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

Group 1
- Use seed money from UTRF and UT, fund research with commercial applications; if none, why not?
- Centers on 100% soft money hard pressed to release resources to pursue other grant possibilities
- Resources from one grant cannot be used to solicit funds from another grant
- Management of Centers – Reasonable fiscal policy: provide F&A to finance seeking further funding
- Funding opportunities for Humanities faculty actively sought out and supported; need similar contact/support person for social sciences
- Create workshops tailored to humanities and social sciences; currently not “in the culture” of these faculty members
- Formalized coaching on Fulbright. Requested on line examples of proposal components
- New faculty does not understand OR support mechanisms available to them
- UT needs to advertise its success. Press releases find their way back to the funding agencies and “They love this stuff!”
- Full posters on walls of faculty accomplishment (cover articles, etc.)

Group 2
- OR facilitate communication to form Interdisciplinary teams
- Center scale proposals – bigger grants expands excellence
- Support expanding graduate student pool (Stipend; Fellowship program. Example: CIRE program)
- OR provide assistance with Infrastructure. Takes too long for facilities to provide installations, etc.
- Mentoring for faculty and graduate student

Group 3
- Increase funding, personnel, lab space, and compliance support
- Faculty experts in their discipline, not grant managers. Mgmt duties should fall to OR or staff in research admin. imbedded in Colleges/Departments
- Undergrad./grad. student research experience very important; make coursework lab time more experiential, incorporate it in a learning continuum
- Provide more corporate/agency partnerships for undergr. research opportunities; student research makes faculty more successful
- More presentations/outreach to Humanities, Social Sciences, and Fine Arts faculty about how OR can assist them
- Train Department Heads on how to manage information / facilitate communication with faculty
- Technology is a key in capitalizing on collaboration. Need to capitalize on SciVal, Scopus, Experts, etc.
- Collaborative teaching across can provide a basis for research collaboration. OR should encourage multi-disciplinary activity in both teaching and research
- Evaluate faculty on number, novelty, complexity of all proposals submitted (funded or not). Unsuccessful proposals = opportunities on future efforts

Group 6
Strategy: Outreach to Faculty
- Does OR offer help with research methodology?
  - Ideas: mentors, online examples of successful proposals
  - Training sessions – positive feedback RE: Boot Camps
  - OR Action Item: be more deliberate in 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.)
- Admin support for proposal submission/mechanics; Support learning/navigating various electronic proposal and award systems
- Disparity – some colleges have full-time proposal help while some do not; e.g., A&S faculty

Group 7
- Most opportunities to develop scholarship focused at the individual level. Chancellor’s Awards and Professional Development Awards are given to individuals, not to teams
- Limited opportunities for faculty release time to develop significantly new ideas and to write big proposals—only a few such opportunities are available each year
- A lot of important research is still being done by individuals, not transdisciplinary research teams
- Make sure people with good ideas are supported and submitting proposals, regardless of the new focus on big, transdisciplinary research projects
- Problem that Centers (best mechanisms for providing both individual and collaborative grant support)
forced to compete with Departments and other Centers because of IRIS accounting.

**KEY POINT #1:**
- 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, but 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.)
- 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
- Useful resources related to these issues also housed in Library; can OR pursue a network of OR/OIT/Library resources to address these needs?
E2: How can the Office of Research help expand and support corporate & foundation R&D?

**Group 1**
- People engaged with corporations and are responsible for the relationship
- OR should be tracking faculty-corporate teams
- Faculty contact opportunities with corporations 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
  - OR staff trained to handle Corp contracts, they are used to handling federal contracts and grants
  - Provide template to faculty of problem items on corporate contracts
  - OR staff to provide a realistic timeline of how long it takes to negotiate a corporate contract

**Group 3**
- Partner with other universities on proposals
- Foundation and Corporation Fair – like career fair – invite representatives 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 / more staff to work in Foundation/Corporation Engagement and Federal Agency Engagement
- Identify opportunities from foundations can be supported by having more staff for opportunity mining
- Better interaction between R&D
- Receiving email Funding Opportunities important, but not enough. More interpersonal “boots on the ground” face-time where staff members deal one-on-one with faculty members 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**
- Interface with the UT Foundation can be frustrating. (Accounting system and silo system are barriers
- Faculty display of research (e.g., EUReCA) to let faculty share research interests. Corporate and foundation leaders can be invited

**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 to provide more insight on “corporate partnership continuum”
  - Finding right fit can mean funding of a research center and faculty member, strengthen state and federal relationships
  - Companies NEED OUR GRADUATES (hiring)
  - Success: SMRC and Siemens (research, facilities)
- Does OR focus on our alumni relationships? (development)
- UT/OR needs research portfolio/database of faculty research and research centers to offer a better picture of “what we do” and company portfolio/database
- Faculty training on networking with corporations (“How to work with corporate America”, “best way to network”)
- Invite UT alumni that are CEOs/Presidents of companies to get idea of industrial applications

**Group 7**
**KEY POINT #2:**
- Corporations want to own all IP, even if it hasn’t been developed yet. If UT holds all IP rights, companies are disincentivized to participate in research projects with us
- OR to facilitate the loosening of restrictions on IP sharing? Perhaps an internal funding pool for certain ideas with the intention that we will share IP rights on those projects?
- Some universities have negotiated with their states to give up IP in order to attract companies, jobs, tax revenue, etc. but the state government has to agree. Could OR play a role here?
E3: How can the Office of Research help expand and support “Big Idea” large strategic initiatives?

**Group 1**
- Research currently done in “stove-pipes”
- Nurture interdisciplinary discussions
- Leverage ORNL, DoE changes focus more rapidly than UT is capable of responding
- Re-institute ORNL-UT discussions (once sponsored by Dr. Crabtree) to discuss upcoming funding
- Create accessible database on who is working on what now?
- Multiple Director Meetings – what’s in process?
- New content management tools are easy to mine. Need access these tools and get information out
- Receive updates almost immediately from the Department of Energy when new opportunities become available; should be the norm, not the exception
- OR “Green News Letter” and other paper reports should be distributed as PDF files only

**Group 2**
- Define “Big Idea”. Project that involves more than one college, one department, and one faculty. Transformative in addressing novel issues
- Limited Submission process should be organized better and be more strategic
- Develop and bring research leaders together for ongoing ideas / come up with more strategic plans. Plan ahead and getting ahead of the solicitations
- Announcement opportunities come too late/not sufficient time to put interdisciplinary teams together

**Group 3**
- Interdisciplinary faculty 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. OR 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 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 facilitate opportunities and faculty teams
- When working on ideas, developing proposals, etc., encourage other participants (legal, IP). Faculty may need help identifying resources and exploring opportunities, not know where to go; may simply need liaison or portal for information
- OR could identify and communicate high-growth areas

**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.) – can run like a retreat

**Group 7**
- Key problem: potential leaders too busy to take on more big projects; UT at critical mass
- Overworked faculty members – what can be taken away from them so they can do more research?
- Need a support system that frees faculty from the administrative burden
- UT-funded (not research-funded) GRA positions a possibility?
- Faculty need assistance from graduate students to do research; most of UT’s funded (opposed to grant funded) grad students not hired for research but for teaching or supervision
- UT-funded GRAs would provide faculty with some of the research and writing support needed to develop proposals for big projects, especially big, interdisciplinary projects
E4: How can the Office of Research help expand and support transdisciplinary scholarship?

Group 1
- Not addressed
- Group was not aware of RCC
- Requested PAMS abstracts be connected with RCC

Group 2
- Have system where faculty can search what other faculty at UT are working on. Group was aware of RCC
- OR should ensure that faculty is aware of resources available
- Workshops on interdisciplinary projects and how to go after them
- OR should have a good working relationship with research leaders on campus (governor’s chairs, distinguished scientists); Invite research leaders to a round table discussion to learn from their expertise
- Create scholarly culture to encourages interdisciplinary research (support initiatives that encourage interdisciplinary research for promotion and tenure, incentivize interdisciplinary work)

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

Group 4
- OR facilitate identification of opportunities, resources, outreach, strategy
- OR (or others) facilitate process to reach out to faculty RE: infrastructure, technical expertise, opportunities; and eliminate barriers
- Enable course release for faculty to develop projects
- Develop targeted program for program development with seed money for transdisciplinary projects
- Run contest for Big Idea projects / pay for them in early stages (leverage OR process)
- Incentivize those who break out of silos (financial, P&T). Must be valued within each department
- Vice Provosts need close association with OR; not enough coordination and resources
- OR to make critical decisions and limit strategy to several key elements. Focus! Incremental changes
- Incentivize faculty to serve on panels, study sections, review panels (P&T, travel funds, time release), AND report back!

Group 5
- Transdisciplinary ≠ interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary. The support for each can be different

Group 6
- Universities are disciplinary by structure, so 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 INCENTIVE to go outside their “silo” e.g., reduce teaching load in home department to teach a class in another department
- Governor’s Chair a good model for SENIOR FACULTY HIRES (n/a for Junior Faculty hires)
- Do we promote PI subcontracts within UT?
  - Do we use our TOOLS and 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; was not research-related, 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?
E5: How can the Office of Research help grow and support strategic partnerships?

**Group 1**
- OR coordinate future strategic partnerships; need individual to coordinate & meetings to find interested team partners
- Anticipate opportunity, not respond to solicitation
- Workshops on “What does transdisciplinary mean?”
- Senior faculty to be reminded repeatedly as to the importance of multi-disciplinary research; Provost can’t make the change happen
- Governor’s Chairs are tenured in a single department, but may be associated with several (but have voting authority only in their tenured department)
- Investigate ORNL 50% tenure positions

**Group 2**
- Streamline ORNL Joint Faculty Agreement process (for ORNL- & UT-based researchers); is difficult and takes too long
- 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 develop relationship and communicate to faculty how best to work with Ag
- Best steps for working with other institutions on negotiating contracts and subcontracts; engage with other ed institutions at OR level; know resources at other institutions to facilitate collaboration; OR to be a clearinghouse
- Sponsored Programs staff assigned to departments: a specific person works with several given departments; single point person for faculty is key.

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

**Group 7**
**KEY POINT #3:**
- Could OR help create better partnerships with the State of TN? (Ex: Miss State collects data for TN on a contract that wasn’t up for bid.
- UGA takes new faculty members on a weeklong tour of state
- Everyone you meet is a useful connection and is opportunity to educate others about UT’s mission
E6: How can the Office of Research define and support engagement & outreach serving the research and scholarly enterprise?

Group 2
- Assist faculty needs with outreach.
- Have metrics for outreach easily accessible to use on a proposal.
- Translate the work done at UT to the public; this is not done enough

Group 5
- Arts & Sciences raising funds for student travel
- How to get students involved in research (provide $300 for every student involved in research, would encourage more faculty to participate)
- Set up an Office of Undergraduate Research, funded from multiple units
- Public education – take advantage of the STEM Academy
- Better communicate what UT does for undergraduate research
- Clearinghouse of all activities
- Need to know who is doing public speaking
- Tennessee Today calendar is incomplete; too late to attend talks if you rely on the Tennessee Today calendar; more comprehensive calendar should be maintained and available online; email sent out every Monday morning
- Need to build a more coordinated program of outreach for students and off campus activities
- UT is wired but not connected

Group 7
- Some universities have a separate VC just for engagement; at UT engagement is combined with research.
- Need greater UT-level attention to outreach; administration must make a decision to devote people to this
- Outreach takes last place after teaching, research, and service missions
- Engagement should be closely tied in with scholarship
- UT should promote engagement that partners with and produces scholarship
- How is engagement valued and incentivized?
- Junior faculty members are effectively discouraged from service
E7: What other essential questions can you contemplate and provide input on?

**Group 3**
*(Question primarily answered by Graduate Student in Psychology.)*

- 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 hours
- Present format of lab classes is “wasted” on non-research bound students
- Integrate knowledge and discovery in curriculum
- “Threshold Program” needs to be reintegrated; program allowed student to design own curriculum

**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
R1: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing research services?

Group 5
- UT needs a better center for statistics and data management to benefit faculty and students.
- Not enough training/software available for graduate students. Inadequate & insufficient support
- Little support for faculty for Foundation funding.
- Decide what is worth investment; not enough funding to do everything; use an ROI analysis
- Prioritize units to be the Top 25 leaders in the country; some units may lose out, to be Top 25 difficult call that 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 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
Group 5

External Communications
- Need to “spin” UT news to be a better message
- Increase positive messages
- Office of Communication and Marketing is understaffed
- Hard to get tools and a message delivered; 1 web staff for a college is too little; grossly understaffed to update webpages, create brochures and posters
- UT not participating in enough undergraduate recruiting activities. Representatives either don’t attend or have the appropriate materials
- Does a college has the authority to release information or if everything must be filtered through the Office of Communication and Marketing. Since that unit is understaffed, external communication is limited and not timely
- What is the perception of UT? The public is familiar with sports but is clueless about research. High school students close by don’t know what is available at UT. Assumption is our name is all that is needed. Out of state students seem to find out about UT by accident
- Need to prioritize who we want to know about us. Current students should be involved in external recruiting activities

Internal Communications
- Get top researchers with a connection to medicine to sit down together
- People of similar areas to talk and meet regularly
- Support for connecting researchers to lead to success of multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinary research
- Need timely and specific information of proposal opportunities so there is enough time to respond
- Should be better communication from OR on how the Office can help with a proposal
- OR does a lot of work / offers lot of services that campus not aware of; promote these activities better.
- Get faculty “over the hump” on how to prepare a proposal
- Provide guidance on how to keep a center going rather than just how to write a proposal
- Could team senior faculty with junior faculty
- Hold events for faculty from different departments to meet each other and develop a sense of trust so they can work together on research
- Would be helpful if a mechanism existed to collaborate more with Memphis
R3: How can OR assist in supporting and realizing government relations?

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 infrastructure to better position us to engage federal government in pursuit of funding
- OR needs to fund trips and accompany PI to funding agencies
- Many faculty 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 DC
- Encourage faculty to work their way up in committees so they can name 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.
- Faculty should expand their roles in all professional societies
- Office of Institutional Research and Assessment: many of the major proposals, large amounts of data that IRA is supposed to have is either very difficult to get or simply not available
- 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.; organize this information/leverage it to expand involvement
- Need to prioritize what is important
- A searchable database that identifies what people know and are involved in would be very beneficial.
- Provide incentive program for faculty involvement outside of TN
R4: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing IP and innovation?

Group 2

- 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
  - Where is the list of equipment? Skills?
  - Do departments know about what is available as they hire new personnel?
  - OR as responsibility to guide
  - Engineering has good example with Newton computer system
R5: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing partnerships?

Group 2
Partnerships
- Relationship with Ag is confusing, OR should take lead in developing relationship and communicating to faculty how best to work with Ag
- Develop further relationship with ORNL and Y-12 and facilitate working relationships with the faculty
- Work 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
R6: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing multi-disciplinary research?

Group 2

- 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
**Group 7**

- 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 PIs to go outside their units to collaborate.
- At all Top 25 state universities, 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.
R8: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing administrative efficiency?

Group 3
- HR needs to restructure PDQ process and conduct better position analysis
- Need to recognize the importance of the intellectual component of the position, 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
- Non-tenured track researchers to be protected where 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?
- ORNL views UT as the “poor stepchild.” When there’s a budget disagreement, UT always gives in; A relationship change is needed here
R9: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing research incentives?

**Group 7**
- Little NIH money at UT; other Top 25 universities without medical schools who have succeeded in securing this funding were very proactive and focused on working toward a goal that would attract NIH money.
- 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
- No infrastructure at UT for putting together huge interdisciplinary proposals; need large, well-equipped team – takes lot of work and administrative help

**KEY POINT #5:**
- Using IRIS as the system of record poses problems for reporting; work is not being captured fully by IRIS, creates wrong impressions when work is not included in reports.
- Can view awards in PAMS by PI and department, so why not pull UT 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?
- Other universities promote and encourage faculty to train in other fields. Course buyouts could give faculty time to do more professional development
R10: How can Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing infrastructure-core facilities?

Not addressed

R11: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing infrastructure-space?

Not addressed
R12: How can the Office of Research assist in supporting and realizing R12?

Group 4
- OR could provide leadership in restructuring overly centralized OIT
- 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
O1: Are there Office of Research activities that can support initiatives associated with the other (faculty, graduate and Undergraduate) components?

**Group 2**

**Top 5 (+ 1) Presented to the group**

- Facilitate the communication for interdisciplinary teams
- Streamline process for grants and contracts with corporations and foundations
- Limited Submission process should be organized better and be more strategic in selecting internally competing proposals – more lead time to develop these proposals is also crucial.
- 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; train graduate students to transition to transformative research
- Sponsored Programs 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
- 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

- Need to facilitate getting our own people together (example: initiatives in neuroscience)
- OR needs to encourage and incentivize faculty to outside of Tennessee; get involved at the national level
- Need faculty to serve on national panels, professional society boards, etc.; track involvements / leverage them for future involvement of other faculty
- Need to build more coordinated outreach program to get UT into local community and more broadly know across the country

**Group 5**

**Summary Report – 12/5/12**

- Prioritization: must figure out what matters, not take shotgun approaches
- What are our priorities and how are we going to improve those, knowing we can’t do everything?
- What exactly can OR do since they may not be able to do everything that needs to be done
- May need to serve in a catalyst role sometimes
- Information and Knowledge Management needs great improvement; lacking in necessary data of several types (example: demographic type data required for major proposals; has been very difficult to pull together in the past few years; Institutional Research doesn’t have it.
- OR needs to provide support for connecting researchers for the increasing numbers of transdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and inter-disciplinary solicitations coming out

- Information and Knowledge Management needs great improvement; lacking in necessary data of several types (example: demographic type data required for major proposals; has been very difficult to pull together in the past few years; Institutional Research doesn’t have it.
- OR needs to provide support for connecting researchers for the increasing numbers of transdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and inter-disciplinary solicitations coming out
The following comment came in by email from a faculty participant, after the listening session:

One point to consider for the org chart is that research computing isn't listed. The data management area is listed, and I think it might be considered to be similar to the research computing area. We've been dealing with large amounts of data at NICS (including archival storage) and I think we should sync about the best way to manage data for proposals/projects across UT.

It might make sense to coordinate the high-end HPC capabilities at NICS with the Newton cluster so users can have a unified experience with training, storage, and porting their apps from a few cores all the way to capability runs with 100k+ cores. It seems to me that we might be able to come with processes and systems that will make compliance and data management less onerous for individual researchers and perhaps providing some value to outgoing proposals.