Listening Session Notes

### E1: How can the Office of Research help expand and support excellence in scholarship?

**Group 2**
- Eliminate silos, isolation, fragmentation
- Interdisciplinary scholarships
- Make multi-campus proposals easier
- Corporate collaborations
- Resource exploitations-medical center
- Support faculty and staff more broadly
- Language institute, retention
- Tech transfer more available and understandable

**Group 3**
- Revisit: does scholarship = funding? No, but...
- Be proactive in searching out RFPs; not enough notice;
- Targeted funding NOT by filter
- UTSI: promote faculty engagement; i.e., join ListServs; need to be more inclusive: revamp ListServs
- Provide more seed money
- Reinvestment
- Topic of control over F&A
- Professional development awards
- Provide competitive graduate research scholarships/stipends

**Group 4**
- Publishing in high-impact inter-disciplinary journals (Science, Nature Journals, PNAS, etc.) often necessitates a different approach to manuscript preparation compared to discipline specific journals.
- The Office of Research could provide mentoring opportunities for faculty with aspirations of publishing in these journals by paring them with faculty members who already have had success in this area.

**Group 5**
- Expand Quest
- Promote the Scholar of the week in different ways beyond Quest
- National Recognition of Faculty - Continue and provide additional support

**Group 6**
- OR and Graduate School could develop a training program that will help grad students and post-docs conduct research projects and scholarly activities.
- OR or colleges could provide additional proposal development resources to reduce the time PIs must devote to administrative issues. For example, it would be advantageous to have a POC to help PIs understand and navigate the IP process.

**Group 7**
- Seek outside funds to support
- Better educate faculty about the role of the Office of Research (i.e., support related to grant writing, funding resources)
- Increase networking nationally

**Group 8**
- Mentorship programs for junior faculty members
- Editorial support across the spectrum – grants to manuscripts. With increasing numbers of international professional staff (including faculty) this becomes a more pressing need.
- Identification of collaborative opportunities that expand and enrich individual scholarship efforts (this was a recurring theme with discussion including the OR research capacity catalog and potential new faculty database software – see E3)
- Identify research strengths and build to these – core facilities/equipment, faculty hires, etc.

**Group 9**
- Enhance Mentoring
- Staff cross-training
- Communicate expectations to faculty of strategic plan

### Listening Session 2

**Group 1**
- Using seed money from UTRF and UTK, fund research with commercial applications
- Seed money – if none, why not?
- Centers relying on 100% soft money hard pressed to release resources for other grant possibilities; resources from one grant cannot be used to solicit funds from another grant.
- Management of Centers – Reasonable fiscal policy must provide enough F&A to finance the continuing efforts in seeking further funding.
- Humanities – Alan Rutenberg is the “go to” person for funding in humanities. Alan identifies funding opportunities for faculty and actively seeks them out and supports them through the process. Need contact/support person for social sciences.
- Workshops tailored to humanities and social sciences faculty must be created and faculty strongly encouraged to seek opportunities as this activity is not “in the culture” of these faculty members.
- Formalized coaching on Fulbright is required. Requested on line examples of proposal components.
- New faculty at a loss for understanding Office of Research support mechanisms available to them.
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Group 2
• OR to facilitate communication to form Interdisciplinary teams
• Center scale proposals – bigger grants expands excellence
• Support expanding the graduate student pool
• Stipend
• Fellowship program (internal to University). Example: CIRE program
• OR to provide assistance with Infrastructure. Takes too long for facilities to provide installations, etc.
• Mentoring for faculty and graduate student

Group 3
• Increase the funding, personnel, lab space, and compliance support
• Encourage and allow faculty to be experts in their discipline and not expect them to be Project Managers on Grant Proposals; the management duties of a proposal should fall to the Office of Research and/or increases in staff in research administration imbedded within the Colleges/Departments.
• Undergraduate and graduate student research experience is very important; make lab time related to coursework more experiential and incorporate it in a learning continuum. Provide more corporate/agency partnerships for undergraduate research opportunities. Student research does make faculty more successful.
• Provide more group presentations and outreach to the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Fine Arts faculty about how the Office of Research can be of assistance to them.
• Department Heads need training on how to manage information and facilitate communication with faculty members across the board.
• Technology is a key in capitalizing on collaboration. Need to capitalize on SciVal, Scopus, Experts etc.
• Collaborative teaching across disciplines is important and can provide a basis for research collaboration. Office of Research should encourage circumstances for multidisciplinary activity in both teaching and research
• Faculty members should be evaluated on the basis of the number, novelty, and complexity of proposals submitted, so as to track both (grants funded and not funded). Even unsuccessful proposals are opportunities to nurture future efforts, and such efforts should be recognized.

Group 4 Not addressed.

Group 5 Not addressed.

Group 6
• Strategy: Outreach to Faculty
• Does the Office of Research offer help with research methodology?
• Ideas: mentors, online examples of successful proposals
• Training sessions – positive feedback regarding BootCamps
• OR Action Item: be more deliberate in having sessions to help faculty polish proposal writing skills (“more is better”)
• OR provide seed money to “free up” faculty to pursue scholarship (research, writing a book, etc.)
• Administrative support for proposal submission/mechanics
• Provide support in learning and navigating various electronic proposal and award systems
• Disparity – some colleges have full-time proposal help while some do not (A&S large number of faculty!)
• OR Action Item: engage entire campus... have “floater” proposal development person on hand for one-on-one faculty interactions, even for smaller grants
• Would this be better located at the college or centralized (OR)?
• Coordinate who is already employed on campus to do proposal development

Group 7
• Most opportunities to develop scholarship focused at individual level. Chancellor’s Awards and Professional Development Awards given to individuals, not to teams. At individual level are a very limited number of opportunities for faculty release time to develop significantly new ideas and to write big proposals—only a few such opportunities are available each year. Could OR create more opportunities in this area?
• A lot of important research is still being done by individuals, not transdisciplinary research teams. Do we want that to be lost? Make sure that people who have good ideas are still supported and submitting proposals, regardless of the new focus on big, transdisciplinary research projects. Also continues to be the problem that Centers—our best mechanisms for providing individual and collaborative grant support—are forced to be in competition with Departments and other Centers, because of IRIS accounting issues. If Professor A runs a grant through ISSE, then his/her department doesn’t get any credit for that. This is separate and apart from fights over F&A returns.
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• KEY POINT #1: We need a liaison between OIT and OR. OIT doesn’t have a good understanding of research needs / don’t offer sufficient qualitative & quantitative software, training, reporting, and individual consulting. Need OIT people who want to be part of research teams, not 10-minute problem consultants. Most in OIT have MAs; we need PhD level staff who are more experienced in statistics and other fields than the faculty they are supposed to be helping—expert consultants in core competencies who understand needs across the research spectrum (statistician core, GIS core, qualitative research core, etc.). OIT is “pay for it,” but quality help in these areas has to be purchased elsewhere. This service exists in OIT but needs to be in OR to meet research needs. OR has the expertise to know what support is needed, but reporting grew out of OIT because it was software-related, which was not the best solution. Useful resources related to these issues are also housed in the Library. Can OR pursue a network of OR/OIT/Library resources to more effectively address these needs?

Listening Session 3

Group 2
• Eliminate silos, isolation, fragmentation
• Interdisciplinary scholarships
• Make multi-campus proposals easier
• Corporate collaborations
• Resource exploitations-medical center
• Support faculty and staff more broadly
• Language institute, retention
• Tech transfer more available and understandable

Group 3
• Revisit: does scholarship = funding? No, but...
• Be proactive in searching out RFPs; not enough notice;
• Targeted funding NOT by filter
• UTSl: promote faculty engagement; i.e., join ListServs; need to be more inclusive: revamp ListServs
• Provide more seed money
• Reinvestment
• Topic of control over F&A
• Professional development awards
• Provide competitive graduate research scholarships/stipends

Group 4
• Publishing in high-impact inter-disciplinary journals (Science, Nature Journals, PNAS, etc.) often necessitates a different approach to manuscript preparation compared to discipline specific journals. The Office of Research could provide mentoring opportunities for faculty with aspirations of publishing in these journals by paring them with faculty members who already have had success in this area.

Group 5
• Expand Quest
• Promote the Scholar of the week in different ways beyond Quest
• National Recognition of Faculty - Continue and provide additional support

Group 6
• OR and Graduate School could develop a training program that will help grad students and post-docs conduct research projects and scholarly activities.
• OR or colleges could provide additional proposal development resources to reduce the time PIs must devote to administrative issues. For example, it would be advantageous to have a POC to help PIs understand and navigate the IP process.

Group 7
• Seek outside funds to support
• Better educate faculty about the role of the Office of Research (i.e., support related to grant writing, funding resources)
• Increase networking nationally

Group 8
• Mentorship programs for junior faculty members
• Editorial support across the spectrum – grants to manuscripts. With increasing numbers of international professional staff (including faculty) this becomes a more pressing need.
• Identification of collaborative opportunities that expand and enrich individual scholarship efforts (this was a recurring theme with discussion including the OR research capacity catalog and potential new faculty database software – see E3)
• Identify research strengths and build to these – core facilities/equipment, faculty hires, etc.

Group 9
• Enhance Mentoring
• Staff cross-training
• Communication of expectations to faculty of strategic plan
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**E2: How can the O.R. help expand and support corporate & foundation R&D?**

**Listening Session 1**

**Group 2**
- Expand corporate and foundations relations
- Think and act like a business (cannot contract like a state government-red tape, slow)
- Increase awareness of opportunities
- OR and Development work closer together
- Community engagement and outreach
- Service to the community, use retired faculty
- K-12 expansion

**Group 3**
- Align faculty research interests, then take profile to Foundations/Corporations
- Create a model/central message from UT
- Travel to agencies; invite them here
- Office of Research provide corporate/foundation people a tuned portfolio/message of UT capabilities
- Engagement: UTRF coordinated with OR, Office of Development & other campus organizations
- Model NARCO (Marc Gibson)
- UTSI-DoD model of successful partnerships (UTRF)
- “Tie” relationships at executive level (key partners)

**Group 4**
- Host “speed-dating” events attended by potential corporate sponsors and research faculty. Advantage is that less than obvious matches may be made, in addition to those likely to occur through conventional faculty-sponsor matchmaking.
- Special effort to infuse students into these projects; those students may be more likely to promote future corporate-sponsored research opportunities for UT as they progress through their corporate careers.

**Group 5**
- Enhance ability to match faculty research interest with opportunities
- Assist faculty to transition from Federal to Corporation and Foundation Funding
- Develop local database to identify industry and academic shared interest

**Group 6:** Not addressed

**Group 7**
- Seek standard templates re. university contracts
- Better communication/coordination between UTK internal and UTRF
- Separate initiatives – a. Corporate  b. Foundation

**Listening Session 2**

**Group 8**
- Ensure that all interested and relevant faculty members are notified and provided an opportunity to interact/meet with representatives from these entities when they visit campus. May require more directed communications
- Expand the OR team(s) to better address opportunities
- Increase interactions between research sponsored programs development groups and individual unit development teams across the UT system, starting on Knoxville campus. Each campus and some individual units have development offices – increasing communication/interactions between these offices and the offices of research could help identify new opportunities to bring research-oriented funds to UT
- Streamline contract review/approval timeline – a business model approach as necessary to attract and retain corporate research investment

**Group 9**
- Already identified as needing improvement
- Enhance Communication
- Work more closely with UT Development office
- Staffing issues
- Better coordination with Oak Ridge, UTRF, UTK

**Group 1**
- We have people engaged with corporations and they are responsible for the relationship.
- OR should be tracking faculty-corporate teams
- Faculty contact opportunities with corporations need to be broadly disseminated well in advance so that calendars may be adjusted.

**Group 2**
- Streamline process for grants and contracts with corporations and foundations
- Contracts take longer to negotiate to the detriment of the research
- Proposals have different requirements, process is different
- OT staff to receive training to handle Corp contracts, they are used to handling federal contracts and grants.
- Provide a template to faculty of the problem items on corporate contracts. This way when faculty is working with corporations they can provide a heads up to them.
- OR staff to provide a realistic timeline of how long it takes to negotiate a corporate contract.
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Group 3
• Partner with other universities on proposals
• Foundation and Corporation Fair – somewhat like a career fair – and invite representatives in to set up a booth and talk with faculty members as they stop by.
• Target visits of corporate / foundation representatives with major opportunities that are being pursued.
• Need more personal connections which can be supported by having more staff to work in Foundation/Corporation Engagement and Federal Agency Engagement.
• Identify more opportunities from foundations can be supported by having more staff for opportunity mining, or deepen the relationship with those in Development who are already working on this idea.
• Better interaction between Research and Development.
• Receiving Funding Opportunities via email is important, but not enough. Need more interpersonal “boots on the ground” face-time where staff members deal one-on-one with faculty members who wish to pursue new or different opportunities for which they do not have prior experience. Staff members consult, investigate, and discuss results with individual faculty members.
• Invite Corporate/Foundations representative to campus more often, weekly if possible.

Group 4
• The interface with the UT Foundation can be frustrating. (Accounting system and silo system are barriers.
• Consider a faculty display of research, similar to EURECA for undergraduate researchers. This will let faculty share research interests. Corporate and foundation leaders can be invited to a special event with the presenters at this symposium, which would be a good addition to Research Week each spring.

Group 5  Not addressed.

Group 6
• Positive feedback regarding coordination by Susan Ballentine to local small business
• How to find an RFP that fits research/groups?
• Has OR historically ignored informing faculty about SBIR/STTR-type grant RFPs?
• OR should provide more insight on the “corporate partnership continuum”
• Finding the right fit can mean funding of a research center, funding of a faculty member, strengthen state and federal relationships
• Companies NEED OUR GRADUATES (hiring)

Group 7
KEY POINT #2: IP issues. Corporations want to own all intellectual property, even if it hasn’t been developed yet. If UTK holds all IP rights, companies are disincentivized to participate in research projects with us. Can OR facilitate the loosening of restrictions on IP sharing? Perhaps internal funding pool for certain ideas with intention of sharing IP rights on those projects? Some universities have negotiated with their states to give up IP to attract companies, jobs, tax revenue, etc. but the state has to agree. Could OR play a role here?

Listening Session 3

Group 1
• Corporate and Foundation Development streamlined
• Help formalize long term cooperation
• Synergize disciplines to get research dollars from corporations
• Connect researches with consortiums and R&D research
• Make databases for corporations and foundations with keyword enable search available

Group 2
• Hire more people that are already good at developing corporate partnerships and senior enough to already have useful contact networks.
• Utilize alumni organization more
• Involve Research Foundation more

Group 4
• Make colleges aware of corporate and foundation opportunities.
• Dept. heads “make it clear” basic department functions still need to be done; less value placed on transdisciplinary efforts
• OR is the correct place for database of outreach and transdisciplinary research, minority programs, etc.
• Would like to see more corporate / foundation visits to campus RE: funding opportunities
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**E3: How can the Office of Research help expand and support “Big Idea” large strategic initiatives?**

**Listening Session 1**

**Group 2**
- Expand and support “Big Idea”
- Know what our resources are
- Breaking down silos—“speed dating”
- Big idea Developer – skills, opportunities, top down and bottom up
- Build on student’s ideas also
- System-wide sharing of what we are doing and can do
- Focus groups – continual

**Group 3**
- Spot strategic initiatives early /assemble faculty groups
- What are the big national opportunities?
- Talk to key partners; listen to feedback
- Can we find “faculty gurus” for general areas?
- Use aggressive leaders to gather teams

**Group 4**
- Support for cluster hire research areas; should be selected on a competitive basis (different research areas able to make case for a cluster hire) driven by bottom up by advocacy that includes department heads, deans, and faculty engaged in transdisciplinary research (not from Chancellor down).

**Group 5**
- Help facilitate team building
- Early identification of opportunities
- Infrastructure support: OR take lead in facilitating large projects. Example related to cost sharing. When going after large projects cost sharing and/or institutional support will be required. PIs spend too much time going to other departments/centers asking for funding. OR take the lead in doing this; PIs spend too much time on this task and takes away from science.

**Group 6**
- OR could consider leveraging ORU funds to encourage “big idea” and/or trans-disciplinary research projects.
- OR could sponsor a workshop(s) on how to do “big idea” research projects, perhaps with presentations by PIs who have been successful and discussion of resources and support available to PIs who undertake such projects.
- OR could consider designating a “Big Ideas Coordinator” to track annual or limited submissions, alert DHs/faculty well in advance, facilitate teaming and brainstorming meetings, and coordinate the internal competition process for limited submissions.

**Listening Session 2**

**Group 7**
- Roundtables (topic-specific, event-oriented)
- Develop PI reward/benefit beyond initiative
- Develop incentives (annual reviews, P&T)

**Group 8**
- When these are initiated at an administrative level make sure that relevant faculty members are well informed and actively engaged in development of the program

**Group 9**
- Timing is of the essence….need adequate time and resources to put together these complex integrated proposals
- Better define objectives
- Trans-disciplinary approaches are essential
- Better presence in DC to be better informed of things that will happen
- Support and incentives to run multi-disciplinary programs
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Group 2 (Cont.)
• Develop and bring research leaders together for ongoing ideas and come up with more strategic plans. Planning ahead and getting ahead of the solicitations to allow for more time to put proposals together.
• Announcement opportunities come too late and not in sufficient time to put interdisciplinary teams together and go after them.

Group 3
• Interdisciplinary faculty hires. New hires; need to focus on interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary hires, and “don’t hire what you just lost”. VCR can act as an advocate for this type of hiring in the Chancellor’s cabinet.
• Thoughtful use of ORU process.
• Better use of Science Alliance funds to support big ideas as related to ORNL.
• Continue efforts on big ideas. Office of Research needs to communicate efforts and talents of faculty members
• Encourage faculty to sustain grant-writing efforts even in the face of failure

Group 4
• Infrastructure support: (requires $, people; underestimated, yet critical) need exists for user-friendly, education, outreach, expertise statistical support; no core, central facility exists Different perspective: “a shared service is no service.”
• Ask: What suffers with shared service? (tends to be the fundamental, serious, critical areas)
• OR could be facilitator of opportunities / faculty teams
• When working on ideas, developing proposals, etc., encourage consideration of other participants, i.e., legal, intellectual property. As ideas arise, faculty may need help identifying resources and exploring opportunities. May just not know where to go; may simply need liaison or portal for information.
• OR could identify and communicate high-growth areas.

Group 5
Not addressed

Group 6
• Strategy: Start CENTRAL, start EARLY
• Start centrally because faculty do better with “bubbling up” focused research
• Knowledge of what lies ahead – forecast national funding prospects
• Need two years advance thinking – this shows need it at the VCR level
• Form a “think tank” group (besides the Associate Deans of Research) with transdisciplinary makeup (senior faculty and GCs, etc.) – run like a retreat

Listening Session 3

Group 1
• Get “Core Facilities” up and running and make capability known to the campus community
• Enhance and revisit forms of communication to faculty
  o Repeat message regularly
  o Hard copy newsletters appreciated
  o More information in research newsletters
• Meet with new department heads individually and review Office of Research services and capabilities

Group 7
• One key problem is potential leaders are too busy to take on more big projects. We are at critical mass. Need a discussion about how overworked faculty members are and what can be taken away from them so they can do more research. Exmp: faculty advising students. 42% of faculty time spent on administrative issues, not scholarship. We need a support system that frees faculty from the administrative burden.
• University-funded (not research-funded) GRA positions: Is this a possibility? Faculty need assistance from graduate students to do research. Most of UT’s university funded (as opposed to some grant funded) graduate assistants are not hired for research but for teaching or supervision. University-funded GRAs would provide faculty with some of the research and writing support needed to develop proposals for big projects, especially big, interdisciplinary projects.
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**E4: How can the O.R. help expand and support trans-disciplinary scholarship?**

### Listening Session 1

**Group 2**
- Expand and support trans-disciplinary scholarship
- Avoid stagnation - re-compete centers (get centers to focus on big ideas - look at what funding is coming - trans-disciplinary)

**Group 3**
- Old model of hiring faculty does not equal trans-disciplinary focus!
- Still “department-based” hires and rewards
- Use Governor’s Chair model of hiring/cross-department hires

**Group 4**
- Change internal culture of F&A / credit / control between departments, colleges, centers and campuses (these can be barriers to collaboration). Example: tentative campus-level efforts to solve F&A distributions issues for Center proposals have been made, but conversations with Deans and Department Heads indicate that this only partially removes barriers for center-led proposals. Additional VCR-level leadership is needed to better understand and articulate the issues and propose solutions that remove barriers.

**Group 5**
- Provide faculty boundary spanning support for transdisciplinary projects.
- There is concern as to which department or college will take the lead, which also ties into F&A distribution.
- Example: Standard F&A split procedure

**Group 6**
- OR could consider leveraging ORU funds to encourage “big idea” and/or trans-disciplinary research projects.

**Group 7**
- Work with the Provost to facilitate transdisciplinary relationships among deans and department heads

**Group 8**
- Increase interactions and exchange of information System wide between research offices and faculty
- System-wide research symposium
- Improve the research capacity catalog (RCC) – accuracy and quality of content; this effort would need to be at the unit/dept level and somehow incentivized
- RCC could be significantly supplemented (or replaced by) pending purchase of a faculty database software package with imbedded/associated analysis capacity to make linkages and identify collaborative opportunities (within and beyond UTK)
- UT President put out an edict to increase scholarly interactions across the UT system – knock down silos

### Listening Session 2

**Group 1** -- Not addressed.
- Group not aware of the Research Capacity Catalog
- Requested P&MS abstracts be connected with the Research Capacity Catalog

**Group 2**
- Need system where faculty can search what other faculty at UT are working on. RCC was mentioned but the group was aware of it. OR should ensure that faculty is aware of the resources available.
- Provide workshops on interdisciplinary projects and how to go after them; what the needs are; how to form a team and get funded; how to communicate across disciplinary boundaries for research.
- OR should have a good working relationship with research leaders on campus; example, governor’s chairs, distinguished scientists. Invite research leaders to a round table discussion, we can learn from them and their expertise.
- Help create a scholarly culture that encourages interdisciplinary research including supporting initiatives that encourages units to consider interdisciplinary research for promotion and tenure, and incentivizing interdisciplinary work in other ways.

**Group 3**
- Hire trans-disciplinary faculty. VCR can act as an advocate for this hiring in the Chancellor’s cabinet.
- Points listed in E3 also apply to E4.

**Group 4**
- OR could facilitate identification of opportunities, resources, outreach, strategy.
- OR (or others) should reach out and touch faculty re. infrastructure, technical expertise, opportunities ... and eliminate barriers. (OR should at least facilitate the process.)
- Enable faculty to apply for course release to develop projects.
- Develop targeted program for program development with seed money for transdisciplinary projects.
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Listening Session 3

Group 1
Not addressed – answered in E5 and E6

Group 2
See comments for R6.

Group 3
- Assign credit for publishing multidisciplinary work (e.g., getting credit for publishing in another discipline’s journals).

Group 4
- OR should set up a database of expertise to provide ability to search for other faculty for collaboration purposes.
- Problem getting other departments to participate; they have different priorities.
- Tenure and promotion structure does not support transdisciplinary scholarship. Depts. and Colleges do not place value on writing grants, only value is on actual awards.

Group 5
- Transdisciplinary research not the same as interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary; define what each means to campus; to achieve one doesn’t guarantee achieving them all. The support for each can be different.

Group 6
- Universities are disciplinary by structure; OR has to facilitate transdisciplinary activity (i.e. remove/reduce boundaries)
- Conflicts: handling tenure and degree programs (fractional credit given at some institutions)
- What do we expect from our research centers in facilitating interactions?
- Faculty need INCENTIVES to go outside their “silo”
- (e.g., teaching load reduction in home department to teach a class in another department)
- Governor’s Chair hires are a good model for SENIOR FACULTY HIRES (not applicable for Junior Faculty hires)
- Do we promote PI subcontracts within our own university?
- Do we use our TOOLS? Does the faculty know what tools are available to them? (i.e., citation indices can indicate novel applications of research concepts)
- How does the Law School achieve a higher percentage of alumni giving/investment?

Group 7
- Praise for PDT as a limited resource, but a very helpful one. Many proposals would go nowhere without PDT support.
- Example given of an Immigration Issues conference in the past, supported by OR (spearheaded by Drs. Shefner and Ansley). This was not research-related per se, but was transdisciplinary. Would OR support similar projects in the future? Ex: NIH R13.
- Can OR generate and promote “big ideas” foci for researchers to rally and collaborate around?
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E5: How can the Office of Research help grow and support strategic partnerships?

Listening Session 1

Group 2
• Strategic Partnerships: Corporate, Medical center, TVA
• Nurture and maintain ORNL
• Development Foundation and OR work better together
• Government and industry and academia together

Group 3
• Look at E2: Define our strengths, gather faculty
  o Look at national trends
  o Strategic partnerships lead to strategic direction
• Should seed money be invested in defined strategic areas?
  o Should OR be involved in strategic initiatives?
  o Strategic game plan for budget hearings
  o Identify areas to be developed
  o Conflict: “how to make all flowers grow…”

Group 4
• Define our strengths, then strengthen the strengths. Will then be in a better position to partner with institutions that have complementary strengths.

Group 5
• Support developing top down relationships building and encouraging bottom up and ongoing relationships

Group 6
• OR could develop financial incentives, or remove financial disincentives, to facilitate collaboration between centers and departments.

Group 7
• Maximize alumni opportunities
• Develop centralized structure & coordinate effort of strategic and targeted PR/image for UT research

Group 8
• Expand strategic reach
• Fix the “lobbyist” relationship
• Think outside box in partnerships between UT / other agencies/groups/companies: ie English History/Vols Teach/Art/Y12 (RE: Y12 meeting with UT this year)

Group 9
• Types – internal (ORNL, Y12, Other institutions, Foundations, Corporations
• Minimize business model differences
• Better understanding of what is going on at UT
• What will happen in near future
• Lack of understanding within and between components of the UT System

Listening Session 2

Group 1
• OR must coordinate future strategic partnerships. Need individual to coordinate, and meetings to find interested team partners.
• We must anticipate opportunity, not respond to the solicitation.
• Workshops on “What does transdiscipline mean”
• Senior faculty need to be reminded again and again RE: importance of multi-disciplinary research; they vote on tenure. Provost can’t make the change happen.
• Governor’s Chairs are tenured in a single department; they may be associated with several, but have voting authority only in their tenured department.
• Investigate ORNL 50% tenure positions.

Group 2
• ORNL Joint Faculty Agreement process (either for ORNL or UT based researchers) is very difficult and takes too long. Streamline the process.
• How to identify key people at ORNL and Y-12 to develop and continuous relationship
• Relationship with Ag is confusing, not sure how to work with them. OR should take lead in developing this relationship and communicating to the faculty how to best work with Ag.
• Best steps for working with other institutions on negotiating contracts and subcontracts. Engagement with other educational institutions at OR level. Know the resources at other institution to facilitate collaboration. OR to be a clearinghouse.
• Sponsored Programs office proposal staff should be assigned to departments so that a specific person works with several given departments; faculty would have a point of contact and always know who is working on their proposal. The Sponsored Program person would get to know the faculty’s research interest and help identify collaboration with other faculty. When working on a proposal the faculty member wants to be sure that the SP contact is with them from beginning to end of the process and be able to address their questions and concerns. A single point person for faculty is key.

Group 3 Not addressed.

Group 4 Not addressed.

Group 5 Not addressed.

Group 6
• Strategic Partnerships (see E2: Corporate and Foundation R&D)
Group 7

**KEY POINT #3:** Could OR help to create better partnerships with the State of TN? Ex: Mississippi State is collecting data for the State of TN on a contract that wasn’t up for bid. Why isn’t UTK doing this work? Relationships with some State of TN departments are better than others. There is a resource for State of TN relations here at UTK, but it seems to be more politically-oriented (quasi-lobbying). Could OR use this service, or have them set up initial contacts for us?

Good idea! UGA takes new faculty members on a weeklong tour of the state. Everyone you meet is a useful connection. This is also a great opportunity to educate others about the university’s mission. It helps people in the state understand that we are more than just teachers.

Listening Session 3

**Group 1**
- Expanded use of Research Capacity Catalog
- Use Associate Deans to get ideas and opportunities to cross different college boundaries
- Broaden targeted email delivery
- Centers operate in isolation

**Group 2**
- See comments for R5.

**Group 4**
- New SEC $2,500 travel grant could help enhance strategic partnerships
- There seems to be some “tension” between UT and ORNL
- Department issues about co-authorship on papers with ORNL
Listening Session Notes

**Group 1**: Not addressed.

**Group 2**
- Engagement and outreach
  - Continuing education, promote lifelong learning
  - Use retired faculty
  - Engage with local community k-12, use internet more
  - Actual service to the community
  - University community support - community at large
  - More programs like Medical Explorers at UTMC
  - Campus-wide open house to bring the community in

**Group 3**
- Need coordination for those working in engagement
  - Office of Research and Office of Development
  - ID who is engaged with community at university level
  - Coordinate with foundations
  - Establish infrastructure for engagement
  - Worry that (current occupant) is a term appointment
  - UTIA?

**Group 4**
- Better coordinate efforts of the outreach coordinators on campus. Many of the Centers have these people, and central administration positions, but don’t always work together, either because of lack of knowledge that they exist or F&A / credit / control issues.

**Group 5**
- Publicize that OR will provide assistance with Outreach and Engagement.
- Establish campus level initiative for coordination and assistance. Identify that to faculty.
- Enhancing Pre-collegiate program and exposure

**Group 6**: Not addressed.

**Group 7**
- Communicate (internal and external) resources & successes
- Award/recognition aligned with research/scholarship
- Online newsletter to faculty
- Present scholarship in action

**Group 8**: Not addressed.

**Group 9**
- Effective use of IT
- Keep up with technological IT advances and use to support engagement & outreach
- Partner with UT Extension
- 95 TN county Extension offices to get the word out and tell our story

**Listening Session 2**

**Group 1** Not addressed.

**Group 2**
- Faculty needs assistance with outreach. Arts and Sciences no longer has this capacity, but is doing outreach but no one that can assist.
- Have metrics for outreach easily accessible to use on a proposal; no need to reinvent the process every time.
- Translate the work done at UT to the public. This is not done enough and the community needs to know the benefits of the research and work done at UT.

**Group 3** Not addressed.

**Group 4** Not addressed.

**Group 5**
- A& S is trying to raise funds for student travel.
- Issue: how to get students involved in research. Provide faculty w/$300 for every research student, encourage more faculty to participate, & track students involved. All disciplines to have access.
- Set up Office of Undergraduate Research; funded from multiple units. UG students have had positive feedback when talking to different units about their willingness to support this activity.
- Public education: exploit the STEM Academy.
- Better communicate what UT does for UG research.
- Should have a clearinghouse of all activities.
- Need to know who is doing public speaking. Should be a coordinated way for outside groups to contact the university if they need a speaker.
- The UT calendar is incomplete; is too late to attend talks if relying on Tennessee Today calendar. A more comprehensive calendar should be maintained and available online. An email sent out every Monday morning alerting everyone of activities for that week.
- Need to build a more coordinated program of outreach for students and off campus activities.
- UT is wired but not connected.

**Group 6** Not addressed.

**Group 7**
- Some universities have a separate VC for engagement; at UT engagement is combined with research. Need greater university-level attention to outreach. Admin. must devote people to this. Outreach takes last place after teaching, research, and service missions. Engagement should be closely tied to scholarship; UT should promote engagement that partners with and produces scholarship. Otherwise are we generating knowledge and not disseminating it sufficiently. The...
outreach message has also been a moving target recently. What is outreach? Do we have any idea? It’s exhausting, and what’s the value for promotion and tenure? Zero. How is engagement valued and incentivized? Junior faculty members are effectively discouraged from service.

Listening Session 3

**Group 1**
- Leverage sources outside the university
- Proactive engagement of community in scholarly and other activities
  - Take research to the community; e.g., engage the College of Arts to help communicate our research on obesity to various school systems
- Office of Research to facilitate “matchmaking” among academic units
- Target collaborative announcements

**Group 2**
- Define institutional priorities RE: engagement & outreach to wisely use limited resources and leverage our efforts in teaching & research
- Allocate more resources to support efforts RE: context of priorities
- It takes more people than we currently using
- Institutionally important to feature faculty and student research as important outcome at UTK and poorly understood by public
- Faculty and students not trained to communicate to the general public, or have easy pathways for such activity.
- OR & UTK Communications should collaborate to provide training and avenues for increasing this type of institutional communication by faculty and students
- Create undergraduate outreach class
- Understand what is available pre-award and post-award that suits a faculty member at different points in their career
- Faculty must know what these services are and how to access them (it’s also beneficial to have localized support closer to the faculty members)
- Determine how to engage students
- Tap into freshman and sophomore student ties with their former high schools to feature opportunities and roles of research for students at UTK.
- We develop materials to distribute to the public. Is there a better way for the public to get the information that they need?

**Group 4**
- Evaluation system should reflect valuing transdisciplinary research
- IP development is now included in the evaluation process
- OR can provide a website list of minority institutions for faculty
Listening Session 1

Group 2
• Are we engaging companies around us?
  o Re-evaluate P&T and resources
  o Outreach
  o Collaboration-credit
  o How to recruit, attract, and retain
  o Support faculty

Group 3
• Model of Associate Deans meetings to coordinate engagement
  o Office of Strategic Partnerships model from University of Michigan
  o Profile of assets/strengths (University of Wisconsin)
  o More electronic/web presence

Group 4
• We should strategically promote our success. This needs to focus not only on the dollars, but also scholarship, arts/humanities, outreach stories, community impact stories, etc.

Group 5  Not addressed.

Group 6  Not addressed

Group 7  Not addressed.

Group 8  Not addressed

Group 9
• Ask customers what their needs are
• How much can the Office of Research do?
• Know the METRICS of how performance is being evaluated and proceed accordingly!
• Overcome policy barriers….better yet ELIMINATE them!

Listening Session 2

Group 1  Not addressed.

Group 2  Not addressed.

Group 3  
(Primarily answered by Graduate Student in Psychology.)
• Would like to see more lab experience that relates to research as part of the way that instruction/student learning occurs at UT rather than 1 or 2 labs for 3 hrs
• Present format of lab classes is “wasted” on non-research bound students.
• Integrate knowledge and discovery in curriculum.
• “Threshold Program” needs to be reintegrated to allow student to design his/her own curriculum.

Group 4  Not addressed.

Group 5  Not addressed.

Group 6  
• PRIORITIZE strategic plan – just as important to say what OR plans NOT to accomplish; do not want to get a little bit done on many items
• OR guide goal toward SHARED RESEARCH FACILITIES

Group 7  Not addressed

Listening Session 3

Group 3
• Increase tele-presence with ORNL (e.g., VTC capabilities) to enable better access to seminars, graduate training, etc.
• Provide better benefits for unmarried partners to enhance faculty retention.
• Increase funding to support more graduate and undergraduate research assistantships, especially in the summer.
• Develop way for OR personnel to work more closely/directly with colleges and centers.
• Clarify policies that define OR vs. Development funding.
• Enhance communications so PIs in related research areas will know what their colleagues are doing. (Since closing the UT Faculty Club, there is no informal gathering place for faculty to meet with peers to discuss research ideas.)
• Increase publicity for non-monetary faculty awards.
R1: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing research services?

Listening Session 1

Group 5
- Office of Research and Sponsored Program to continue offering support for new researchers as well as experienced researchers who are transitioning to new opportunities.
- The group chose to not spend too much time on this question because comments made that services were being provided. Miriam asked group to give this some thought and please recommend to her anything more that we could be doing.

Listening Session 2

Group 5
- UT needs a better center for statistics and data management to assist with data research design to support research. Would be beneficial to faculty and students. There is not enough training available for graduate students. There is not enough software. Inadequate & insufficient support.
- There is little support for faculty for Foundation funding. Not everyone in the group knew that the OR has a Director of Foundation & Corporate Engagement. Faculty is not asked who they know at various foundations. Group consensus was a heavy investment of time is necessary to be successful. Personal contacts are what matters most.
- Need to decide if something is worth the investment since there is not enough funding to do everything. Use an ROI analysis.
- Need to prioritize which units should be the Top 25 in the country. Some units may lose out, but to be Top 25 in something, this difficult call has to be made.
- Need to know what we want to do. If grant writing is primary we need more proposal development staff.
- Proposal writing assistance is paying off but more would be better. Expand external technical peer reviews of junior faculty proposals, especially for first time awards.
- Information and knowledge management is key.
- What can OR do? VCR is the only one to speak at the campus level to promote research. Need to bring the message and be the catalyst.

Listening Session 3

Group 1
- Information dissemination
- More support for tenured long term faculty after start-up funds expended
Listening Session Notes

R2: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing communications?

Listening Session 1

Group 5
• Comments made regarding getting UT’s message out to the community and constituencies. Lots of research and scholarly activity taking place at UT and it is not featured or highlighted as often as it should be.
• Work with communication office to tell research stories and involve external constituencies. Good communication is about more than telling good stories: we also need to make even better stories, in which the communities themselves are both interested and involved.
• Publicity about UT’s great achievements
• More presence with Federal agencies

Listening Session 2

Group 5
• External Communications
  o Determine how to spin UT news as a better message
  o Increase positive messages
  o Communication and Marketing Office understaffed.
  o It is hard to get the tools and a message delivered. Web staff – 1 for a college is too little; grossly understaffed to update webpages and create brochures and posters.
  o UT not participating in enough undergraduate recruiting activities. Representatives either don’t attend or have the appropriate materials.
  o Question arose if a college has authority to release information or if everything must be filtered through Communication and Marketing Office. Since that unit is understaffed, external communication is limited and not timely.
  o What is the perception of UT? The public is familiar with sports but is clueless about research. There is a problem of marketing and promoting UT, overshadowed by athletics. Even high school students close by don’t know what is available, we have no presence. Assumption is our name is all that is needed. Out of state students seem to find out about UT by accident.
  o Need to prioritize who we want to know about us. Current students should be involved in external recruiting activities.

Listening Session 2 (cont.)

• Internal Communications
  o Get top researchers with a connection to medicine to sit down together.
  o Get the people of similar areas to talk and get together regularly.
  o Provide support for connecting researchers to lead to success of multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinary research.
  o Need timely and specific information of proposal opportunities so there is enough time to respond.
  o Should be better communication from the Office of Research on how the Office can help with a proposal.
  o It seems that OR does a lot of work and offers a lot of services that the campus community isn’t aware of. OR must promote these activities better. The services aren’t benefiting anyone if people know about it.
  o Need to get faculty over the hump of how to prepare a proposal.
  o Provide guidance on how to keep a center going rather than just how to write a proposal.
  o Could team senior faculty with junior faculty.
  o Hold events for faculty from different departments to meet each other and develop a sense of trust so they can work together on research.
  o Would be helpful if a mechanism existed to collaborate more with Memphis.

Listening Session 3

Group 1
• No Discussion – Answered earlier
**Listening Session Notes**

**R3: How can the O.R. assist in supporting and realizing government relations?**

### Listening Session 1

**Group 5**
- Connecting with other Universities in the region on common issues for stronger voice.
- Connecting with regional and state government.
- Example: Posters on the Hill

### Listening Session 2

**Group 1**
- Who do you know? Which faculty have government contacts or are on review panels.
- Trips to DC. Find out what they are interested in; meet Program Managers.
- Better utilize our connections
- Fund the infrastructure that will better position us to engage the federal government in the pursuit of funding.
- Office of Research needs to fund trips and accompany PI to funding agencies
- We have many faculty who play significant roles. Ask them to disseminate information on a regular basis.
- Bring funding agencies to UT
- Governor’s Chairs bring enormous social capital with them. We need to better leverage that capital
- Historically, UT does not value faculty trumpeting success.

**Group 5**
- UT does not encourage faculty to be involved in D.C.
- Faculty need to be encouraged to work their way up in committees so when a person goes off they can name possible replacements.
- Need to be proactive about name dropping.
- Incentives – If a faculty member is serving on a national panel, they could receive a course release or a financial incentive.
- Expectations of faculty for being involved in research, boards, and journal editors should be communicated and built into a reward structure. Could be $1500 but there is not enough faculty for course release. Expectations vary across colleges. Message should come down from the Dean.
- Faculty should expand their roles in all professional societies.

### Listening Session 3

**Group 1**
- Engage researchers as agency proposal reviewers
- Develop personal relationships
- Meet Program Managers.
- Better utilize our connections

**Group 5 (cont.)**
- Need a way for faculty to know what each other is doing but it is difficult to get faculty to respond.
- UT has no idea who is currently serving on panels, committees, editorial boards etc. We need to organize this information and then leverage it to expand our involvement.
- Need to prioritize what is important.
- A searchable database that identifies what people know and are involved in would be very beneficial. We don’t need to spend time recreating relationships with sponsors, etc. when other people on campus have already established a relationship we could utilize.
- Provide incentive program for faculty involvement outside of TN.
Listening Session Notes

R4: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing IP and innovation?

Listening Session 1

Group 2
• Expanding role of UTRF and patting them on the back
• Make UTRF path easy to follow – streamline
• Contracting

Listening Session 2

Group 2
IP and Innovation
• Inventions are not the cash cow that everyone thinks it is, UT needs to be realistic on this topic.
• Incorporate innovation to the Entrepreneurial Program at College of Business. Work together with faculty where faculty present ideas and the Business students are tasked with developing a product.

Group 6
• See answers for E2
• Make both a research database – UT faculty and centers – AND an IP/corporate database
• Evaluate if we are successful at SHARED RESEARCH FACILITIES
  o Where is the list of equipment? Skills?
  o Do departments know about what is available as they hire new personnel?
  o OR as responsibility to guide
  o Engineering has good example with Newton computer system

Listening Session 3

Group 5
• Move to using provisional patents
• Where does IP sit in university purposes?
• Use some IP as a partnership tool with industry.
• Issue of how to leverage IP
Listening Session Notes

R5: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing partnerships?

Listening Session 1

Group 2
- All our previous answers

Listening Session 2

Group 2
- Relationship with Ag is confusing, not sure how to work with them. OR should take lead in developing this relationship and communicating to the faculty how to best work with Ag.
- Developing further the relationship with ORNL and Y-12 and facilitate working relationships with the faculty.
- Working with the research leaders on campus; example, governor’s chairs, distinguished scientists. Invite research leaders to a round table discussion, we can learn from them and their expertise.

Group 6
- See E2: Corporate and Foundation R&D

Listening Session 3

Group 2
- Invest in infrastructure (people, facilities, tools, hardware, software, technology) to support growth of partnerships with corporations, NGOs, other universities and governmental agencies.
- Hire more people good at developing corporate partnerships
- Office of Research needs better data management. Difficult to accomplish successfully by individual PIs.
- Few people at UTK have developing partnerships as part of their job responsibilities; develop a training program with the assistance of one or more outside experts/consultants
- IP issues often stops research in its tracks. Provide training to faculty and staff concerning IP when faculty get to that point.
- Utilize alumni organization more
- Involve Research Foundation more
Listening Session Notes

R6: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing multi-disciplinary research?

Listening Session 1

Group 2
- Fix multi-campus collaborations on the business side- set up, authorization, credit

Group 9
- See response to questions 3 & 4

Listening Session 2

Group 2
Multidisciplinary Research
- Identify specific metrics for disciplines related to publication
- OR to lead discussions with department
- Publish the results
- For some disciplines co-authors are acceptable, but for others it is not.

Group 6
- See E4: Transdisciplinary

Listening Session 3 (cont.)

Group 2
- Faculty don’t know of other faculty activities
- Need more neutral spaces to allow faculty to collaborate / combine resources from different areas
- The institution can support by:
  - Cluster hiring – crosses college lines and hire around excellence themes
  - Identifying areas of research excellence. They are likely to be multidisciplinary.
  - Revise program and faculty reviews to encourage multidisciplinary scholarship.
- Create opportunities to get faculty of common interests together; e.g., via poster / lecture style meetings, or through celebratory gathering to recognize faculty and promote collaboration.
- It is difficult to meet people from other departments; faculty are insular.
- Single author papers more valued than co-authored multidisciplinary papers in faculty reviews; review criteria need revision
- Degree counting is by solo department or if multidisciplinary the degree for counting purposes is split; encourage more multidisciplinary degrees by double counting when doing tracking within institution.

- OR could develop forms of faculty recognition; faculty could talk about what they are doing during a celebration style event
- Have 30-sec. snapshots of faculty research. “Mic Nite” is a good prototype, but has numerous barriers – held at night and in locations that many are not familiar with.
- Encourage research leaders from different campuses to get together; provide small grants to encourage cross campus interactions. Start small & expand.
- Set expectations for those receiving ORU support that they need to reach out across campus. Annual assessment should include a community-building component to break down barriers.
- Faculty could label themselves in 10 areas they work in to map out who they can work with; to be interactive like Visual Thesaurus, not a list, the more dynamic the better.
- Need to better display & communicate research both internal and external (a central theme for improving many areas of the research enterprise).
- Have research spotlights.
- OR set more expectations for organizations that receive OR support to conduct more multidisciplinary / collaborative work.
- RCC could be more widely promoted and also more sophisticated with tagging and mapping; make it easier for faculty to find those who may be possible collaborators.
Listening Session Notes

**R7: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing F & A distribution?**

### Listening Session 1

**Group 3**
- F&A is Office of Research’s biggest chance to recoup losses
- Educate faculty who want more money from opportunity
- **Group 9**
  - Does current F&A distribution policy encourage multi-disiplinary research?
  - As F&A increases, additional funds should be provided to the Office of Research to grow their programs and provide more assistance to faculty
  - Is current system effective or should it be modified?

### Listening Session 2

**Group 7**
- Right now there is no consistent policy on F&A distribution to units and centers. Unequal F&A return to centers creates a disincentive to collaborate with them. Departments don’t encourage their PIs to go outside their units to collaborate. At all other Top 25 state universities, most centers don’t get F&A return—it all goes back to the departments so there’s no competition. Does OR need to remove this obstacle to center collaborations? Are centers getting too much credit when compared to departments and individual researchers involved? This also impedes interdisciplinary collaboration. What’s the purpose of the centers?
- More flexibility with and carry-over of F&A returns is needed, along with more transparency regarding OR’s access to F&A return. OR has a $0 budget because F&A return actually goes back to Chris Cimino’s office. We need to promote OR’s true relationship with and (lack of) control over F&A money.

### Listening Session 3

**Group 3**
- Develop distribution mechanism so centers are not competing with departments for funding.
- Permit F&A to be carried over and used past the 6/30 fiscal year end.
Listening Session Notes

**Listening Session 1**

**Group 7**

- HR – separate research-funded personnel from state-funded personnel

**Listening Session 2**

**Group 3**

- Human Resources need to restructure the PDQ process and conduct better position analysis. Need to recognize the importance of the intellectual component of the position. Need to be more flexible in hiring and compensation. Current hiring policies go by “job descriptions rooted in number of persons supervised and/or number of dollars handled” rather than ever-changing intellectual requirements of various positions.
- Need to find out how other institutions handle these issues.
- Increase number of highly skilled professional research administration exempt staff positions in the colleges and departments, individuals who understand the intricacies of proposal development and award management and can remove burden from faculty. It is critical that there is more “Bridge Funding” for research staff and faculty, if a short-term funding glitch occurs.
- Non-tenured track researchers need to be protected where they are likely to have continued value to the institution.

**Group 7**

**KEY POINT #4:** Can OR be more of a “problem solver” or appoint someone to a “find and fix” role to assist departments and centers when deep problems arise that need untangling? Often these situations are beyond the ability of the departments and centers to fix on their own. We need someone charged to help the unit solve the problem. Someone commented that even so, OR is still “so much better now than it was” in this area.

- ORNL views UTK as the “poor stepchild.” When there’s a budget disagreement, UTK always gives in. A relationship change is needed here.
Listening Session 1

Group 7
- P&T/Annual Reviews – Change the paradigm!
  o Institutionalize
  o Multidisciplinary
- Value for undergraduate research

Listening Session 2

Group 7
- There’s very little NIH money at UTK. For other Top 25 universities without medical schools who have succeeded in securing this funding (like Penn State), they were very proactive and focused on working toward a goal that would attract NIH money. (At Penn State and at the University of Texas, this was the creation population research centers.) Tennessee has public health deficits (one of the top states for smoking, obesity, etc.), so we should have good opportunities for securing NIH funding to address those issues if we were to create a big, interdisciplinary lab. Ex: a non-smoking lab. But there’s no infrastructure at UTK for putting together huge interdisciplinary proposals. You need a large, well-equipped team, but that takes a lot of work and a lot of administrative help.

Listening Session 2 (cont.)

Group 7 KEY POINT #5 (cont.)
Other universities promote and encourage faculty to train in other fields. Course buyouts could give faculty time to do more professional development. There is already a “training grant” at UTK—a professional development award managed by the Graduate School, but this program needs greater clarity with respect to appropriate uses. The rules fluctuate wildly year to year depending on who’s on the deciding committee. Professional development activities are not necessarily about research, but the awarding committee seems to think so.

Listening Session 3

Group 3
- Provide pre- and post-award administrative support at Department level.
- Buy out faculty time to encourage pursuit of research opportunities.
- Designate a certain amount of F&A as a “bonus” fund that could be added to PIs’ salaries based on criteria established by each college.

KEY POINT #5: Using IRIS as the system of record poses some problems for reporting. Work is not being captured fully by IRIS, which creates wrong impressions when work is not included in reports. “X doesn’t generate any money.” This “brag sheet” matters! We can view awards in PAMS by PI and department, so why not pull university reports from PAMS? PAMS is a better direction for research reporting than IRIS, but PAMS reporting has not been perfected yet.

Research incentive plans disproportionately reward people and teams that have already had research success—what about new people? However, this system has had some success. We let PIs choose whether to put their incentive funds back into their research or use it as a salary bonus. Different things motivate different people.
Listening Session Notes

R10: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing infrastructure-core facilities?

Listening Session 1
Group 4
• We should build our core facilities around our “Big Ideas”. Also, we need to implement user models earlier in the major equipment acquisition process to ensure these core facilities are sustainable long-term. Sometimes we focus so much on acquisition that we forget to ensure that a long-term operational model is in place.

Listening Session 2
No Discussion Recorded

Listening Session 3
Group 4
• Core facilities more of an OR function – OR should help coordinate and/or facilitate.
• OR could list core facilities as resource and help PIs in pursuing grants; e.g., MRIs, etc.
• Percentage of new facilities (~5%) as undedicated for future expansion and new use.
• When space IS available, funding not available to bring it up to code; some space now sitting vacant for this reason.
• Good core facilities and adequate space add to the “critical mass” of why new faculty would want to move here – in addition to existing benefits of good schools, local resources, culture events, parks, etc.
Everyone understands we need more space. But, we must critically examine the current use of space as well. We all see places where space isn’t being used as effectively as perhaps it once was, and in those cases, hard decisions need to be made about how that space is used. At the same time, we should not rely exclusively on metrics such as research-dollars-per-square-foot that may ignore differences between disciplines and other indications of productivity.

We also much acknowledge our commitment to teaching – there are many lab spaces on campus dedicated to teaching – these won’t be tied with research productivity but MUST be highly valued.

Group 9
- Forward thinking for building needs
- Infrastructure maintenance
- A plan for equipment acquisitions/upkeep/maintenance
- Integrated MASTER PLAN!

Listening Session 2
No Discussion Recorded

Listening Session 3
Group 4
- Same responses as in R10 above.
Listening Session 1
Group 4
- See discussion during the afternoon session.

Listening Session 2
Group 4
- OR could provide leadership in restructuring OIT, which has become overly centralized. We need to become more sophisticated to facilitate each unit’s ability to handle more data and complicated IT issues, demand for which is growing and relevant to research.

Listening Session 3
No Discussion Recorded
Listening Session Notes

**Listening Session 1**

**Group 2**
- Move to reliable, paperless, electronic-based system
- Need an efficient coordination system for all compliance issues
- Greater emphasis on financing/rewarding/supporting faculty for national boards and service, professional boards, etc. = VISIBILITY

**Group 9**
Most items were condensed in the following categories:
- Staff
- Trans-disciplinary research planning
- Engagement
- Compliance
- Faculty Service
- System Coordination
- Benchmarking

**Listening Session 2**

**Group 2**  Top 5 + 1 Presented to the group
1. Facilitate communication for interdisciplinary teams
2. Streamline process for grants and contracts with corporations and foundations
3. Limited Submission process should be organized better and more strategic in selecting internally competing proposals. More lead time to develop these proposals is also crucial.
4. OR to be lead in educating UT community on how research is changing to transformative research. Tenure and promotion to be more aligned with the Top 25 emphasis on transformative and “Big Idea” (multidisciplinary) research initiatives that mean fewer single-authored grants and publications. Train graduate students to transition to transformative research to prepare them as they develop their own research programs.
5. In Sponsored Programs office proposal staff should be assigned to departments so that a specific person works with several given departments. This way the faculty would have a point of contact and always know who is working on their proposal. This alone will help facilitate the Top 4 points above.
6. OR to get research leaders (governor’s chairs and distinguished scientists) together on campus Invite research leaders to a round table discussion, we can learn from them and their expertise.

**Listening Session 3**

**Group 4**
- A proposal should never come back “UNREVIEWED” due to missing something “in the fine print”
Listening Session Notes

**OR1: How can you or the Office of Research assist in addressing this issue or supporting and realizing this idea? Please be specific to each idea.**

Listening Session 1 (only)

**Group 2**
- Move to a paperless, electronic system (TERA-PAMS; Reduce red tape burden for faculty; better (easily measurable) benchmarking of research enterprise)
  - Travel authorization and reimbursement
  - Effort certification-faculty development
  - IRB
  - Multiple reports: TERA PAMS, COEUS

**Group 3**

Strategic focus on research investments:
- Identify areas of research interest and focus investment
- ORU program

Large opportunities: Identify large opportunities early to project strategic areas
- Use UTSI relationships with funding agencies

Infiltrating Federal agency R&D agendas: Key partners advise
- Governor’s Chairs were result of national priorities with ORNL agreement but also major investment of UTK colleges
- Who are the UTK players involved with policy?
- How do we get faculty to go to funding agencies?
- Host seminars from DoD, DoE, NIH
- Share government funding agency contacts

Local level support for faculty: Junior faculty
- Large grants not good for them
- Partner with a faculty mentor

Staff retention and compensation; TERA-PAMS; Expanding the PDT; and Staff Incentives
- These issues within OR/SPO need to be addressed if we want any of the other issues to be resolved successfully
- Turnover in SPO
- Need benchmarking
- FIX TERA-PAMS
- Technology resources – web presence
- Can the PDT staff handle more demand? Delegated authority as solution

**Group 4**
- TERA-PAMS/Compliance data management systems; Improve communication between TERA users and community of practice. Info needs to flow both ways; e.g., in research compliance, all recognized the need for e-data management systems, but potential users of such a system were unaware of current implementation plans.

**Group 4 (cont.)**
- AAHRPP accreditation for IRB and Compliance staffing; Compliance is a crucial issue for safe, responsible, ethical conduct of research; represents an area of considerable institutional risk. AAHRPP accreditation/additional staff (and e-data mgmt systems above) might increase capabilities in this area. In accreditation process, institution enacts procedures and processes that do expand capabilities.
- Staff retention, compensation, and incentives need to be addressed; constantly losing good talent to other campus units not good for the OR. High turnover rates impact the individuals left behind, but also has impact on faculty who depend on Sponsored Programs. Admin must advocate for the importance of people in OR and the jobs they do.
- How best to coordinate with the UT System and the UT System components; Change the internal culture of F&A / credit / control across campuses. These can be barriers to collaboration.

**Group 5**

Expanding the Proposal Development Team; A continuum of support; Single PI’s
- College and Dept Level Support: Help needed for the individual PI at the department level.
- A Chemistry faculty in the group said Chem. has 3 staff members taking care of budget development, forms, grants.gov applications, TERA-PAMS, etc. for faculty. Some colleges have this level of service as well (COE, Nursing, Education). Group felt more of this is needed and having this level of help at the dept/college level would facilitate Sponsored Programs work.
- Foundation of any large effort starts with a single PI.
- Humanities and Social Sciences areas require assistance with proposal development. Expanded funding sources equals additional and different rules and regulations.
- Larger center-type projects
- Provision of project management support
- Funding streams identified

Academic Outreach and Engagement Council (AOEC) status
- AOEC has played vital role over the years, promoting and advancing UTK Outreach and Engagement through such activities as sending material to legislators, sponsoring faculty attendance at engagement conferences, and providing a candidate for each year’s Chancellor’s Honor’s Award for Outreach and Engagement.

Cont.
OR1: How can you or the Office of Research assist in addressing this issue or supporting and realizing this idea? Please be specific to each idea.

Listening Session 1 (only) continued

Group 5 (cont.)

• Whether AOEC continues in its current form, or something else takes its place, a campus-level presence for engagement is needed
• The UT System has now mandated that each campus have a defined model for outreach and engagement. Outreach and Engagement also conform to NIH/NSF Compliance Mandate - “Broader Impact”

Infiltrating Federal agency R&D agendas

• Increased presence at key Federal agencies
• More influence & advance knowledge
• Helping design/influence RFPs
• Dilemma: huge commitment. Incentive, increase presence with key Federal agencies
• Discussed the work of bringing in Generals and others from federal agencies and have faculty share their research interest. More staff like Paul needed to work at this level and with other agencies.

Compliance data management system

• All areas of compliance are lacking integrated electronic systems
• Data Management Plan Requirements = OR and Libraries beginning discussions

How best to coordinate with UT System and its components? Start by bringing researchers together. NIH is source of funding UTK needs to pursue further, but we must take advantage of other areas of UT.

• UT Graduate School of Medicine; UTHSC; UTIA; other campuses
• Student rep. indicated that UT students do internships at GSM; recommended that students can help bridge the gap; relationship can start from the bottom up.

Group 6

• Strategic focus on research investments
• OR could identify core research facilities and support these with staff and funds to aid in improving the research climate at UT. This in turn would help with recruiting and proposal success.
• Assisting faculty around proposal development
• OR could coordinate, and perhaps even integrate, with colleges earlier in the proposal development process to enhance proposal quality and compliance.

Large opportunities: OR could seek to develop a mechanism to facilitate obtaining cost share funds earlier for big proposals so faculty can focus on content of the proposal rather than finding matching funds.

Group 7

• Faculty and staff outreach and training; funds for start-ups, outreach & engagement, undergraduate research, base funding; enhancing OR/department heads coordination; reducing the red tape burden for faculty; and local level support for faculty
• Reduce red tape
• Formalize institutional expectations and get everyone “on the same page,” while realizing that not one size fits all
• Re-engage faculty and support expectations

Group 8

• Staff retention and compensation; expanding the proposal development team; and faculty and staff outreach and training
• OR has not been able to retain top staff – lost to other UTK units that can offer promotion
• “Money is not everything” – leadership and recognition are important
• Develop a more responsive, functional career ladder program for OR. Sponsored Programs is the only unit that has established this, and the parameters/criteria for advancement are too narrow as written.
• Staff promotion (ergo: unit management) through UT HR typically cumbersome and necessarily crafted on HR documents/job descriptions rather than actual responsibilities and accomplishments of the individuals
• HR can impair the ability of a unit to sustain itself and grow. Staff must go outside UT to obtain a job offer before UT salary can be realigned

Group 9

Staff Issues

• Compensation and retention
• No connection with faculty bonus plan and staff
• Staff leaving or to departments, receiving higher pay
• Better communication with HR regarding positions and salaries

Compensation & Retention Issues

• No connection with Faculty Bonus Program and Staff
• Communication with HR concerning job grade, title and compensation
• Staff leaving OR to Departments because of increased grade and salary

Compliance

• Compliance systems should be electronic: NO PAPER!
• System vs. Unit Compliance
• Communications
• Inevitable that more compliance will be mandated....need to be able to manage this
• Costs
• Policy (System VS Unit)
• Proper training of faculty & grad student
**Listening Session Notes**

**OR2: What new or additional issues or ideas should be explored and what are your recommendations to best address these issues or ideas?**

**Listening Session 1 (only)**

**Group 2**

Impacts the following issues: local level support for faculty; staff retention and compensation; TERA-PAMS; Expanding the PDT; faculty and staff outreach and training; and staff incentives.
- Delineate staff roles, expectations, educate and support – development

Impacts the following issues: upper level advocacy for compliance; compliance data management systems; compliance staffing; reducing red tape burden for faculty
- Need coordination system for all compliance issues (IRB, Data Control, Export Control, etc.)

Impacts the following issue: Infiltrating Federal agency R&D agendas
- Greater emphasis on service (financing/rewarding, supporting faulty for national boards and service (federal agencies, professional boards, etc.)

Impacts the following issue: define/declare role of engagement in OR
- Support/reward research that has community impact

**Group 3**

Drew graphic with 3-column structure:

**Base:**
- Issues impacted: staff retention and compensation; TERA-PAMS; expanding the Proposal Development team; faculty and staff outreach and training; and staff incentives

**Roof:**
- Office of Research

**Columns:**
1. Strategic relationships
2. Faculty Support
3. Value Networking System

**Strategic relationships**
- “Heavy hitters” with ties to agencies
- PI base for strategic grants, emphasis on program management
- Utilize alumni and current relationships, i.e., key partners
- Identify areas of strategic interest then identify faculty with that talent or for hiring (Buddy Moore)
- UTSI – work with UTK, share networking
- More institutional support regarding budgets
- Reward process/promotion and tenure process
- Create standard of training for PostDocs – compliance issues

**Value Networking System**
- UTK is “wired but not connected” (Ernest Brothers)
- Market what we have to offer in partnership
- Clean up compliance red tape
- Train faculty to network, partner
- Communicate what sponsored research support exist
- Infrastructure!
- Diversity issues/cooperation networking
- Delegated authority to take burden off of Office of Research

**Group 6**

Reducing red tape burden for faculty; OR could partner with other campus organizations (eg, OIT and library) to provide some services for proposals (data management, compliance plans) to reduce PI burden.

Reducing the red tape burden for faculty; during internal competitions for annually recurring limited submission calls, OR could prioritize proposals not selected to identify PIs that should be encouraged in subsequent calls and avoid re-competition among the same PIs the following year.

**Group 7**

Impacts the following issues: faculty and staff outreach and training; funds for startups, outreach & engagement, undergraduate research, base funding; enhancing OR/Department Heads coordination; reducing red tape burden for faculty; and local level support for faculty
- Provide “local support” for proposal development in colleges, departments (& create perception of priority)
- Engage in discussions to create the method whereby faculty can maximize that local support
- Change priorities to support strategic thinking
- Show outcomes and benefits of this approach; consider a pilot project for introduction

---

Faculty “buy-in” (Steve Thomas)
- PDT support
- Faculty mentoring
- Communicate training programs/new hires/all faculty
- Reward process/promotion and tenure process

Cont.
OR2: What new or additional issues or ideas should be explored and what are your recommendations to best address these issues or ideas?

Listening Session 1 (only) continued

**Group 8**
Impacts the following issue: Better (and more easily measurable) benchmarking of research enterprise
• No single set of metrics will be able to represent the entire spectrum of scholarship activities within UTK
• Increase availability of data that represents the spectrum of academic activities at UTK, including teaching outcomes – will require technological support in moving current paper records to electronic systems, and mining these systems to generate data sets necessary for benchmarking, accreditation processes, and significant extramural funding opportunities that will be unavailable to UT exactly because this data is unavailable
• Target data collection (at least initially) on anticipated/recurring large RFA’s
• Discipline-specific benchmarking will need to be established for individual units (i.e., top 10 metrics), and normalized across units where possible (i.e. number of federal grant applications/research FTE, direct cost research expenditures, academy memberships/fellowships, etc.) – normalization will require central (OR) involvement/management

**Group 9**
Engagement Issues
• Collaboration issues
• Inadequate funding
• Better link to Campus Communication resources to get information about what we do out to the public
• OR should develop a dialogue with UT Extension

Develop good stories with a WOW factor