sciences
- SSAC funding increases for inflation
- support structures for Engineering distance program
- talk to each department to see what they need in terms of research
- improve grants & contracts support
- training on grants administration
- transfer seed money to Senate committee
- transparency in how funds are spent
- hire research development staff
- mentoring program for researchers (like Alice Clarke)
- develop participant pools
- mentor
- outreach/industry relations help
- mentor students to apply for their own funding
- assign reference librarian to each college
- college grant management
- Train research office better
- single place to get funding

### Priorities

- talk to each department to see what they need in terms of research
- large classes should "count" more
- more international research
- allow non-tenure track research leaves
- Administration should invest in research
- give more support to those going to high-impact conferences
- grant fund for arts & humanities
- change priorities
- Support junior faculty research
- funds for non-tenure track faculty
- Fund writing time
- allow buying out teaching
- Reallocate money from non-academic parts of University
- Fund all, not just sciences

### Saving time or effort/efficiencies

- large classes should "count" more
- reduce activities reporting/paperwork
- Utilizing more students in writing and preparing publications,
- applications for funding should be streamlined
- make committee service meaningful
- reduce teaching loads
- flexible teaching schedules
- reduce service
- Create a dedicate research time each week
- eliminate post-tenure evaluations
- Eliminate SOAR
Small Fixes

- applications for funding should be streamlined
- Reduced rate or free parking for research participants,
- Larger IRB membership
- increase time for funds usage

Where to put funds

- provide course release for accomplishments
- subsidize flights to MSP to reduce costs
- semester releases to seek funding
- fund publication costs
- GRA stipends and waivers
- funding for travel
- increase research funding
- need to have an electronics technician available for departments in the College of Arts and Sciences
- hire tech support
- increase in faculty lines
- obtain journals
- Support junior faculty research
- Fund all, not just sciences
- higher salaries for support staff
- mentoring program for researchers (like Alice Clarke)
- Put more money into research infrastructure
- funding for software
- Create pool of small project funds
- dedicate more of the Provost’s budget to research
- fund grad students for travel/special training
- Funding
- more teaching assistants
- funds for non-tenure track faculty
- Find more space/build
- Reallocate money from non-academic parts of University
- Summer research grants
- allow non-tenure track research leaves
- increase seed grant funding
- Increase my salary
- summer graduate assistance
- grant fund for arts & humanities