Executive Summary

The Faculty Senate Research and Service (R&S) Committee, with input from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and UA’s Research Advisory Committee, designed, developed, and conducted a survey to collect faculty feedback regarding research at the UA campus. The survey contained 28 specific questions divided into multiple categories. Requested responses were either to rank in order or assign a weight in order of importance. One could enter written comments for each question.

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) administered the confidential survey from October 3 through November 2, 2018. All faculty members counted for Faculty Senate seat apportionment, including those having full-time, part-time, regular, and temporary employment status, received the survey. An analysis of the survey participants indicated:

- Including the partial responses, there was a 31.5% overall response rate to the survey.
- Regular full-time faculty represented the bulk of the respondents with a 40.2% response rate and 94.7% of all responses received.
- Nearly half of the tenured and tenure-track faculty responded (49.4% and 48.4% respectively), representing 71.8% of all responses.
- In all, some of the questions received up to 600 responses.

With assistance from OIRA, the R&S committee analyzed the survey. Three separate hyperlinked sections in this document contain the results of the survey:

1. Recommendations.
2. Numerical results: Numerical results of the survey (questions 1 to 27) are tabulated based on the demographics of the respondents (tenured, tenure track or non-tenure track, and full-time, part-time, or all).
3. Summary and detailed comments: The committee members read all comments to prepare a summary for each question (questions 1 to 24). In addition, Q28 offers general comments not addressed otherwise.

In addition, detailed comments are organized in three general categories of research thrusts:

- Humanities (HUM),
- Natural Sciences and Engineering (NS), and
- Social Sciences (SS).

Within each of these categories, comments are organized into three groups: Tenured faculty, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty. Part-time faculty provided few comments, and thus, we did not group them separately. Links to detailed comments for different categories are provided at the end of the summary comment for each question.
Recommendations

1. UA should focus its research priorities on (a) increasing scholarly and creative activity output, and (b) increasing research funding. UA Faculty and Administration should increase efforts to promote research, creative activity, and graduate programs, which will require:
   • Rigorous administrative efforts (1) to develop partnerships with industry/business, and (2) to lobby for UA research in Washington, DC and Montgomery.
   • Institutional support for faculty (1) to create impactful websites, and (2) to effectively utilize social media outlets.
   • Support for faculty to host regional, national, and international conferences on the UA campus.
   • Reduced teaching load and/or short-term supplement for faculty who excel in research, as measured by quality/quantity of research publications, scholarly output, creative activities, and external funding.

2. (a) UA should engage faculty to re-align and/or create institutes and other research priorities that build upon existing research strengths. Two factors should be considered in hiring faculty:
   • Build on existing research strengths, and
   • Support critical teaching needs.

   (b) UA should invest both in:
   • Salary enhancement to retain top faculty, and
   • Competitive salary packages (including start-up funds) to hire new faculty.

   (c) Investments are needed in areas such as major research equipment, support services (IT, library), upgrading lab equipment, arts research infrastructure, and central research facilities.

3. UA should increase the graduate student population from the current 14% to 20-25% of the total student population. Emphasis should be placed on recruiting doctoral students. Graduate student recruitment should focus on U.S. universities and colleges, which will require assistantships/fellowships funded initially through a graduate student endowment and then by sponsored research projects. Graduate student support offers and workloads should be competitive on a national basis.

4. Associate Deans for Research should be evaluated periodically by direct faculty feedback. The University’s research support system should be service oriented. Specifically:
   • Improve support for proposal development, writing, editing, and finding research opportunities
   • Streamline compliance procedures, shifting from policing research to facilitating research
   • Seek PI input to enhance grant account reporting and maintenance systems
   • Improve academic software and computer hardware support

5. Engage and empower faculty to achieve research excellence. In particular, recognize faculty excellence based on qualitative/quantitative assessment of publications/creative output, and external funding.

6. Effective faculty recruitment and retention requires a supportive spousal employment policy, as well as access to child-care facilities and a formal family leave policy.
Numerical Data

For each question, two numeric tables are provided.

- The first table contains mean, standard deviation, and ranking of each answer arranged in order of decreasing mean. This information is represented graphically on the right side of the table.

- The second table (usually on the same page) shows the mean of each answer split into two categories: (1) tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track faculty, and (2) Full-time, part-time, and all faculty. Each column in a given category also compares the mean of the column with respect to the mean of the remaining columns in that category (with arrows indicating that the mean is higher or lower than the overall mean). The last row in the table lists the number of responses for each question, which varies depending upon the question.
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 1 Detail View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order your expectations for the research priorities of the University.</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>Rank1 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase scholarly and creative activity output</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase research funding</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve research ranking</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve community engagement and economic development</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order your expectations for the research priorities of the University.</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th>By Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase scholarly and creative activity output</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase research funding</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve research ranking</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve community engagement and economic development</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question 2 Detail View

### Weight how new tenure-track or tenured faculty hires should be allocated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To support the university’s existing areas of research strength</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the teaching needs of the colleges</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create new areas of research strength, based on competitive proposals submitted by faculty members</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the four new university research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th>By Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the university’s existing areas of research strength</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the teaching needs of the colleges</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>28.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create new areas of research strength, based on competitive proposals submitted by faculty members</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the four new university research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty Research Survey Results**

**Question 3 Detail View**

**Weight** the following groups in order of where emphasis should be placed to support the research priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>18.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctoral researchers</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Weight Comparison**

Weight the following groups in order of where emphasis should be placed to support the research priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doctoral researchers</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's students</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate students</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 4 Detail View

**Weight the impact (positive) of the following on research growth.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empower faculty and staff for research excellence</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote research and graduate programs</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernize and streamline research infrastructure and support systems</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and invest in research areas of strength</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Weight Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empower faculty and staff for research excellence</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>26.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote research and graduate programs</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernize and streamline research infrastructure and support systems</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and invest in research areas of strength</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses 252 162 164 558 20 578
# Faculty Research Survey Results

## Question 5 Detail View

**Weight** the allocation of effort that should be put forth by the following groups to externally promote research, creative activity, and graduate programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>30.48</td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University administration</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR professionals</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>19.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>30.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University administration</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>23.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR professionals</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents:** 550
### Question 6 Detail View

**Rank** the following in the order you expect will have the greatest impact on externally promoting research and graduate programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank 1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impactful websites including individual faculty research websites</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-media, radio, and television outlets</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA recruiter add-on presentations on graduate programs at recruiting events</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major university events (sporting events, convocation, etc.)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs, brochures, and handouts</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Mean Rank Comparison

**Rank the following in the order you expect will have the greatest impact on externally promoting research and graduate programs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Description</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impactful websites including individual faculty research websites</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-media, radio, and television outlets</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA recruiter add-on presentations on graduate programs at recruiting events</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major university events (sporting events, convocation, etc.)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs, brochures, and handouts</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 7 Detail View

**Rank in order the priorities UA should have to develop relationships with sponsors and/or decision makers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research partnerships/collaborations with industry/businesses</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbying in Washington and Montgomery for research at UA</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and economic outreach</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic efforts to attract new industry/businesses</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni outreach and engagement</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Rank Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Priority Description</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research partnerships/collaborations with industry/businesses</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobbying in Washington and Montgomery for research at UA</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community and economic outreach</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic efforts to attract new industry/businesses</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni outreach and engagement</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Mean rank comparison includes mean rank of each priority by tenured, tenure track, non-tenure track, full time, part time, and all faculty members.
# Faculty Research Survey Results

## Question 8 Detail View

**Rank** the following in the order you expect will strengthen research engagement of the UA community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>Rank 1 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting regional, national, and international conferences</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting department, center, or institute-level seminar series</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting eminent scholars (top researchers, company executives, etc.) for short-term visits on UA campus</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting summer workshops on research topics of national/international interest</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging graduate students to participate in research competitions at regional/national level</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mean Rank Comparison

**Rank** the following in the order you expect will strengthen research engagement of the UA community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hosting regional, national, and international conferences</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting department, center, or institute-level seminar series</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting eminent scholars (top researchers, company executives, etc.) for short-term visits on UA campus</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting summer workshops on research topics of national/international interest</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging graduate students to participate in research competitions at regional/national level</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 9 Detail View

The following strategies to recognize productive faculty in research and creative activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load for faculty who excel in research</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term annual supplement (bonus, GRA and other research support) to top researcher(s)</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named chair position for senior faculty (professors)</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named chair position for faculty in mid-career (Associate professors) and early career (Assistant professors)</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time annual award with plaque, monetary compensation, and research presentation by top researcher(s)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced teaching load for faculty who excel in research</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>30.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term annual supplement (bonus, GRA and other research support) to top researcher(s)</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>24.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named chair position for senior faculty (professors)</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>15.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named chair position for faculty in mid-career (Associate professors) and early career (Assistant professors)</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time annual award with plaque, monetary compensation, and research presentation by top researcher(s)</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 10 Detail View

**Rank the following approaches for establishing research areas of strength.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>Rank1%</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align research institutes with the existing research strengths of the faculty</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on competing proposals from faculty</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on strategic initiatives of the administration</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align all research with the four new research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align research institutes with the existing research strengths of the faculty</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on competing proposals from faculty</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on strategic initiatives of the administration</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align all research with the four new research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 11 Detail View

**Rank in order the priorities UA should put in place for investment in personnel.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary (and research support) enhancement to retain existing faculty</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive salary packages (including startup funds) to hire new faculty</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student fellowships to recruit and retain top students</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time research staff and technician support</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sabbatical opportunities for pre- and post-tenure</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary (and research support) enhancement to retain existing faculty</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive salary packages (including startup funds) to hire new faculty</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student fellowships to recruit and retain top students</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time research staff and technician support</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sabbatical opportunities for pre- and post-tenure</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question 12 Detail View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight the optimum allocation of investments by UA in research and creative activity infrastructure</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire major new equipment and capabilities in alignment with research priorities</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance research capabilities of library, IT, high-performance computing, etc.</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and replace equipment in individual research-productive labs</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance arts research infrastructure (studios, gallery/exhibition spaces, theater/performance venues, interdisciplinary arts research labs)</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance centralized research facilities (Central Analytical Facility, Animal Care Facility, etc.)</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight the optimum allocation of investments by UA in research and creative activity infrastructure</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire major new equipment and capabilities in alignment with research priorities</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance research capabilities of library, IT, high-performance computing, etc.</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and replace equipment in individual research-productive labs</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>22.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance arts research infrastructure (studios, gallery/exhibition spaces, theater/performance venues, interdisciplinary arts research labs)</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance centralized research facilities (Central Analytical Facility, Animal Care Facility, etc.)</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>15.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question 13 Detail View

**Weight** the following options for percentage of graduate and professional (e.g., law school) students with respect to the total UA students (current percentage is 14%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>35.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>24.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>39.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊕ 0.29</td>
<td>⊕ 2.56</td>
<td>⊕ 3.04</td>
<td>⊕ 19.61</td>
<td>⊕ 19.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>37.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊕ 4.08</td>
<td>⊕ 0.12</td>
<td>⊕ 5.26</td>
<td>⊕ 11.41</td>
<td>⊕ 11.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>39.74</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊕ 1.88</td>
<td>⊕ 1.55</td>
<td>⊕ 3.99</td>
<td>⊕ 22.76</td>
<td>⊕ 22.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⊕ 1.72</td>
<td>⊕ 1.78</td>
<td>⊕ 4.02</td>
<td>⊕ 7.77</td>
<td>⊕ 7.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 14 Detail View

**Weight the allocation of where UA should focus its efforts to recruit graduate students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National universities and colleges</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional universities and colleges</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA undergraduate students</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International universities in developed countries</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International universities in developing countries</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National universities and colleges</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>36.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional universities and colleges</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>17.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA undergraduate students</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International universities in developing countries</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 15 Detail View

**Weight** the importance of the following sources of funding to support graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-funded GRA/GTA support</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-funded graduate fellowships</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored research funding support</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition waivers/discounts for self-supported students, spouses, etc.</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental awards to enhance sponsored-research support</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-funded GRA/GTA support</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>32.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-funded graduate fellowships</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored research funding support</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition waivers/discounts for self-supported students, spouses, etc.</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental awards to enhance sponsored-research support</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 16 Detail View

**Weight** the steps that should be taken to raise the profile of graduate studies on the UA campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer competitive salaries and workloads</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>25.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer internal research grant opportunities for graduate students</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update graduate school policies including course-work/graduation requirements</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and cater to social, cultural, and career needs of the graduate students</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen/support graduate student organizations (e.g., GSA)</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer competitive salaries and workloads</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>40.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶10.8</td>
<td>▶5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer internal research grant opportunities for graduate students</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>24.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶2.32</td>
<td>▶3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update graduate school policies including course-work/graduation requirements</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>12.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶0.62</td>
<td>▶0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and cater to social, cultural, and career needs of the graduate students</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶5.22</td>
<td>▶1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen/support graduate student organizations (e.g., GSA)</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶2.55</td>
<td>▶0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Question 17 Detail View

### Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Proposal Submission Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>Rank 1 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal development, writing and editorial support</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in finding opportunities for research and creative activities</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal process to pro-actively develop collaborative team proposals</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget development procedures</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, training, and personal communications about Office of Sponsored Programs resources</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Proposal Submission Support.</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal development, writing and editorial support</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in finding opportunities for research and creative activities</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal process to pro-actively develop collaborative team proposals</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget development procedures</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, training, and personal communications about Office of Sponsored Programs resources</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 18 Detail View

**Rank** in order the importance of the following to improve Research Compliance Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Rank 1 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed up/streamline IRB/IACUC/ITAR procedures</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from policing research to facilitating research ensuring transparency and compliance</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline on-line research compliance training (e.g., financial disclosure, chemical/laser safety, etc.)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper training and oversight of Research Compliance Personnel</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication, training, and seminar about research compliance</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed up/streamline IRB/IACUC/ITAR procedures</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from policing research to facilitating research ensuring transparency and compliance</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline on-line research compliance training (e.g., financial disclosure, chemical/laser safety, etc.)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper training and oversight of Research Compliance Personnel</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication, training, and seminar about research compliance</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 19 Detail View

#### Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Grant Management Support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Rank1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to enhance the grant account reporting system, software, and tools and training</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to simplify multi-year grant maintenance in consultation with PI needs</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-actively monitor external grants to facilitate timely continuation or renewal requests and/or closure</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to institute flexibility in the purchasing process for research supplies and equipment</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer seminars, training, and communication about grant management</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to enhance the grant account reporting system, software, and tools and training</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to simplify multi-year grant maintenance in consultation with PI needs</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-actively monitor external grants to facilitate timely continuation or renewal requests and/or closure</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek PI input to institute flexibility in the purchasing process for research supplies and equipment</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer seminars, training, and communication about grant management</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 20 Detail View

**Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Information Technology Support.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order the importance</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic software and computer hardware support</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-performance computing, cloud computing</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web video conferencing tools and facilities</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large data storage</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, training, and communication about IT services</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean Rank Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order the importance</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic software and computer hardware support</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-performance computing, cloud computing</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web video conferencing tools and facilities</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large data storage</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, training, and communication about IT services</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty Research Survey Results**

**Question 21 Detail View**

**Weight the importance of the following groups that should be evaluated by faculty feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans of Research</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP staff and administration</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance office personnel</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and purchasing office personnel</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT personnel</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Weight Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans of Research</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>33.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP staff and administration</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>23.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance office personnel</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and purchasing office personnel</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT personnel</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Faculty Research Survey Results

## Question 22 Detail View

**Weight the importance of the following factors that should be considered for reducing teaching load**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality/quantity of research publications, scholarly output, and creative activities</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funding</td>
<td>26.69</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/undergraduate research student supervisions</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to university and local community outreach</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to professional organizations</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/quantity of research publications, scholarly output, and creative activities</td>
<td>39.66</td>
<td>29.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲6.99</td>
<td>▼8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲0.9</td>
<td>▲6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/undergraduate research student supervisions</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲0.29</td>
<td>▲1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to university and local community outreach</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>16.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲3.52</td>
<td>▲7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to professional organizations</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲2.7</td>
<td>▼3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Research Survey Results

### Question 23 Detail View

**Weight** the importance of the following priorities to improve faculty recruitment and retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spousal employment</td>
<td>30.13</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to child care facilities</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal university policies on family leave and tenure-clock modifications to accommodate life circumstances (e.g., birth of a child)</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to recreational center and related facilities</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>12.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to elder care resources</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A centralized website for social/cultural/community needs of faculty</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight the importance of the following priorities to improve faculty recruitment and retention</td>
<td>Mean Weight Comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Tenure</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tenure Track</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-Tenure Track</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal employment</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>31.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to child care facilities</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>24.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal university policies on family leave and tenure-clock modifications to accommodate life circumstances (e.g., birth of a child)</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to recreational center and related facilities</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to elder care resources</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A centralized website for social/cultural/community needs of faculty</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 24 Detail View

**Weight** the importance of the following criteria to identify faculty excellence in research and creative activity

### Mean Weight Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative assessment of publications/creative outputs produced (e.g. publications that appear in high-impact journals, monograph published with a prestigious university press, creative activities in venues nationally or internationally recognized as prestigious)</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative assessment of publications/creative outputs produced</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree production</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative assessment of return on investment for research start-up funds</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses** 232  146  128  488  18  506
Faculty Research Survey Results

Question 25 Detail View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assign a percentage to your responsibilities</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40.74</td>
<td>19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/creative activity</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>18.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assign a percentage to your responsibilities</th>
<th>By Tenure</th>
<th>By Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>35.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△9.85</td>
<td>△7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/creative activity</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△5.03</td>
<td>△11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△1.16</td>
<td>△0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>△3.62</td>
<td>△4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 26 Detail View

**Weight** the importance of the following elements in your research and creative activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human subjects</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>44.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential financial conflicts of interest</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to politically unstable or physically treacherous locations</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous or regulated chemicals</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological materials</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>17.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous equipment or conditions (e.g., lasers, extreme heat/cold, vacuum, radiological materials)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrate animals other than humans</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight the importance of the following elements in your research and creative activities</td>
<td>Mean Weight Comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By Tenure</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human subjects</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>65.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷13.01</td>
<td>▷8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential financial conflicts of interest</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷1.1</td>
<td>▷5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to politically unstable or physically treacherous locations</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷2.84</td>
<td>▷1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous or regulated chemicals</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷4.33</td>
<td>▷0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological materials</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷1.24</td>
<td>▷0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous equipment or conditions (e.g., lasers, extreme heat/cold, vacuum, radiological materials)</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷3.84</td>
<td>▷0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebrate animals other than humans</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▷0.43</td>
<td>▷0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Research Survey Results

#### Question 27 Detail View

**Weight** the distribution of financial needs for being successful in research and creative activities in your discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your salary/benefits (summer support, teaching buy-out, soft-money position)</td>
<td>37.68</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/benefits for others (technicians, graduate students, postdocs, staff)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, registration fees</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/supplies/reagents/contract services</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant costs (e.g., incentives or compensation for study participation)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database, software, or infrastructure access/license fees</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication costs</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight the distribution of financial needs for being successful in research and creative activities in your discipline</td>
<td>Mean Weight Comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your salary/benefits (summer support, teaching buy-out, soft-money position)</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>35.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/benefits for others (technicians, graduate students, postdocs, staff)</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>19.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, registration fees</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>16.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/supplies/reagents/contract services</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant costs (e.g., incentives or compensation for study participation)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database, software, or infrastructure access/license fees</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication costs</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary and Detailed Comments

Use the link below the summary for each question to read detailed comments in the document.

Comments are divided in three broad categories:
   HUM: Humanities, NS: Natural Sciences, SS: Social Sciences
In each category, comments are arranged according to the tenure status:
   T: Tenured, TT: Tenure-track, NTT: Non-tenure track

Question 1: Rank in order your expectations for the research priorities of the University.
   a. Improve research ranking
   b. Increase research funding
   c. Increase scholarly and creative activity output
   d. Improve community engagement and economic development

Each unit should establish its own priorities and ensure that all three elements (research, teaching, service) are in balance. Scholarship, creative activity, and quality of these must be top goals. Quality should receive greater emphasis. We must not forget that funding opportunities vary across disciplines. Too much focus on funding alone will be wasted faculty time. Funding is a means and not an end. The University needs to make investments in research to increase internal opportunities, and to improve research support (the current process to gain internal support is too burdensome at present). The internal support system should be smarter and less bureaucratic. Research productivity should be recognized and rewarded (e.g., reduced teaching). Create a true research culture. Diversify by adding funding sources outside NSF, DOE, and NIH. Hire more research faculty. Gradually increase research activity among current faculty combined with hiring senior faculty with significant external funding. Travel budgets for faculty to attend research conferences have not kept up. Increase leave opportunities. Retain successful faculty. Allow higher pay for technicians without HR restricting it. Research should not be a business. Research can support local communities and provide economic development. Need greater visible impact of research across Alabama. Adjuncts represent a large pool of wasted opportunity for the University. Involve/invite their participation.

   Detailed Comments:  Q1-HUM  Q1-NS  Q1-SS

Question 2: Weight how new tenure-track or tenured faculty hires should be allocated.
   a. To support the four new university research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)
   b. To support the university’s existing areas of research strength
   c. To create new areas of research strength, based on competitive proposals submitted by faculty members
   d. To support the teaching needs of the colleges

Make sure we can teach our students. Students need skilled, dedicated teachers. Give teaching needs greater weight. UA is in no position to focus on research at the expense of teaching. Need more faculty to keep up with increased enrollment. Support a balanced approach to recruit grant-generating faculty and maintaining appropriate faculty numbers. Support current needs and strengths first. Be careful not to over-allocate to new initiatives. Improve research infrastructure and support system. Don’t create a two-tier system on campus. Each college should have a mini-OSP. New institutes are not viable, are a waste of
money, and were developed without faculty input. University has taken a top-down approach in creating institutes, which seems disastrous. Institutes are not really helpful to the overall mission. Grow them at a slower pace so they can demonstrate productivity. Don’t force direction of each departments’ hires to be related to institutes. Maximize existing strengths rather than force tie-in with institutes. Lack of mission, structure, and communication are symptomatic of research dysfunction at UA.

Detailed Comments:  Q2-HUM  Q2-NS  Q2-SS

Question 3:  Weight the following groups in order of where emphasis should be placed to support the research priorities

a.  PhD students
b.  Master’s students
c.  Technical Staff
d.  Post-doctoral researchers
e.  Undergraduate students

Research priorities should include those outside STEM. Graduate students are underpaid and overworked. Place emphasis on graduate student research. Improve quality of graduate students. Better graduate students drive up our profile and our reach. Increase fellowships to recruit quality graduate students. Both PhD and MS students should receive focus. Increasing PhD assistantships could be even more of a research spark than hiring new faculty. Post-docs are ok. Provide bridge funding for post-docs to successful research faculty. UG and MS students should be incorporated into robust research programs. Groom UG students for research so they can pursue advanced degrees at UA. Find more ways to involve them, increase support for them. Great UG’s can make significant contributions to research. Build solid Masters’ programs so we can then have better PhD programs. A strong Masters’ program is needed to support research thrusts. If no one trains MS students in research, we will have no qualified PhD students. Attract more PhD students, fee-paying MS students are not going to help research. Simplify course requirements. Need more technical support staff, and internal support to operate and maintain equipment; need hard-money technicians. Hire research faculty, and research assistant professors but with discretion. Need greater administrative support, infrastructure improvements. Improve IRB process and communication with Research Compliance. Provide differential teaching for research active faculty. Separate Graduate Student Council for SGA. Teach our students and serve our communities.

Detailed Comments:  Q3-HUM  Q3-NS  Q3-SS

Question 4:  Weight the positive impact of the following on research growth.

a.  Promote research and graduate programs
b.  Recognize and invest in research areas of strength
c.  Increase the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students
d.  Modernize and streamline research infrastructure and support systems
e.  Empower faculty and staff for research excellence

Need more graduate student lines. More funding for English GTAs. More support for graduate student recruitment. Increase graduate fellowships. Emphasize quality. Allow humanities to keep tuition dollars to compensate GTAs. Support faculty who have already spent time at UA. Strong research and facilities should come before promotion and growth. Turn adjunct positions into tenure track positions. PhDs must be able to find competitive jobs, otherwise reduce PhD students. Invest $1 billion in research. Provide more internal funding. Increase faculty release time and start-up packages. Change attitudes about research: Associate deans should be enabling research, institute directors should be supportive of faculty, technical staff should be doing technical jobs. Faculty end up beaten down by bureaucracy and negative feedback. Staff end up under-utilized and performing secretarial work rather than providing research support. Need web-era technological skill sets for research infrastructure and support. User fees should
be kept at a minimum. Our instrumentation is old and no longer supports cutting-edge research. Capital campaign to update aging infrastructure for the sciences, art, and humanities. US does not need every university to churn out PhDs. Research support system needs additional resources. Better IRB staff and computer system; it is outdated and power-hungry and needs a complete overhaul. Reduce faculty responsibilities for mundane tasks. Need specialists to help with research grants and support. Improve climate for diversity.

**Detailed Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4-HUM</th>
<th>Q4-NS</th>
<th>Q4-SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 5:** Weight the allocation of effort that should be put forth by the following groups to externally promote research, creative activity, and graduate programs.

a. PR professionals  
b. Faculty  
c. University Administration  
d. Research staff  
e. Students

Multiple comments from Humanities (Hum), Natural Science (NS), and Social Science (SS) faculty stated that administration and PR staff for promoting research should not be expanded beyond what currently exists. Comments from all groups tended to represent diametrically opposed opinions, from faculty being solely responsible for promoting their research, to the expectation that only administration should promote research. Many of the comments supporting promotion of research by faculty also mentioned that funding should be provided for faculty to attend conferences to promote their research.

**Detailed Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5-HUM</th>
<th>Q5-NS</th>
<th>Q5-SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 6:** Rank the following in the order you expect will have the greatest impact on externally promoting research and graduate programs.

a. Major university events (sporting events, convocation, etc.)  
b. Social-media, radio, and television outlets  
c. Impactful websites including individual faculty research websites  
d. Programs, brochures, and handouts  
e. UA recruiter add-on presentations on graduate programs at recruiting events

Multiple comments from all groups (H, NS, and SS) stated that none of these are effective for promoting research and graduate programs (and facilitating graduate recruiting). A smaller number of comments supported faculty websites as a promotional tool, and about an equal number supported using sporting events to publicize research. An even smaller number supported the use of social media for promoting research. Multiple comments stated that research should be promoted through conference presentations and publication in recognized peer-reviewed journals. A number of comments suggested that the university should invest in faculty/facilities to develop high-profile programs. Multiple mentions were made of establishing contacts between reporters and UA researchers to position faculty as expert resources for news stories.

**Detailed Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6-HUM</th>
<th>Q6-NS</th>
<th>Q6-SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question 7:** Rank in order the priorities UA should have to develop relationships with sponsors and/or decision makers.

a. Lobbying in Washington and Montgomery for research at UA  
b. Research partnerships/collaborations with industry/businesses  
c. Community and economic outreach  
d. Strategic efforts to attract new industry/businesses  
e. Alumni outreach and engagement
A number of faculty from all groups (H, NS, and SS) view the expenditure of funds to support these efforts as a waste; they support directly funding research. Multiple individuals support improving/exploiting relationships with alumni. A couple of individuals in the Social Science group point out that Alabama suffers from the nation’s perception of our position on particular social issues, which may impact our efforts to attract outside investment in research.

**Detailed Comments:** Q7-HUM Q7-NS Q7-SS

**Question 8:** Rank the following in the order you expect will strengthen research engagement of the UA community.

- a. Hosting department, center, or institute-level seminar series
- b. Hosting regional, national, and international conferences
- c. Hosting summer workshops on research topics of national/international interest
- d. Encouraging graduate students to participate in research competitions at regional/national level
- e. Hosting eminent scholars (top researchers, company executives, etc.) for short-term visits on UA campus

Comments from faculty members in Humanities and Natural Science support hosting eminent scholars/faculty for a duration of between one semester and one year, and both groups have members that are supportive of hosting seminar series and/or internationally-relevant research events/conferences. All of these are presumed/expected to be supported financially by UA. Comments from faculty members in Social Science indicate funding should be used to provide seed grants, and support research labs, journal editorships, and participation of faculty and grad students in conferences.

**Detailed Comments:** Q8-HUM Q8-NS Q8-SS

**Question 9:** Weight the following strategies to recognize productive faculty in research and creative activity.

- a. Named chair position for senior faculty (professors)
- b. Named chair position for faculty in mid-career (Associate professors) and early career (Assistant professors)
- c. One-time annual award with plaque, monetary compensation, and research presentation by top researcher(s)
- d. Short-term annual supplement (bonus, GRA and other research support) to top researcher(s)
- e. Reduced teaching load for faculty who excel in research

Faculty members’ comments stressed that time is the most important resource needed to produce more research, with reduced teaching loads and sabbaticals being examples that would enable that additional research time. This was particularly pronounced in full-time non-TT faculty but was mentioned repeatedly amongst all full-time faculty comments. How “top researchers” are determined by the administration was also mentioned many times, with concerns of cronyism and the use of awarded external grant dollar amounts as the primary determining factors for the selection of research support by the administration. There were also multiple comments (primarily by faculty outside of the “NS”) that illustrated concern of funding inequities between disciplines — e.g. arts and humanities funding is far less available, and funding that is available is at far lower amounts than many other disciplines. Named/endowed professorships were almost unilaterally seen as not a good use of resources for support by faculty in all categories. More internal funding resources were named multiple times as important “carrots” for research productivity.

**Detailed Comments:** Q9-HUM Q9-NS Q9-SS

**Question 10:** Rank the following approaches for establishing research areas of strength.

- a. Align all research with the four new research institutes (Transportation, Life Sciences, Cyber Security, and Water)
- b. Align research institutes with the existing research strengths of the faculty
- c. Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on competing proposals from faculty
d. Create new research clusters (cross-disciplinary or otherwise) based on strategic initiatives of the administration

A centralized institute-based research approach/focus was almost universally criticized by all commenting respondents. It was also mentioned multiple times that plans for any centers or institutes should come from faculty interests/strengths already present at UA, and those plans should come from faculty, not from the upper administration. Multiple comments stated that from their point of view the existing research institutes do not represent the range of research at UA — especially arts, humanities, and social science research. These comments were quite consistent between tenured, TT, and non-TT full-time faculty.

**Detailed Comments:**  
Q10-HUM  Q10-NS  Q10-SS

**Question 11:** Rank in order the priorities UA should put in place for investment in personnel.

- a. Competitive salary packages (including startup funds) to hire new faculty
- b. Salary (and research support) enhancement to retain existing faculty
- c. Graduate student fellowships to recruit and retain top students
- d. Full-time research staff and technician support
- e. Increased sabbatical opportunities for pre- and post-tenure

Across all responses, the recurrent theme is non-competitiveness of salary offered to the existing and new faculty. Salary compression is a major concern across tenured faculty, many expressing thoughts about leaving UA based on higher market salaries and better offers made to new hires. The issue of poor retention and recruitment due to non-competitive salaries is also pronounced in the responses from tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, who feel that UA could do better in both. The salary and research support disparity is apparent in responses from humanities, where research grants are rare and carry less dollar amount than in other disciplines. Some suggested improvements to increase research productivity include better GRA/GTA support, support for conference travel, and increased availability of sabbaticals. The aspects such as startup packages and GRA/GTA support are considered very important but consistently rank lower than compensation across all faculty categories.

**Detailed Comments:**  
Q11-HUM  Q11-NS  Q11-SS

**Question 12:** Weight the optimum allocation of investments by UA in research and creative activity infrastructure.

- a. Maintain and replace equipment in individual research-productive labs
- b. Acquire major new equipment and capabilities in alignment with research priorities
- c. Enhance research capabilities of library, IT, high-performance computing, etc.
- d. Enhance centralized research facilities (Central Analytical Facility, Animal Care Facility, etc.)
- e. Enhance arts research infrastructure (studios, gallery/exhibition spaces, theater/performance venues, interdisciplinary arts research labs)

Across all areas, faculty identified a need for more centralized resources for conducting research and engaging in collaboration with other faculty. Moreover, faculty in the natural sciences highlighted that a more proactive and faculty empowered stance towards maintenance of current equipment might alleviate some of the challenges faculty currently face. Faculty in both the social and natural sciences also noted a need for an overhaul of OIT as the current services were found lacking. Faculty in the social sciences expressed their frustration at a lack of expected equipment (particularly an MRI) and concerns about a lack of investment in the library (especially considering proposed plans to move the stacks off campus).

**Detailed Comments:**  
Q12-HUM  Q12-NS  Q12-SS
Question 13: Weight the following options for percentage of graduate and professional (e.g., law school) students with respect to the total UA students (current percentage is 14%).

a. 10%
b. 15%
c. 20%
d. 25%

Across all areas, faculty identified a need to focus on improving the quality of the graduate students recruited as opposed to the quantity. Also, several faculty members in the natural and social sciences noted that focusing on online and professional programs does not help the research productivity of the university. Faculty in the social sciences suggested that the institution should not lose sight of its existing excellence in undergraduate research to chase potential gains in graduate student research.

Detailed Comments:  Q13-HUM  Q13-NS  Q13-SS

Question 14: Weight the allocation of where UA should focus its efforts to recruit graduate students.

a. UA undergraduate students
b. Regional universities and colleges
c. National universities and colleges
d. International universities in developing countries
e. International universities in developed countries

Several faculty pointed out that local and regional programs that either do not have any graduate programs or are terminal masters are likely UA’s best recruitment target. However, feelings differed some as to whether the university should view its undergraduate program as the best source for recruitment.

Detailed Comments:  Q14-HUM  Q14-NS  Q14-SS

Question 15: Weight the importance of the following sources of funding to support graduate students.

a. Sponsored research funding support
b. University-funded graduate fellowships
c. University-funded GRA/GTA support
d. Tuition waivers/discounts for self-supported students, spouses, etc.
e. Supplemental awards to enhance sponsored-research support

Tenured faculty recommend higher stipends and tuition waivers to attract more graduate assistants (a particularly acute problem in arts/humanities and social science fields). GTAs and GAs are valuable for enhancing the reputation of the university and for assisting with teaching and research activities. Tenure-track faculty have the same recommendations regarding attracting graduate assistants to enhance the reputation of the university and to provide experiences necessary to transition graduate assistants into tenure-track faculty at UA or other institutions. Non-tenure track faculty express the same concerns in addition to recommending providing graduate assistants more opportunities to teach.

Detailed Comments:  Q15-HUM  Q15-NS  Q15-SS

Question 16: Weight the steps that should be taken to raise the profile of graduate studies on the UA campus.

a. Update graduate school policies including course-work/graduation requirements
b. Offer internal research grant opportunities for graduate students
c. Strengthen/support graduate student organizations (e.g., GSA)
d. Identify and cater to social, cultural, and career needs of the graduate students
e. Offer competitive salaries and workloads
The most commonly cited way to improve the profile of graduate studies on campus was, again, providing better stipends to graduate assistants. Many also expressed concern about the high workload that is not comparable to what graduate students experience at peer institutions. Several commented that the amount of coursework required to earn a PhD is excessive, which takes away time from students’ research. Tenured faculty recommend the university recruit top level faculty to attract high quality graduate students. Additional recommendations from both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty include better work/life balance and career-focused mentoring for graduate students as well as provide better stipends to graduate assistants. Tenure-track faculty had similar comments regarding graduate assistantship salaries. Non-tenure track faculty commented on work/life balance for graduate students.

Detailed Comments: Q16-HUM Q16-NS Q16-SS

Question 17: Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Proposal Submission Support.

a. Help in finding opportunities for research and creative activities
b. Proposal development, writing and editorial support
c. Internal process to pro-actively develop collaborative team proposals
d. Budget development procedures
e. Seminars, training, and personal communications about Office of Sponsored Programs resources

In regard to submission of grant proposals, faculty in all research areas are in agreement that OSP is in need of serious improvement. There were many complaints about high staff turnover, overworked staff, and proposals rejected without review because OSP did not submit them by the deadline. Several commented that in other universities of our size, each department has its own dedicated staff member for grant writing support. The help with writing grants that OSP offers does not usually extend above the level of proofreading; more meaningful feedback and assistance is desired. Researchers in social sciences and the arts and humanities also noted that there is no one at OSP with expertise in these fields, making the office nearly useless in their search for external funding. There were also complaints about post-award accounting support.

Detailed Comments: Q17-HUM Q17-NS Q17-SS

Question 18: Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Research Compliance Support.

a. Change from policing research to facilitating research ensuring transparency and compliance
b. Speed up/streamline IRB/IACUC/ITAR procedures
c. Streamline on-line research compliance training (e.g., financial disclosure, chemical/laser safety, etc.)
d. Personal communication, training, and seminar about research compliance
e. Proper training and oversight of Research Compliance Personnel

Numerically, the highest priority items for improving research compliance included streamlining institutional board processes (IRB/IACUC/ITAR) and improving the relationship between researchers and research compliance from adversarial to collaborative. There is also the suggested need to improve the online compliance training system, especially among the natural science disciplines. Most comments came from the social and natural science disciplines. There are mixed comments, some suggesting research compliance oversight and support has really improved recently at UA, while others indicate a need for greater improvement in terms of interaction with faculty and facilitation of research planning and administration. The pattern in the comments about the research compliance office is that the role they play seems to be much more about regulating and telling researchers what they cannot do rather than facilitating researchers to accomplish their research goals within regulations. There were many comments about the Institutional Review Board (IRB) being over-zealous in its requirements, too slow, and out of step with IRBs at other institutions. This pattern was especially strongly noted in the comments and numerical data from the social sciences. A worthy recommendation is to study the research compliance office at other institutions that seem to function well and adopt their best practices. Another
consistent comment is that the research compliance personnel are overworked and underpaid. They are spread too thin to be able to play a proactive and collaborative role in the research process. Further comments included frustration about a lack of consequences for researchers who fail to comply with policies, and that online safety training requirements are onerous and misaligned with researcher/institutional roles.

**Detailed Comments:** Q18-HUM   Q18-NS   Q18-SS

**Question 19:** Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Grant Management Support.

a. Seek PI input to enhance the grant account reporting system, software, and tools and training
b. Seek PI input to simplify multi-year grant maintenance in consultation with PI needs
c. Pro-actively monitor external grants to facilitate timely continuation or renewal requests and/or closure
d. Seek PI input to institute flexibility in the purchasing process for research supplies and equipment
e. Offer seminars, training, and communication about grant management

Overall, the top priority for improving grant management support is to involve faculty/PIs in policy and process planning for grant management. The need to enhance grant account reporting, software, tools and training with faculty input ranked especially high. The written comments were consistent with this pattern and also included specific concerns about the burden placed on PIs for budget management, the slowness of the Contracts and Grants office in processing new grants and expenses, failure to provide routine timely updates on grant budget spending, and the use of confusing software (Cayuse) for tracking grants. Many comments indicate a disconnect between grant accounting and the PI, and the need to have a more PI-user friendly system with more regular, understandable accounting records. Again, it is recommended that the staff need to be supported with higher pay and more personnel.

**Detailed Comments:** Q19-HUM   Q19-NS   Q19-SS

**Question 20:** Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Information Technology Support

a. Academic software and computer hardware support
b. Web video conferencing tools and facilities
c. High-performance computing, cloud computing
d. Seminars, training, and communication about IT services
e. Large data storage

The highest priority item for improving IT for research focused on the need for more personal, one-on-one, academic software and hardware support. The written comments reflected this pattern with comments relating to needing support on personal computers. An example was the need for OIT to help with installation of academic software on student’s personal computers since now a lot of research is being done on computers owned by individuals rather than the university. The ability to provide qualified and personalized technical support hinges on having a larger number of better trained support personnel. Those faculty that were aware that UA had access to Zoom felt that it was a great resource to support virtual communications for collaborations, and others appeared to be unaware of this resource and thus frustrated by the inability to have effective virtual communications. A simple fix for discontent about support for virtual collaborations would be to better publicize the Zoom option to the faculty as a whole. Also, there is a need for an institutional method for organizing and archiving research data to be in compliance with federal funding agencies’ requirements for proper data management.

**Detailed Comments:** Q20-HUM   Q20-NS   Q20-SS

**Question 21:** Weight the importance of the following groups that should be evaluated by faculty feedback.

a. Associate Deans of Research
b. OSP staff and administration
c. Compliance office personnel
d. Accounting and purchasing office personnel
e. IT personnel

There are a range of opinions from faculty. Faculty feel that the associate Deans of research, the center Directors, and the VP for research should be evaluated yearly. The different offices such as OSP, Purchasing, IRB etc. should be evaluated but not necessarily specific individual staff. In addition, only those faculty who have to deal with the specific office should submit evaluations. What most faculty seem to agree on is that a formal method to communicate problems occurring with different offices is needed, especially for repeat problems. The faculty should also be informed about the steps that the offices plan to take to rectify the problems. Some offices, especially purchasing, are very restrictive. In short, a customer-driven approach to service is warranted with better communication between departments and better paid staff, especially accountants to help with grant fund management.

Detailed Comments: Q21-HUM  Q21-NS  Q21-SS

Question 22: Weight the importance of the following factors that should be considered for reducing teaching load.

a. Quality/quantity of research publications, scholarly output, and creative activities
b. External funding
c. Graduate/undergraduate research student supervisions
d. Service to professional organizations
e. Service to university and local community outreach

Many faculty from humanities and social sciences feel that all departments should have similar policies for teaching load. Funding alone should not be the sole measure used to decide who gets a reduced teaching load. Scholarly output should also be used to gauge faculty success. Appropriate value and FTE credit are not given for faculty mentoring undergrad students, and students in general, in research. Some faculty have suggested that a formal application procedure for requesting a reduced teaching load in a semester would be beneficial.

Detailed Comments: Q22-HUM  Q22-NS  Q22-SS

Question 23: Weight the importance of the following priorities to improve faculty recruitment and retention.

a. Spousal employment
b. Access to child care facilities
c. Access to elder care resources
d. Access to recreational center and related facilities
e. A centralized website for social/cultural/community needs of faculty
f. Formal university policies on family leave and tenure-clock modifications to accommodate life circumstances (e.g. birth of a child)

Faculty members’ comments stressed the importance of access to quality childcare facilities, formal policy on spousal hiring, and expanding the policies for family leave including maternity leave. The issue of lack of quality childcare in the Tuscaloosa area and the long waiting time for UA’s Child Development Center was mentioned repeatedly and is a concern shared by the tenured, tenure–track, and non-tenured faculty. The need for building a new UA childcare center on campus similar to the existing Child Development Center, with no/reduced waiting time, was proposed. There was an obvious negative impact of lack of quality childcare and support for spousal hiring on retention of existing faculty/new hires, and the productivity of current faculty noted in the comments. Another concern obvious from the comments is
the need for improvement of K-12 education with special emphasis on high schools in the Tuscaloosa area, which seems to play a big role in retention and new hiring.

**Detailed Comments:**  Q23-HUM    Q23-NS    Q23-SS

**Question 24:** Weight the importance of the following criteria to identify faculty excellence in research and creative activity.

a. Quantitative assessment of external funding secured  
b. Quantitative assessment of publications/creative outputs produced  
c. Quantitative assessment of return on investment for research start-up funds  
d. Qualitative assessment of publications/creative outputs produced (e.g. publications that appear in high-impact journals, monograph published with a prestigious university press, creative activities in venues nationally or internationally recognized as prestigious)  
e. Graduate degree production

Faculty members’ comments stressed that qualitative assessment of publication/creative work is an essential criterion to identify faculty excellence, and it should be discipline specific. However, a holistic view is more important than just looking at the number of papers published or dollar amount obtained through external grants. The comments further reflect that most faculty believe that to measure faculty excellence, faculty should be evaluated based on cumulative and collective quality of scholarship, external recognition, and contribution to the scientific community/society. Graduate student supervision and graduate degree production (quality) should also be taken into consideration. Assessment of the quality of the graduate degree should be based on the “product produced”. For example, a student graduating with no publications vs. a student graduating with multiple peer review journal papers should not get equal weight (in areas where applicable). Faculty strongly believe that return of investment is important but how to measure return of investment is equally important. ROI should not be assessed merely based on dollar amount secured by faculty from external funding but should take into consideration the quality of cumulative scholarship and research.

**Detailed Comments:**  Q24-HUM    Q24-NS    Q24-SS

**Question 28:** Please identify any actions the University can take to reduce bureaucratic hurdles you might have experienced in pursuing research, scholarship, and/or creative activities.

**Detailed Comments:**  Q28-HUM    Q28-NS    Q28-SS
Q1: Rank in order your expectations for the research priorities of the University

Q1-HUM-T
"1. Travel budgets have not kept up with the increase of travel costs.
2. Better support for Associate level professors would be a good investment for UA, which needs to grow its Full professorship."

Address internal issues (e.g., service and teaching expectations) to create conditions in which increasing scholarly output can take place.

As a member of the humanities, I sometimes feel as if the administration has forgotten the role that scholarly books play in the university's research rankings. My colleagues and I can contribute, but only if we have the comparatively slight resources to perform our scholarly work.

Find a way to pay people fairly for their research achievements despite budgetary fluctuations. Writing and publishing scholarly book is an immense; I had a book published two years ago and have received only minimal raises for it. I understand WHY that's occurred, but the very occurrence remains unfair and dispiriting.

Growth and predictive data driven models can be problematic when applied to the fine and performing arts. Yes, everything can be counted but those numbers aren't always meaningful.

I am more concerned about quality of output than quantity.

I'm angry and bitter after so many years of seeing this university willfully and repeatedly turn its back on the English department.

If you want good research programs, you should fund graduate students properly so that we can attract a better student--our packages are not competitive at all with SEC, (and nowhere close to R1 schools.) In the humanities, this represents a crisis at this university: our applications go down every year the stipend and teaching load gets less competitive (they went up when we raised it 4 years ago). The students we are able to attract are the only ones who know our first year undergraduates' names. And yet we ask them to teach twice as much (in the same number of hours) as R1 schools, for what amounts to half the pay. The lack of resources devoted to both graduate students is becoming a serious problem for maintaining the health of our programs.

Increase in funding need not be across the board. It should be focused in the areas most likely to have the impact desired.

It is ridiculous to expect this university to be a research 1 institution when the K-12 schools think it is a triumph to be ranked 47th nationally.

More leave opportunities (like sabbaticals) would help scholarly output in the humanities.

More research funding for the Humanities (CARSCA application is more convoluted than nation-wide grants)

Please do not use amount of grants dollars or numbers of publications as an indicator of the QUALITY of creative research done

Research funding should include travel expenses to conferences, funds for access to copyrighted material. Not every researcher needs a lab or equipment, we all have different needs for our research. There should be some rewards for faculty who direct dissertations. Directing a dissertation is extremely time consuming and takes away from the faculty's own research. In my department, it is always the same faculty who are directing dissertation. It puts them at a disadvantage compare to colleagues.

Research ranking will only improve once we have a med school. Perhaps a merger with UAB?

Senior Aspire to qualifying professors. More frequent sabbatical leaves, course reduction for directing dissertations, more conference funding...

The option to increase the -quality- of scholarly and creative output was missing from the above list. It should be the top priority.

This is a confusing question. Are you asking what the University's priorities should be in my personal opinion? Or what I believe the University's priorities currently are? I have answered according to the former.
Travel funding (at least in my area) is totally insufficient even for one conference. I spend too much time on administrative requirements; it takes away considerably from my research time. We have to care about research because it is a mission of the university, not just to receive a ranking. That will follow a real focus on quality research. We need to keep in mind the overall health and well-being of the university community and connection to the local community. Sometimes we may be focusing on successes that are the easiest to measure and wind up ignoring important elusive factors that attract faculty and students to UA.

The research goals for the university seem skewed toward the sciences, where we have spent lots of money on buildings & start up costs, with little in the way of results for the money spent. We are not a land grant institution nor a school with a medical school. We will not make it far up in the rankings. **Q1-HUM-TT**

Continue to support humanities, arts, and social-science research that may not bring in large grant dollars, but does lead to publications, award, and international reputation of faculty, all of which is critical for graduate training as well as UA's broader research mission. Faculty in the humanities are expected to publish single authored books. For those of us who work with images, a book could cost $10,000 out of pocket. This includes cost of high resolution images, rights to reproduce images, and subvention fees. Subvention fees are not payment to publish a work and in no way mean that the work is a vanity publication. They are payment to print the high quality images necessary to illustrate a work based on images. All university presses, the gold standard of peer-review and academic excellence, require subvention for illustrated books. Grants need to be available, especially to support faculty on the tenure track who are not yet tenured.

Humanities need funded. The indirect costs from large grants should be used to support humanities centers where those faculty can have in-house sabbaticals for their research. This is what UNC, UVA, and other true R1 schools do. It is should merely go to, pay for administrators. An R1 can not occur with STEM alone. Currently, these faculty get nothing and are easily wooed away by other institutions that do.

I asked the Interim Director if he thought it was possible to increase the ranking of the University from R2 to R1. He said it would be impossible, unless the University added an actual medical school, vet school and dental school. The pressure on faculty, from Deans, to make it their responsibility to produce enough research to become an R1 institution is unrealistic.

I have a response to this question. I see the improvement of the research ranking - as a result of the other three components. Since increasing the research ranking is a top priority, we have to ensure that all other elements are in place first.

I think increasing the QUALITY of scholarly/creative output should be the primary goal. All other goals in the realms of funding, ranking should be pursued ONLY in the pursuit of a better culture of scholarship at UA.

**Q1-HUM-NTT**

Improve research ranking broadly -- but 'increase research funding for the humanities' (specifically) would be my top priority.

Increased funding, leads to increased output, leads to increased ranking, engagement and development. The University should know that arts and humanities research, for which external funding opportunities are much more modest, is still part of the research ranking and overall profile of the university. Equating research importance with dollars is a mistake.

I believe the University has a responsibility to support local communities, and we can accomplish this through initiatives and partnerships in research.

I would like to see that UA improves its ranking in the field of competitive research universities. In many fields there is a need to find ways to engage with society at large. For example, in business there is a need to translate scholarly findings into things that will be read by practitioners. Wharton,
Harvard, and other top schools do that. It enhances their stature enormously and leads to substantial donations.
Research output is already as much as the faculty in the Department of Art and Art History could contribute given the enormous amount of service, teaching, and responsibilities in their workload. We just need more support via funding and course release.
Scholars need room to breathe. A book that will be read for generations to come may be the only thing a professor produces in a decade. She should not be forced to produce an article a year simply to improve research metrics. The University should be a place of refuge from the commercial world outside of it. The values of the marketplace, the demand that everything be able to placed on a ledger and balanced in the accounts, have no place at a University.
Some areas of research (e.g. humanities) do not pull in research funding but are important to the intellectual and creative life of faculty, students, and the broader community. Faculty should be supported in their endeavors regardless of ability to secure grants or funds for the university. There needs to be a difference in expectations for research funding between the different areas (humanities, sciences, social sciences) as some fields automatically have more opportunities to apply funding.

"Involve the adjuncts and pay them better. For some reason the adjuncts are treated like they don't have anything to contribute. They already live here and want to live here, they're involved in their field, and they have a hard time finding opportunities. They represent a large pool of wasted opportunity for the university.
Nobody wants to do more for the same low pay, but there are ways to involve them or at least invite their participation in ways that will benefit them without handing them more tasks."

**Q1-NS-T**
Better internal research support for pilot studies to generate data for larger grants.
By increasing scholarly activity and research funding, the research ranking of UA will improve.
Community engagement and economic development is important for state funding, but UA is at best a state-assisted institution.
"Diversify and embrace funding other than NSF, DOE and NIH.
UA OSP and C&GA need to promote for flexibility in supporting Foundations, DoD, State Agencies, Corporations, Gifts"

Hire more research faculty, not NTRC.
I feel that improving research "ranking" is a direct outcome of increases / improvements in the other three elements.
I think the order implied above represents a path forward. University investment in #1 leads to #2, which fosters #3 and #4. But the university has to recognize that it is imperative to support high quality scholarly work int he near- and medium-term even if it means foregoing obtaining (or frantically chasing) funded opportunities that bring in dollars but do not support high-end scholarly work that will ultimately increase the long-term ability to obtain research funding that supports high-end scholarly work thus establishing a positive feedback loop...
I understand that funding is important to increase our profile, fund more grad students, help offset budget cuts from the State, etc., but I hope we will not lose sight of the fact that research output and advancing science (which I know requires funding) should always be more important than just landing big grants. Funding is a means not an end.
If UA succeeds in increasing scholarly and creative activity output this will lead to increased research funding and research ranking. Properly supported scholarly active faculty will engage our community and will contribute to economic development. Thus Increasing scholarly activity should be the highest priority and any other ranking would be putting the cart before the horse.

"Improve Research Ranking
Increase research funding
Increase scholarly and creative activity outputs. Improve community engagement.

Improving research infrastructure and staff support for instrumentation should be number 1 on the list. Without doing that, all the other goals are pretty meaningless. New instruments without improving support staff squander much of the investment made.

Improving research ranking is in my view a catch-all category, and by leaving it ranked 1 here, I mean that this priority would encompass greater investment in research infrastructure and personnel by the university that would serve to elevate our ranking among peer institutions, as I struggle to see how the faculty can increase research funding or do much more of anything else without this.

In my opinion, it will be important for the university not to "lose itself" in the pursuit of bigger research dollars. There is very good science that can occur with little or limited funding, i.e., not all good science necessarily has to be funded science. But, generally speaking, it is acknowledged that funded science tends to be of a high caliber or else it likely would not have been funded. All that said, the priority is to find funding to support good science, not to do science in order to get money.

Philosophy espoused by my college (Engineering) is that increase in funding will lead to increase in research ranking....

Ranking is important; UA us news ranking changed from 77 to 88 to 126 over years: that is a big issue in a long run.

Research priority number one should be to create a "true" research culture and environment, in which the administration facilitates research initiatives and improves expediency of bureaucratic steps and rewards faculty who are successfully in research.

Research rankings are subjective; however, sustained research funding and scholarly output will ensure that UA is better positioned to be recognized a globally research-competitive university.

Scholarly productivity should be first. Without credibility, research funding will be limited.

The above is my expectation; i.e. what senior management wants, which may or may not be the same as what I think UA should be trying to achieve.

The University of Alabama focuses far too much on dollar signs and rankings. To some extent, I understand the motivation for focusing on research grants (more grants = more overhead = more money for the university). However, far too little emphasis is placed on the PRODUCTS, including scholarly and creative activity output, MENTORING in a research setting (and what mentoring does for retention, recruitment, and thus, $$$$$$$), and producing students whose research experiences facilitate professional development and successful career searches (= alumni with $$$$$$$).

These decisions need to be made university-wide as it affects all faculty in all departments, not just those in the more 'traditional' externally-funded disciplines.

To improve ranking we need to improve funding and output; to improve funding, we need to improve output; to improve output, we need a temporary injection of internal funding until the external one catches up.

UA needs more of a research culture, but that won't happen without investment in infrastructure. The impressive way that we recruit undergrads is due to the investment in infrastructure that was made (recruiters all over US, scholarships, etc). Same is needed for research. Until faculty see that happen, all of the talk about research is really just talk. Many of us have been in centers and institutes at other places with $20M budgets. We know what that looks like, and there is little evidence of support to come even close to the culture needed until investment is made.

While Research I is the aspirational goal, a greater priority should be placed on raising the research ranking.

Why do none of these options talk about research quality, only quantity?? I would rank increasing the quality of each of these areas above all of the options given.

Without the funding the ranking won't go up.
I do not care about any of these. The only thing that should matter is the university’s commitment to research, not our ranking, not how much external money is brought in. The university currently offers almost no internal support for research, and this shows that the university is not serious about supporting research. We need substantive internal support opportunities. If you do 1, 2, and 3 as I listed then research rankings will follow. Improve support for research active faculty.

Improving the research funding and output should lead to an increase in research ranking. While ranking in and of itself is nice, the funding and output are what will benefit the faculty we currently have. In my opinion, increase research funding, increase activity output, and improve ranking are all inter-correlated. Not sure if this question is actually "what is your understanding of the University administration's expectation"?

It seems to me that the best way to improve research funding is to improve our research first. More support for hiring graduate students until projects get funded. At many R1 universities, faculty can hire new students as TA's until they get project support. At UA, we have the chicken-egg problem that to get the student you need the project, but to get the project you need initial results (i.e. students!). And, sometimes when you get the project, its hard to find the right graduate student immediately.

Need to increase student interest in working on fundamental research than very applied. Research funding is increasingly difficult to get in the sciences and I would love to see the university focus on helping faculty secure external funding. I think that improving our research ranking and our outputs will follow from increased funding but increased funding can only follow from better support. In many instances this would not require more money but a better use and distribution of funds. Research is directly proportional to quality of education (teaching) imparted to students. I my opinion, the research focus should also incorporate high teaching standards that are not measured by SOI, rather by industry and future research, economic needs (example along the lines of NSF 10 big ideas https://www.nsf.gov/news/special_reports/big_ideas/). Research ranking should improve if we increase funding, scholarly output, improve economic development, increase numbers of Phd students. Scholarly output doesn’t require funding in all areas and can be a focus throughout UA. By increasing funding it will be possible to improve engagement. The ranking just follows the first three and shouldn't be the primary goal.

Scholarship first; research ranking will follow!
The university needs to provide faculty with the ability to better conduct research and submit research grants by enhancing the administration. I spend far too much time being an accountant and dealing with these online tools that are supposed to enhance productivity, but actually hinder us. If we want our ranking or output to improve, faculty need to have these administrative responsibilities taken off their shoulders. We need more and more efficient administrators for tracking grants.

To facilitate improvements in research output/ranking, this will require greater administrative assistance from UA (e.g., allotting better support/additional staff at the college-level for grant preparation/submission and providing additional GRA lines within departments to better assist faculty in executing their research agenda). Furthermore, steps need to be taken to overhaul the current IRB. The issues being flagged for concern would never be issues at R01 institutions. Unfortunately, the IRB (in most cases) impedes the research process rather than supporting it.

To increase research ranking, faculty need more time to think / focus on research.

Q1-NS-NTT
Faculty PI’s that bring in grants and have requested set amounts that he/she would like to pay research technicians/managers need to be able to pay said technician/manager the amount that was requested without HR restricting this amount. Other research institutions (i.e. UAB within the University of Alabama’s system) pay their technicians significantly higher than at UA at Tuscaloosa. If #’s 1 and 2 are accomplished then #’s 3 and 4 will follow.
Improve the possibility of research without the constrains of being founded. Research should not be a business
Must also work to retain successful faculty.
Research dollars are a tool for gathering data for publications, the standard measure of success in academia. Not the end all measure of success. Research funding has significantly gone down while size of each grant increases, thus less numbers awarded. If shift is here then UA needs to not ask for publication numbers etc. Ask for grant dollars as measure of success.
Research ranking will improve as a result of an increase or improvement in the other areas..

Q1-SS-T

"#1 Change the culture at UA to one that encourages, rewards, and facilitates the work load toward research (Must come first)
#2 Full faculty rank promotion must involve obtaining funding for research and scholarly activities."

At least one dean makes is unequivocal and refuses dollars to units that are not in research-funded fields. That action is contrary to the growth of knowledge.
I strongly oppose the central administration's current emphasis on grant-funded research--to the detriment of research that is not "grant friendly." Much work in the humanities, as well as most creative efforts, are not typically grant-supported. The administration appears to value the "pursuit, discovery and dissemination of knowledge" ONLY if it is tied to external funding, which is extremely reductive and is insulting to those of us in traditional humanities fields and pursuing creative endeavors.
I think the order is sequential. 1 has to occur before 2, for example, and all 3 have to occur before research ranking is improved.
I would love to see "Improve the quality of scholarly and creative activity output" in this list. That's notoriously difficult to quantify and demonstrate, and therefore is less useful for the aims of improving ranking. But shouldn't it be on the list (and on our minds) anyway? I'd rank it highly.
If we can do the first three we will improve our research ranking.

Improve economic incentives to engage in research,
"Improve library holdings across all research disciplines represented at the University
Increase University staff positions to match aspirational peers
Reduce faculty responsibilities for routine (1) clerical tasks, (2) management duties, and administration of academic programs."

Increased funding and output will yield an improved ranking.
Increasing funding is good, but for many people outside of the hard sciences, we're robbing Peter to pay Paul. In other words, we're dedicating a fair bit of faculty time to hopefully get funding that will compensate for the lost faculty time. It's not a great model for everyone to operate upon.
Money for the sake of money is simply not the point of being a university - especially a capstone public university. Research funding is extremely important, but that's primarily because it makes possible the things we're actually here to do - scholarly and creative activity output, community engagement, and economic development. Those are the things that matter most. If the priority is funding over scholarship, we're acting like a profit-making business not a university.
More research funding will result in better research ranking...

More research staff, more creative (less bereaucratic) OSP, more fund-raising dedicated to research
Opportunities to increase our scholarly activity and research funding will lead to improve research ranking. There should be some consistent mechanisms in place for all University faculty to have opportunities to increase scholarly activity output. This being said, it is a disservice to faculty with a proven history of obtaining funding to have teaching loads increased to accommodate teaching release time among new faculty (in addition to being provided with start-up funds). This aforementioned method is being used by some college deans (UA Administration need to have a way to ensure that equity is being implemented). This type of perceived inequity equates to the perception of being undervalued and marginalized among faculty members that have dedicated many years to the university, whether intentional or not. Also caution should be taken to ensure that colleges with
majority women or not unequally being included in this type of perceived inequities versus, those in business, engineering, or law with majority male faculty not being included.

Really you need to do no. 3 to make 1 and 2 happen.

Research rankings are primarily impacted by external funding. Although this element of research activity is important, it does not solely reflect scholarship and research activity. This comment is coming from someone in a discipline where grants are important to research. I would much prefer a gradual strategy of increasing research activity among current faculty combined with hiring advanced faculty with significant external funding. Overall, I think this strategy would be more effective and would have fewer negative implications for faculty culture.

Sort of hard to improve ranking without improving scholarly and creative activity which requires additional funding. Shouldn't have allowed administrators to be involved in creating the survey. The administration wants us to produce more research but doesn't seem to understand what that means in particular departments. For faculty who perform research abroad this would require time off to travel and network with overseas scholars. Also, to complete research, faculty need funds to travel to research locations. Supporting faculty travel to conferences is also important here.

The most important priority should be to improve the university's national research profile. The critical pitfall to avoid is to focus too narrowly on research funding. External funding is extremely important for some disciplines, but not others, in determining ranking.

The question asks about my "expectations." I have understood this as my "preferences." So my list is not a prediction of what UA will do.

The University has been talking about becoming a Tier 1 institution ever since I got here (some years ago). I have never seen a coherent plan for how that is supposed to happen. Further, there appears to be no systematic recognition or support of productive scientists; it’s more about which faculty are their deans' "pets." This is demoralizing to those who work hard, produce well, and always seem to be at the bottom of the list when gold stars are handed out.

The world urgently needs the knowledge we generate through research.

UA leadership needs to understand that MANY disciplines CANNOT secure outside funding and grants — they just aren't available! If UA truly wants to increase our research footprint, then they need to STOP measuring by outside grants and instead increase scholarly output by making UA funds available to help scholars fund their research. If we increase output and provide money to do this, then we will naturally improve our research ranking. You can't improve our ranking just by focusing on improving the ranking.

We need to have a greater, visible impact across Alabama demonstrating how the University impacts and improves the lives of the regular people in our state.

Without a medical school, I feel efforts toward R1 really requires a massive increase in external funding and most college faculty are not on teaching loads that would allow for such time commitments to writing proposals. Therefore, to achieve R1, there MUST be a reduction in teaching load to faculty who are pursuing multiple million dollars proposals annually. 1-1 is the norm for such endeavors at R1 schools. 2-2 is just not possible to expect to reach R1 status.

Q1-SS-TT

Different colleges (and even departments) need to have different priorities. Some areas make the largest impact via publications, others via grant support, and others via community engagement. A university-wide, one-size-fits-all approach would grossly oversimplify this. Some areas have more high-impact journals than others. Some areas have more opportunities for acquiring research funding than others. Each of these priorities should be values, but perhaps not equally across colleges/departments.

I don't think the university knows what it wants. Administrators send conflicting messages and sometimes backtrack on what they themselves have said in the past. Overall, it does not feel like research is a high priority here.

I think all options are of equal importance
If research and scholarly input is essential, then creating a true research library is also a priority. Gorgas is far from being a true research library. Its holdings are meager, the building is a ruin, and with the removal of security arches, the catalogue has become a work of fiction.

Improve infrastructure for research activity: e.g. access to genetic biostatistician, wet labs, statistical analysis consultation services.

Improving research ranking seems like the umbrella under which all the rest will help accomplish. Invest sufficiently in new and existing faculty to provide them with resources necessary to conduct high-quality research, as well as to obtain sufficient preliminary data to be competitive for federal grants. My startup was half the average of that of my colleagues at Research 1 universities, and the seed funding available at UA is much less than that available at those universities.

The first three expectations are required before an improved research ranking will occur. The priorities (in my estimation) follow a progression. Funding to increase output which should increase ranking.

The priority of the university should be to improve investment streams in the faculty themselves: competitive salaries, more returned indirect funds from funded research, research infrastructure and clerical support, research facilitators (including GTA and GRA lines), etc. As someone with funded research, I find myself spending a really disturbing amount of time fighting the university to provide me with services that it should be striving to give me. One good example is how tyrannical and frankly impossible contracts and grants is to work with. Another is the difficulty setting up pre-approval authorization, which means that UA projects start well behind projects applied to other universities. We need to be an R1 university.

Q1-SS-NTT
All about becoming a Research 1
All of the above are important and support each other.
Focus on student-led research rather than faculty output

I keep hearing that we need to be ranked as a "tier 1" research university, but I have also heard from leadership in the research department that it isn't possible to be tier 1 because we don't have an academic medical institution like UAB, so we are just trying to increase our overall standing. This is confusing as a new faculty, because it seems that the goal is unclear.

I think that we should praise the accomplishments of all research and scholarly activity. The University represents economic sustainability for Tuscaloosa, and we should assist the community through research.

I want the university to prioritize research more for faculty and have more efficient systems and staff to support non-research activities that take away from research productivity such as teaching (e.g., reducing teaching load or number of students per class), undergraduate advising, learning antiquated systems rather than more efficient and widely available systems for conducting day-to-day business (e.g., digital measures instead of the FAR, Cayuse instead of IRB, etc).

Increasing scholarly and creative activity output along with research funding should consequently improve our research ranking. The end goal might be to improve our ranking, but boosting scholarly/creative output and research funding is how we will actually get there. Therefore, those processes should be the focus of our efforts.

Items 2 - 4 are all of equal importance and are interdependent, from my view.

Provide opportunities, funding, and support for contingent faculty to work to their full potential to do the research, creative activity, and service for which they have been trained. Better yet, let all faculty be treated and supported the same. Have all faculty have equal workloads of teaching, service, and research / creative activity. End the caste system.

Research rankings and funding without a medical school can prove difficult to move in the correct direction.

Strong support for faculty to engage early with funding agencies (i.e. presenting ideas at DOD conferences, interacting with Proposal Officers at the stages BEFORE program announcements and
funding opportunities are formulated) is necessary; the vision for this, based on utility function (probability of funding * amount of funding) needs to come from VPR. The ranking is important, but I don't see how you get there without increased funding and output. At the end of the day, though, as long as the med school is still housed under UAB, we're not going to move too far up in rankings regardless of what we do. The ranking formulas are skewed in favor of institutions with med schools. They're also skewed toward privileged NE, Midwest, and West Coast schools, but that's a whole other issue. The hiring practices for faculty on this campus also discriminate against people not from schools in those regions.
Q2: Weight how new tenure-track or tenured faculty hires should be allocated.
Q2-HUM-T

"New" isn't necessarily better. Why not improve the strengths that are already there. BTW: in the humanities, "quality" is difficult to measure, and especially has little to do with grant funding. All FTI's in the English department should be immediately placed on TT lines. The cost to the university would be minimal. Another option: "To support a balanced approach where some resources are devoted to recruiting grant-generating research faculty and some resources are devoted to maintaining appropriate faculty numbers in crucial but non-grant-generating disciplines, as opposed to the apparent current wholly imbalanced policy of putting almost all resources into grant-generating positions and hoping they pan out." = 100

Contingent faculty do not earn what they are worth.

I think your choices are terribly flawed--they mostly assume that senior administration get to decide what counts as research worth doing. I just don't buy that and won't make a choice among the options given. The only way you break out of that is assuming that the Colleges get to call the shots. That's just not how the creation of new knowledge works--so you're basically giving in to the senior admin's move to turn us into an applied tech school. Really unfortunate.

It is good to look forward towards growth, but we need to remember what is currently working and those persons (faculty and students) that have made it work...and support that work. We need to keep our own grass green and not pine for the grass that we think looks greener.

Many areas of UA are suffering terribly with faculty positions going unfilled while income-producing programs are getting all the faculty lines. This is highly detrimental to the overall strength and diversity of interests at UA.

Supporting new areas is great, as long as we don't duplicate other UA system strengths at other schools. Teaching and meetings students' needs is a priority. Not doing it will automatically lower research output.

The humanities plays an important role in the instructional mission of the university, and can contribute productively to the research mission as well, primarily in the form of PhDs granted and books published, but not if we don't get any new hires (and we're both comparatively inexpensive to hire, especially when one measures startup packages, and revenue neutral or better to retain, since we teach a lot of students).

The students should be the priority of a university, thus the funding should go to support teaching needs within the various departments.

These questions are so vague and difficult to interpret as specific outcomes. "Supporting teaching needs" could mean giving positions to high volume areas, or it could mean helping areas that are struggling or in development. "Competitive proposals" could mean creative and innovative plans or it could mean proposals based solely on growth and numbers.

UA is in no position to focus on research at the expense of the undergraduate and graduate programs of teaching, which provide the funds needed to support research. Too much focus away from an existing strength is a good way to create a new weakness. Let's not forget the effect a change in scholarship funding had on enrollment; small investments of money have large returns on the teaching end of things.

"University grants like RCG and CARSCA have become increasingly more bureaucratic and inconsistent.

Faculty invest a lot of time on applications and it's ultimately not worth the effort"

We cannot do everything well.

We have a very top-down way of running this university, but the faculty are hired because of their talents and expertise, so when that based is tapped, the university will thrive. Again, do quality work throughout, have quality programs, and the accolades and rankings will follow.
The so-called research institutes are mostly the result of pork-funding, not merit...

Q2-HUM-TT
Support current needs and strengths first, but also invest in the future. Be careful not to over-allocate to new initiatives and thereby make current programs (and faculty) feel undervalued or unappreciated. Teaching helps faculty think through ideas/problems and allows for cutting edge research. By increasing graduate and undergraduate liberal arts disciplines, this research production will also increase. Even Dr. Bell has repeatedly stated that teaching should facilitate our teaching and vice versa. If not, we are stagnant and will not compete with other institutions. Teaching needs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels needs to be a top consideration for faculty hires-- not just research dollars.
The 4 research institutes are not equally accessible across disciplines
"The four institutes (with the exception of Transportation, which does have a strong history at UA) were created with no consultation with faculty about what the existing strengths/priorities of UA are. I think they should be disbanded and we should start afresh, taking into account what faculty are already doing that could be capitalized and improved upon.

We also desperately need more faculty to keep up with the growth in undergraduate enrollment. The faculty we have cannot be as research-active as possible when they are overtaxed with teaching. The current situation in the math department is a good example."
There has been a concerning shift away from allocating new hires to the humanities recently. This should not continue. The research output of the humanities is central to the university's mission. "New" isn't necessarily better. Why not improve the strengths that are already there. BTW: in the humanities, "quality" is difficult to measure, and especially has little to do with grant funding.
All FTI's in the English department should be immediately placed on TT lines. The cost to the university would be minimal.

Q2-HUM-NTT
Tenure is a stupid thing. Once a faculty has tenure, then they quit caring anything at all about service to students or the community.
Again, support for the new research institutes are not necessarily applicable for all areas. Departments that teach a majority of the university's students in their core classes (e.g. English) should have sufficient faculty, who represent the breadth of research/teaching areas, to teach the students who attend the University of Alabama. Converting current FTI lines to NTRC lines could help with this pressure.
I would like to see more tenure fault in both areas: Research and teaching at any level. It's a balancing act, of course. All are important but if the goal is to get higher ratings (and that seems to be the case) then continuing to do the same thing that other schools are doing won't make much impact. Developing bold initiatives in new fields is risky but it's probably the best strategy for leaping over the competition. Great teachers will pay off in future support. Division of labor makes sense in a university as much as anywhere else. You need to pay enough to hire really good teachers who will engage students and the community outside the university.
Research output and commitment should also consider the amount of contact hours that faculty have. Studio art courses, each of which meets for 6 hours a week, does not have the same commitment as a course that meets only 2 hours a week.
The humanities are cheap. All you need are blackboards, desks, and a few dog earned copies of Descartes, Du Bois, and Virginia Woolf. It doesn't cost much to teach the classics; it costs a great deal to run trendy interdisciplinary programs or fund "social impact" scholarship.
With increased enrollment, our priority is to provide a meaningful experience for the students. I feel the best method to do this on a large scale is to offer quality instruction.

Q2-NS-T
Although research is an important goal that I strongly support, we must recognize the need to provide outstanding TTF in areas needed for teaching. Areas of strength should be supported, but this assumes that the administration can recognize where these are. This is not universally true for the institutes. Administration should solicit the faculty for areas where investment can be successfully made. I would also note that our experience with cluster hire efforts has been mostly ineffective (mildly). Cyber Security is so far behind that we would be an "also ran" - needs deep investment. Lots of issue son campus regarding Cyber Security leads. The most technical units on campus are not given opportunities to excel or even make many hires in the area. Deep structural changes needed if Cyber Security is even included in a research thread (so much potential, but so much lack of leadership or vision in the area on what could have been...) Current Cyber Institute brings in very little money, but has very high admin salaries...

Given that there have already been significant hires in the four new research institutes those now need to show that these are viable research areas at UA and that the investments were justified. Too little is currently done at UA to support existing research strengths. Creating new areas of research strength based on competitive proposals sounds interesting, but the process for this needs to be worked out. Growing existing areas of strength and addressing exploding teaching needs are paramount. It is difficult to ignore need to grow new areas of emphasis, but this is a long-term and risky process (targeted new areas may not flourish).

"Hiring fresh out new faculty does not reduce faculty/student ratio for many years. Hiring fresh out new faculty will not grow the University research profile for (at best) many years. Hiring new faculty without support for graduate students will not improve research or class sizes. Hiring senior faculty with supporting junior faculty and graduate student support can more quickly increase the research portfolio.

Invest in the CURRENT ACTIVE research faculty at the University is the fastest and least expensive improvement and opportunity to quickly increase the research portfolio. Much like undergraduate student retention, the cost of recruiting is a sunk cost."

I think there is too much emphasis on faculty hiring related to research institutes and those departments that "can bring funding". Neither the focus areas of the research institutes aligned with the most current funding trends at federal and corporate level. Also, faculty allocation to departments in humanities, arts, and social sciences should not be based on funding rather than on research productivity. I'm glad you included teaching here. We are behind many other universities in our research programs, but why can't we play to our strength: teaching? Also, lost in all is that our student body has increased 100% in the last 15 years, but our faculty has probably (I'm guessing here) increased about 30%.

It is important to maintain strength in successful research areas. The administration appears to treat a replacement of a retired faculty as a "new" position, while many faculty would only consider expansions of the number of faculty to be "new" positions. This makes even the discussion difficult since support of existing areas has very different meaning depending on how "new" is defined. Many faculty do not see how their research interests/skills intersect with those of the four research institutes, so at least half of the tenured and tenure-track hires should support all areas of research strength, not just the research institutes.

Not sure why we bothered with these institutes. What is the purpose? Who are these people and how do they serve me? Not clear and seems like a waste of resources. Our college needs folks to help us with grant applications and post-award paperwork. We have to rely on OSP for help with federal grant apps and our admin assistant manages post-award $$ for 14 researchers in our department. Other colleges have a person in house that helps with grants and works as a liaison between the researcher and OSP. Each college should have a mini OSP in house....people you are familiar with and work with regularly. Missing in the list is a statistical consulting group for researchers. We need more biostats folks on this campus and these folks need degrees in stats....Example: I cannot use the stats person hired for the life institute on my grant because NCCIH sees him as a political scientist---not a biostats person. Plus, we need access to these folks for our own research plus thesis and dissertations.
Ostensibly the four new institutes have been designed to maximize the majority of funding-productive/potential existing research. While there are issues ranging from "growing pains" to potential "false starts" in some cases, it is imperative that these succeed in sustainable manner.
The Centers are a nice idea on paper, but are functionally a major waste of effort and money, in my experienced opinion (20 years, many millions in funding and ~100 publications, while teaching every other day; Asst.-Full prof. all at UA). The salaries of the administrators and their staff should be poured into many more pilot grants in the ranges common to other institutions ($50-100,000) and not have strings attached with respect to interdisciplinary collaborations - purely the investigator and the science they are doing should be judged. Something needs to be done to help established investigators with strong track records remain competitive once they are beyond the "Goldilocks zone" of a young investigator. Offer us pilot grant opportunities that matter toward getting support via NIH, NSF, DoD, DoE, etc.
The current research institutes will do little to positively impact what I do. The best I can hope for is that they will not negatively impact my own research.
The for institutes have been identified as the cornerstones for UA's research enterprise. Investments must support these institutes and they should build on the existing strengths at UA. However, we should be open to pursuing new areas strategically. All of these should complement the instructional / educational mission.
The newly formed Research Institutes are not viable. They are a waste of money and where developed without faculty input. The administration claims that want to increase research but they continue to go about it in the wrong way. Until the faculty are survey and given an opportunity to contribute the research profile of the university will never change.
The research institutes are not really helpful to the overall research mission. They have been created with a top-down approach and with little input from faculty that actually do the research. They don't have clear missions and aren't adequately funded (see failure to recruit a director for ALRI). UA struggles to recruit top investigators because we have nothing to offer them (see research instrumentation comment above)
These research institutes are nothing but empty shells. The university should focus on maximizing the use of existing strengths rather than creating a facade with these research centers.
This is hard to answer in part because my research area does not fall into one of the four new university institutes. So part of me wants to solicit new areas from faculty proposals, but I also fear that we are losing sight of the undergrad teaching. I don't want us to focus on research to the point that our undergrad instruction gets worse than it already is.
To support state of the art new research areas.
University has taken top-down approach in creating centers, which has not engaged existing faculty, and seems destined to fail. Engage faculty and value them.
We have really good faculty in place. They need support and resources (e.g., time, infrastructure) to be more competitive. Bringing in new faculty without changing the support and resources available will result in incremental increases rather than the big changes sought.
With the growth of the student body, the teaching needs must be considered in order to serve the students appropriately.
With intended or not, the impression among many research active faculty was that the institutes were applied from a top-down mandate for research direction.

Q2-NS-TT
"Expanding into new areas is always a challenge so I think limiting this investment to really compelling cases is ideal.
The others are all equally well deserving."
However, the university should allocate more, much more resources on hiring teaching staffs and support research faculties.
If the University wants to have the 'research institutes' then create and fund an actual institute and hire people into it. Don't try to force the direction of each department's hires to be related to these things. It is totally unclear to me how the research institutes will benefit the university research climate or tenure-track faculty research efforts. The lack of mission, lack of structure and lack of communication are symptomatic of research dysfunction at UA.

It will be difficult to support the 4 new university institutes when the current infrastructure - across all divisions/departments/colleges - is poor. There has to be greater investment in what UA currently has as far as faculty and expertise before any collaborative institutions can be successful. UA does not have a strong funding track-record - why would their "research institutions" all of a sudden be so different? Also, there have been other collaborative research institutions established at UA in the past, which have yielded very little (if anything) research and funding wise.

more diversification, multi-disciplinary areas of research is required.
Regarding the new University Research Institutes, it is not clear how much faculty buy-in currently exists and how much current research in different departments and Colleges overlaps with the mandate of the institutes. There may be other potential institutes that have a greater critical mass in terms of research faculty and resources on campus.
Since our student body has grown so much quicker than our faculty body, we need to make sure we can teach our students, especially in upper level courses that require more attention.
These are all very bad ideas, and demonstrate a serious lack of vision among upper administration (or whoever designed this survey). Faculty growth should be organic and driven by faculty, not prescribed from the top down. Any administrative influence is harmful. I reject all of the suggestions listed.

Q2-NS-NTT
Get back to teaching model of students first. 200-300 students in 300 level courses' with no TA's significantly limits student learning to minimal teacher contact and ability to ask true 300 level learning questions.
If enrollment continues to increase, the teaching need of the colleges is only going to increase as well. Certain colleges are already short on graduate teaching assistants so the need to hire FTTI's and PTTI's is becoming increasingly important to keep up with enrollment.
The top-down imposition of the new university research institutes seems like a disastrous approach antithetical to the goals of improving the research mission of the university.
UA seems to have a very narrow scope of research interests/areas and this limits our standing in the research community

Q2-SS-T
80% of new areas of research should be directed toward problems that affect the future of the US and the international community. Academic disciplines do not organize their efforts specifically for this purpose, so the the articulation of such problems should be organized by the Office of Academic Affairs- presumably with advice from inter/multi-disciplinary faculty committees.
As someone who works in a book-driven discipline in the humanities, it is essential that any future research funding and programming visions take account of the shifting landscapes of academic publishing, and in the area of monographs in particular.
At least in my college, we had way too many non-tenure-track assistant and associate professors. They get the same titles, but are forced to teach 3 and 4 classes. They are also expected to hold graduate faculty status, so they still need to have some research productivity. That is absolutely abusive. If we are going to hire on the teaching track, it needs to be strictly undergraduate teaching or targeted graduate teaching. But it seems like we want research productivity, but we keep hiring teaching lines and disguising them as researchers.
first and third are bullshit, pet projects of somebody in admin. OMIT!
I don't even know how to rank these. I think that the priority should be to hire the best people in a particular field according to the needs to ALL departments. The first one has nothing whatsoever to do with Arts or Humanities, so maybe a category that is more inclusive would be helpful.
I give the research institutes low priority because the Life Sciences institute seems to be dead in the water with no permanent director. I give teaching needs greater weight than I would normally recommend simply because faculty growth, at least in my area, has not matched undergraduate enrollment, so existing faculty are pressed to do more and more teaching. It's hard to generate grant funding when you're teaching hundreds of students per semester.

I think that the new strategic plan is a tragic mistake. We have missed the boat in terms of research focus and other universities are far ahead of us. We are wasting time and resources on what is essentially a game of strategic follow the leader. The truth is that we are principally an undergraduate institution and we should focus on that rather than focus on graduate education and research funding. The way Rose has handled faculty hiring is problematic as we have had to hire people that fit the strategic plan, but do not address our teaching needs.

I think we need to balance departmental needs and center needs. I am concerned that resources are going to go to centers at the expense of departments. I think both departments and centers can be strong. In our department, we have faculty members who are more productive than center faculty. A center appointment does not ensure productivity. I believe a balanced strategy will be most effective. Ideally, these areas are not in competition. That is, increasing faculty size and research strengths should yield better teaching and more student engagement in research.

"If we fail to understand the difference between training and education we will fail the students. Adjuncts are ok but tend to train. Faculty educate. It is an important and underestimated difference with serious long-term effects."

Teaching needs should never be supplanted by research needs. Our teaching of undergraduates is what allows UA to exist.

The four new university research initiatives are stupid and seem to have come from an article on page 37 of the Chronicle of Higher Education. "Water?" Really? How is that supposed to be an area of research for many of our disciplines?

The research institutes are only relevant to the extent that they represent areas of strength. To focus exclusively on areas of strength assumes that we are adequately staffed in all areas. This is not the case. There are some disciplines that are barely represented on this campus.

The university research institutes should be supported mostly with existing faculty. New hires within existing areas of research and new areas of research (based on competitive proposals) could also contribute to the research institutes.

Theoretically if you are hiring tenure-track/tenured faculty to support the teaching needs, then you will also be supporting existing areas of research strength and creating new areas of research strength. If this is targeted as more adjunct/contingent labor that is a problem and does a disservice to your university goals of R1 achievement.

This question was not really clear to me. Some of the above would overlap with others areas in my opinion, for example new University research institutes and supporting the existing areas of research strength. I would ask as a university do we have clear allocations of what the expected weight is for Teaching Research and Service? It does not appear to be clear among all colleges. I would ask that a honest discussion happens in regards to this, there are many inconsistencies among colleges.

UA cannot at this level forget the need for teaching students.

We HAVE to have a spousal hire policy. We could pluck some great people from other universities if we know there's a place for their spouse to be hired. Right now, we lose great candidates because we can't get their spouses a proper job in Tuscaloosa. That's unacceptable.

We need to tenure our professional and clinical track faculty members.

Q2-SS-TT

A heavy focus on hiring faculty to "focus" on the research institutes diminishes the quality of the faculty. We've had to turn away extremely well-qualified faculty because they didn't "fit" the agenda of the
university and ended up hiring individuals who would not otherwise have been considered for work here. As phrased, this asks faculty to choose between “money generating” fields (e.g., engineering) and “traditional/liberal arts” fields. Efforts should be weighted toward keeping early-mid career faculty who are producing and have built labs and networks. When they leave, we lose more than anything else. Senior faculty are going on to positions we cannot match, but there is no excuse for losing mid-level faculty who have established themselves and their research in Tuscaloosa. If we can't keep them it is simply because we won't. That is unacceptable, and the price for this policy is profound and across the campus as they are the most active in multidisciplinary research. Funding post-docs for active faculty members could be a way to generate a lot of research and improve the attraction for graduate students to campus.

I couldn't answer the questions because they seem to imply that people who fulfill the teaching needs of the colleges are different than those who both enhance and expand our current research strengths. Less teaching responsibilities for first year tenure track faculty. My dept works hard to keep new preps to a minimum and to protect tenure-track faculty's research time, which I find very helpful. My responses to Q01 and Q02 are not at odds. We have to develop a much deeper funded research portfolio for UA. But, I do not think that the categories in Q02 are mutually exclusive. Provost Whitaker stood in front of the Senate when the administration was first rolling out its ambitious goals to hire 400 new faculty and said that we had managed our undergraduate student growth through an over-reliance on non-permanent, non-tenure track faculty. He clearly stated that was not sustainable and that this faculty growth was aimed at correcting this imbalance. He and President Bell repeated that message across multiple venues. Overtime, however, that message shifted to growing the faculty, but to enhance our research productivity, especially in the new research institutes, not to address the over-reliance on non-tenured instructional faculty. Again, this does not have to be an either or. Expand the faculty in departments that have grown disproportionate the the overall university growth, with the expectation that the new faculty will be funded or fundable. Not all understaffed departments will be able to hire fundable faculty, but many will. Grow the research institutes, but at a slow pace so they can demonstrate the ability to hire and retain excellent research faculty with established funding pipelines. Otherwise we are throwing money at new areas, without buttressing weak spots. New hires should also be allocated to help strengthen departments and diversify research interest. Q2 was confusing. Are these really the only options? Teaching is not the problem here. It ranks higher in priority than any other college I have been at - and it's not that it's bad but if we want to be a research insirition then we need priorities closer to that of other research universities. Teaching needs seem to be met at this point. Less focus on undergraduate enrollment and more emphasis on hiring GRAs so that research can be done should be the focus. We need infrastructure to help current faculty with external funding and training to prepare them to conduct research. The university needs an interprofessional research center! The research institutes are exciting, but they leave out enormous swathes of the campus. It is disappointing that there isn’t a research institute that doesn't incorporate the production value of the humanities, much of the social sciences, several of the hard sciences, the fine arts, etc. I understand that these institutes are productive, have the opportunity to raise much-needed research funds, and are well-liked by the legislature. These are all good things. But it does run the danger of turning the campus into a two-tier campus, which will drive away the best faculty and graduate students in fields that are cast as irrelevant. (Just at a moment when Alabama is getting quite a good national reputation in these fields.) The university research initiatives do not align with topics that top journals (or even low tier journals) in our field would publish.
There needs to be a better infrastructure in order to support research. Whether we get tenure is primarily determined based on our research productivity. Our percent effort should reflect the how heavily this is weighted.

**Q2-SS-NTT**

Anyone who has a terminal degree and is therefore hired into a tenure-track/tenured position should be able to teach. The emphasis for those hires should instead be placed on how they can contribute to research priorities.

Faculty from existing areas of strength and new areas should be affiliated with institutes so that departments and institutes benefit rather than a zero sum set up.

I do'n't understand what is meant by "supporting" the new research institutes.

It's not your tenured faculty that gets your students educated, it's the teaching staff and graduate students.

Seriously, tenure needs to be completely revised. We've got more than a handful of assholes in our department who won't even sit for a picture, much less contribute to the growth of the department. Plus, it's the most antiquated and discriminatory system in existence today. They only hire and promote other jobbers who support continuing the corrupt system, then actively discriminate against non TT faculty. One person in my Dept never missed an opportunity to insult non TT faculty. It's an embarrassment.

Students need skilled, dedicated teachers.

Support of research institutes is only available if one has interest in or professional knowledge of those area...if not, then no support should be required.

The idea of competitive research proposals between units to hire faculty seems like a recipe for enmity and misunderstanding. Furthermore, the glacial pace of approvals would mean that proposals would not be timely enough to be competitive.

The University research institutes are a nice addition to the University, but it seems fantastically short-sited to force new hires to hit these targets blindly. It makes sense to use fit as a tie breaker, but to overlook perfect hires that can advance the research reputation of a college, perform masterfully in the classroom, and conduct great service, because they don't research something like Water seems crazy.

There are two ways to build reputation: research and the performance of students in the marketplace. I'd argue that we grossly undervalue the second.

To attain critical mass of resources to win competitive large-scale proposals, the university should use existing resources and build on them.
Q3: Weight the following groups in order of where emphasis should be placed to support the research priorities

Q3-HUM-T
"Research priorities" must include those outside of STEM. Graduate students are the lifeblood of the research/creative activity effort and grossly underfunded. Does "emphasis" mean "money"?

Graduate students who are teachers of record are in our department overworked and underpaid. Load should be reduced from 2/2 to 1/1 and salaries should be raised to be competitive with other schools of our caliber.

"GTAs in English make $13,500 a year with no dental insurance. Many live on food stamps. What are you going to do about it? We're tired of asking. For this university to be focused on so-called 'research' priorities is fiddling while Rome burns."

I have no idea what it means to "place emphasis" on any of these groups. Are you talking about hiring? Recruiting? Funding?

Research by non-Ph.D. students is more service than actual research (in general).

Silly question/options, once again. What do you mean by research? Undergraduate research? Externally funded/subsidized doctoral or post-doc student research? Or faculty freed up from any teaching duties who produce new knowledge on their own? Or who write grants to support that last group? Different definitions of research apply to each of your categories and so you provide people with a meaningless choice in this answer.

Technical support for research is pretty thin at UA. They are placing too much emphasis on undergraduate research, but our graduate students are the ones who will go on the job market and the ones doing more research. This school would benefit from concentrating on solid MA programs that feed other PhD programs. Once we have built up some of our research infrastructure, we can then have better PhD programs. We need to be careful not to create a two-tiered system where the non-teaching researchers that bring in big grants are highly regarded, while those that perform the bulk of teaching are looked down upon. It smells of the old tradition of the husband that is applauded for going off to work while the wife is home watching after kids and keeping the house running.

You leave off the professors who manage graduate students. Directors of Graduate Studies: it would seem smart to me to properly compensate those positions so that you reward the energy needed to revitalize programs--to recruit, to retain, to professionalize. The pay across campus in the humanities for this kind of work has decreased every year for the last 20 years (if you include inflation), so each person doing the job knows they are valued less than the person before them. Probably smart to put money towards the department leaders who work intimately on improving research standing at the graduate-student level.

Q3-HUM-TT
PhD and Post-docs are most driven to produce. Increasing undergraduate research and grooming those students for the future will lead to more PhD’s for the university as those students decide to pursue advanced degrees and choose to stay on at UA.

Technical staff to assist in applying for grant funding would be ideal.

We desperately need to attract more GOOD PhD students - that is going to be the demographic that has the most impact on improving research. Going after fee-paying masters students (the Graduate School’s current strategy) is not going to help research; it is another example of UA pursuing numbers for their own sake rather than quality/impact.

We have a significant number of MA students who are not well funded but then go off to ranked doctoral programs elsewhere. By increasing their support, we can grow the graduate program smartly and ethically. Too much attention has be given to doctoral programs and sadly they are not receiving jobs upon graduation in many fields. Also, our undergraduate growth has plateaued. Post docs and MA is where our focus should be in terms of research priorities.
Q3-HUM-NTT
All groups mentioned deserve appropriate support. While graduate students need more support individually, it is important to find more ways to involve undergraduates. There's a big difference in learning about a thing and being involved in a thing. And it means a lot to have students from our state becoming involved early so that they might find a career path. Students from our state are more likely to choose to stay here and participate in the development of our state.

I work in a department where a masters degree is terminal, so an emphasis on doctoral students doesn’t include my area. We lack technical staff, and facilities management falls heavily on faculty. We are constantly scrambling to repair equipment and keep our labs up and running. We need technical support staff so that we can offer students a professionalized program where things run smoothly and function properly. Technical staff will allow us to focus on teaching and research.

Q3-NS-T
Additional research faculty may also be hired in areas (e.g., in the four institutes) where their main job would be to get grants and not to teach. However, this should be done with due discretion; i.e., not to adversely affect the hiring of tenure-track faculty.

Although I currently have a number of undergraduate research students working directly with me, the net output is relatively low.

Both PhD and MS students should receive focus. Post-docs are ok, but not the primary products of the university.

Graduate students are the engine that make this university work and remain even remotely competitive in research areas where other schools (i.e., medical, institutes, etc.) compete for the top undergraduates (many of which we train too). Undergrad research is an important component, but it is growing in expense and time and investigators should have things like lab fees for every student they take into their lab given back to their research.

GREAT undergraduate researcher can make significant contributions, but the life blood of ALL top-10 programs is research conducted by PhD students. To support those students and start new areas quickly, some postdoc support is invaluable; established instrumentation heavy areas also need some technical support staff. Nevertheless, PhD students are the main priority.

Greater infrastructure on multiple levels is desperately needed for greater research success. Faculty who are expected to pursue research must not be bogged down with advising and other administrative service responsibilities. Additionally, greater administrative support for assembling grant applications (budget, various forms, etc.) is needed. Faculty should be able to focus primarily on the narrative portions of grant applications and not so much on the other administrative components, but right now that is not the case. The IRB process must improve. It is too long and communication with Research Compliance is not often not good.

I hope that 'technical staff' includes the category of 'research scientist or research engineer' or similar titles. They are the ones who can devote themselves to research.

Increasing PhD Graduate Assistantships could be even more of a research spark than hiring new faculty. UA cannot compete in STEM areas with offers of other top schools, who have guarantees and better offers to bring in more and better students. UA in the STEM areas is a second-tier choice for the best students, and that needs to be fixed to move research culture forward.

It is imperative to develop a team of technical research staff (including non-tenure eligible research faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor ranks) and post-doctoral researchers in order to grow and sustain nationally competitive funded research programs. Such personnel will be expected to be much more productive than graduate students. While UA’s primary focus seems to be to increase the number of PhD graduates, we need to recognize that societal needs in many disciplines are at the undergraduate and Master’s level graduates, and NOT for doctoral graduates.

Post-doctoral researchers are an important factor for successful faculty to broaden their research while maintaining the required depth to stay successful. However, UA currently has no means for successful
faculty to obtain bridge funding for post-docs that may enable them to hire high-quality post-docs. A&S currently puts the burden of financing post-docs for new faculty on the departments, which (based on the share of overhead departments receive) is not sustainable. While in some cases a post-doc for new faculty may be justified given the financial constraints I would suggest developing a mechanism that provides the possibility for established faculty (untenured & tenured) to obtain UA funds for post-docs based on their past external funding success. Ph.D. student stipends have been too low compared to similar institutions for too long - if we want to be competitive we need to improve on this.

"Quality graduate students don't come to UA because of low recognition. This leads to slow research productivity, low credibility, and therefore low research funding, and therefore research ranking. This perpetuates the cycle.

Post-doctoral researchers are more productive. Technical staff could help too, if they can support research through data collection. This will help in the short term, by the time quality graduate students can be more easily found. Throwing money at graduate students for the sake of having high numbers is a waste."

Shift some of the undergraduate scholarship funds towards increasing the number of graduate student fellowships; make fellowship more than one year awards; reduce the undergraduate enrollment slight by this shift in funding to increase the graduate student enrollment. Graduate student enrollment is a direct metric for research and scholarly activity for a university.

The University should consider discussing with top research faculty at the University the need for technical staff.

This list is missing research faculty themselves, such as via teaching releases and staff support. To raise research productivity, it is critical to have personnel to achieve this. It is also critical that we keep in mind our training mission and strongly support the training of PhD and post-doctoral students. Technical staff are important components of the research infrastructure. Masters and undergraduate students have less impact on research productivity, but are important components of our teaching mission.

Undergrads and MS student should be incorporated into robust research programs (populated by the other three categories) in support roles that enhance their education and offer opportunities for the to be mentored (i.e., groomed) to elevate to (and through) the other three roles.

Undergraduate students require too much training and generally lack the ability to meaningfully contribute to competitive scientific and engineering research. Other academic funding sources should be used to support their involvement in research activities. Post-docs are the most productive group, but R1 status depends on the production of Ph.D. degrees. Additional technical staff are needed to operate and maintain instruments/equipment and to train students how to use them for their research. We are functioning likea town that has added 10K new residents without updating the water treatment and sewage facility. Our OSP and other technical staff must be improved for us to grow. Infrastructure! We need more support for graduate students so that we can build a network or ladder from undergraduate study to graduate study. In today's climate the student cannot afford to complete a MS or PhD without assistance.

we need to recruit and retain talented PhD graduate students
Without newly trained technical staff, many of our newer instruments are not used to their full capacity. This hinders the research mission.

Yes, PhD students are paramount. However, a strong Masters program is also needed to support research thrusts. Technical staff support in my area (Engineering) has been withering for decades.

Q3-NS-TT
"at this stage, I believe University should not place significant emphasis on number of PhD's produced, instead should focus on quality of the PhD's we producing. simplification of the course requirements (specially number of classes) will help to improve our research enterprise. There are number of research intensive universities which require less number of courses to get PhD than UA."
Growing our research program will require investment in people who can productively contribute to an exciting, interactive research culture. Undergraduate research is primarily for educational purposes and will not produce high-quality results or outputs. Using part-time instructors to cover classes instead of funding GTA positions is a short-term solution that adds nothing to research at UA. Having increased graduate fellowships will help to recruit quality graduate students. Postdocs would also be very beneficial for new faculty so they can get their labs started up while applying for funding. Internal support for research staff and students is critical. This is almost entirely missing from this university currently.

Post docs only make financial sense in a limited areas with high levels of funding. Undergraduate students while gaining valuable experience do not (except in few cases) provide significantly to the research goals. In areas where there are large shared resources/labs my experience is that technical staff should be expanded. Masters students have been de-emphasized and I disagree with this - if no one trains masters students in research we will have no qualified PhD students.

The university system is minting too many PhDs; UA is contributing to that problem by over-emphasizing PhD graduates as a metric of success, at least in COE. There are many PhDs looking for a decent postdoc. University if woefully understaffed with regard to technical support. We don’t have any post docs in several departments. This is a sign of low research priority. We have very few PhD students, another sign of low research emphasis. We should work to increase both of these groups. Further, there is little support from A&S for hard money technicians to maintain the instrumentation within departments. This means lower research productivity, and we are less competitive when applying for large grants.

We should consider the idea of research assistant professors. These positions would function like a "super post-doc." It would allow us to recruit early career scientists that we could not recruit to a traditional post-doctoral fellowship. These positions would allow the research assistant professor to work on existing grants but also to write the own grants, participate in mentoring of doctoral students, and do some very limited teaching.

While undergraduate student involvement in research is important, to be an R1 university, emphasis needs to be placed on PhD students, postdocs and the support of qualified technical staff. The number of PhD and postdocs students is factored into university rankings.

For clinical faculty, non-faculty research staff and assistance is imperative. Undergraduate students already work in many labs. The challenge is finding good graduate students.

**Q3-SS-T**

Again, these seem to be mostly science based and aren't relevant for good chunks of the university. Distribute the emphasis evenly.....increase the greater probability that something extraordinary will develop across a greater number of different types of research contributors.

Doctoral students largely represent uncompensated time for many faculty. We have some faculty running award from doctoral education when they should be running toward it, but without a way to release people from teaching in order to serve on substantial doctoral committees or a compensation mechanism that rewards people for serving on doctoral committees, the dissertation work is largely for highly motivated faculty members or suckers who fall for it, which should not be the case at all. Greater assistance with grant development is very much needed at a level that is closer to faculty (with staff who have specialized knowledge of specific disciplines).

I work at the law school, so I really can't say.

Not sure what was meant by technical staff
Post-docs need to get REAL jobs, not just hang around waiting for crumbs.
Separate grad student council from SGA to give true independent entity
The emphasis should be placed upon faculty doing their own work and not buying their way out of teaching.

The primary focus of research priorities should be upon research faculty.
This question is not clear to me. I would not have included technical staff in this list. Technical staff should automatically be a resource for building a firm research infrastructure. Why allocate a weight that takes away from the other categories?

We are an undergraduate institution. That is our core strength. The new administration wanted to do something different, but is following a well worn strategy that will NOT result in UA reaching its goals, but rather degrading the UG experience.

We have plenty of undergraduate students, thank you very much, and master's programs don't generally support research.

Q3-SS-TT

0's were intentional.

Again, this question implies that the resources given to one group don't include the others. I can't understand this.

But again, supporting research priorities and supporting instructional needs do not need to be at odds. Creating a true research library that relies in a strong book collection and less on ILL is crucial to become a research institution of note.

High quality graduate student education doesn't not appear to be a high priority at UA. My understanding is that many programs have asked for waivers from minimum requirements in order to increase enrollment. This is counter to our long-term interests. We should be investing more in our students and recruiting the best individuals possible.

Increased support for undergraduate students can help provide research opportunities and serve as a funnel into graduate programs. Students who do research as undergrads will be better prepared for the rigorous expectations at the graduate level.

Ph.D. students should be our priority.

Post-docs don't make sense in the current MIS job market.

We are not at all competitive for PHD students which I have it a high ranking. This is for research priorities thus the rankings.

We lose many of our best graduate students to other programs who can offer them more money. Better graduate students drives up our profile and our reach. Undergrads, though few of them will go into academia, are the best ambassadors for our success to the broader public.

Q3-SS-NTT

Funding of these students and technical staff is an issue

"Technical staff would include grant support specialists, high-level technical support (e.g., HPC resource management), and similar research contributors. Clerical staff should not play a role in the research process and therefore should not be emphasized.

I would not place much emphasis on post-doctoral researchers, particularly since they would not contribute toward the university's ranking in other ways (e.g., degrees awarded). Frankly, if a post-doctoral position could be eliminated and replaced with an additional doctoral student slot, that would likely be preferable in most cases. While those post-doctoral researchers who are present should obviously be part of the research process, it would be inadvisable to place undue expectations on having post-doctoral researchers around indefinitely to enhance the university's research profile. In the long run, our resources would likely be better directed elsewhere.

Finally, while Master's students are an important part of graduate education, many Master's students do not intend to pursue a doctoral degree and therefore have little interest (or ability) to engage in research. In other words, Master's students (and Master's programs) cannot substitute for doctoral students. Doctoral students will play a critical role in building the university's research priorities, so the majority of our emphasis should be placed on doctoral programs."
We are a university. Let's try our hand at teaching students and serving our communities. Novel, huh? We must rebalance our thinking and priorities to development of leaders in all professions -- to represent our brand, build eminence, and stand as examples of the high-impact contributions of this university; every bit as valuable and important as pure scholarship.
Q4: Weight the positive impact of the following on research growth.

Q4-HUM-T

"Empower faculty and staff" is toothless. Change it to "Fund faculty and staff" and you have something. Again, problematic wording on the questions. Does "areas of strength" mean areas where quality is recognized? Or does it mean areas with high numbers and money coming in? Faculty need research-based monetary incentives and greater numbers of graduate students--the latter requiring increased numbers of GTS lines.

Faculty produce research, promote it among students, and transmit it to the next generation of researchers. No other group performs all three functions, because no other group teaches students. How about empowering English Dept GTAs with more funding, and English Dept FTIs with TT lines? Again, the costs are minimal. Remember how much teaching these folks do.

I recently moved from another University and it took over a year to move two subawards that I had. In large part this was due to a lack of communication with staff in various offices involved with establishing and approving the grants and the poor quality of the infrastructure/computer systems for faculty to track and monitor the status of research proposals.

I think it would be a good idea to support those faculty members who have already invested their time and expertise in UA. Ignoring them and taking them for granted may end in losing some of the talent to other institutions.

I understand support systems as research assistance and University funds for the Humanities

The humanities should be allowed to keep more of the tuition that humanities core classes generate, so that graduate students can be properly compensated, and the hours they give to undergraduates made more competitive with other institutions. By cutting funding to grad programs in the humanities each year as we have done for at least the last four years, applications drop, and our undergraduate education also becomes less competitive (affecting retention). I would like the university to consider these links between graduate programs and undergraduate teaching with more qualitative sensitivity: improving the conditions of graduate students opens up more one-on-one teaching time with undergraduates. It also would help us develop more robust research programs at the graduate level. This is not the place to try to save a few more dollars each year.

These numbers are assuming the Research covers ALL areas of research within the university, including the Arts.

This is an empirical questions. I recommend conducting a study to find the effects of these things on research growth. (Also, what is "research growth"?)

We should be pursuing all of these goals in equal manner.

Your choices read like the administration wrote them--what does the last choice even mean? What does it mean to promote research and graduate programs--produce a glossy flyer or double the travel budget for a unit and half the teaching load by hiring more faculty. Seriously, this survey convey to me that no one really wants any info from us on nitty gritty details but, instead, wants vague senses to help justify decisions already made.

Q4-HUM-TT

"Promote" should = "fund."

All of these areas are crucial and it's pretty impossible to pick one over any of the others. "It's not exactly clear to me what is mean by "modernize and streamline research infrastructure...""

What we need are ways to work more flexibly across Colleges. I could see great benefit from Art/Art History and Engineering collaborations from the standpoint of external funding. Are there ways to also find internal support for cross-college efforts?"

Modernization is good, but what does "streamline" mean? Sometimes is code for reduction of resources.

Need to fund and empower humanities faculty. Without full support (research money, graduate assistance, sabbaticals, and in-house research leave options), the University will not retain those faculty who are succeeding nor will they cultivate a culture of research excellence among those who are not.
Strong research and facilities must come before promotion and growth. Our facilities are outdated. When students visit our competitors campuses, they see state-of-the-art facilities and prestigious faculty. If we don’t have the same, there is no amount of advertising that will get people in the door. If we want to increase enrollment, especially at the masters level, we have to do better work and offer better spaces.

These questions are very difficult to answer

**Q4-HUM-NTT**

"Alabama will never be Duke. It will probably never be University of Michigan or The University of Texas at Austin. Ambitious high school students with high standardized test scores will never choose, en masse, to go to Alabama over Vanderbilt or Berkeley. It would cost a lot of money to hire star professors to come to Tuscaloosa, money that could be spent on turning positions for adjunct faculty into tenure track positions. It is pathetic to see the despair of PhD graduates from name brand institutions, with strong publication records, who are forced now to be underpaid, overworked adjuncts. Attempting the futile task of turning Alabama into Berkeley or Chapel Hill by increasing the focus on graduate studies and bringing in highly paid star academics only makes this problem worse. It both produces more PhDs who cannot get decent academic jobs, and it siphons away money that could be used to replace adjunct positions with tenure track lines. Not to mention that many of those jet-set star professors and graduate students will be terrible teachers compared to the humble assistant professors who might otherwise be doing the teaching at Alabama. Any department at Alabama in which PhD students only matriculate in order to become professors one day needs to take a hard look at its placement numbers. This means most humanities departments, I imagine. If less than 50% of a department’s graduates are finding tenure track jobs, then it should cut in half the number of PhD students it is admitting or dissolve its PhD program."

The idea to invest more in the development of the grad school does not necessarily mean to neglect the undergraduate program. But the real pride of a university of the size and ranking like UA should be the establishment of a competitive grad school.

The job market is over-saturated with PhDs. We should place less focus on accepting new PhD students and more emphasis on supporting faculty and instructors who have advanced degrees but are paid well below their peers in other institutions. Many instructors want to research, and they do, but they are less supported by the university than they should be. Examine and use current resources, rather than trying to reinvent the wheel.

"If a program is any good it doesn't need promoting.

Fix the financial disincentives that prevent interdepartmental work.

Shrink the administration. UA is wasting a lot of money on a bloated administration. It's not clear what all of these people do. What they don't do is research. I bet we could cut lose maybe half of the administration, move that money into research, and be more competitive."

**Q4-NS-T**

"research growth" implies more graduate students, so item 3 is redundant, unless you include reducing the size of undergraduate population (which I think is a good idea but has no political traction at administrative level due to tuition revenue).

After 10 years of investing millions/billions in undergraduates, invest $1 billion in research. All of Q04 MUST be done if the University wishes to make significant strides in research growth. The University is chasing research growth by building facilities without adequate planning. Expensive laboratories set empty or rarely used because administrators prefer to see infrastructure that can be micro-managed. Senior Associate Deans should be enabling active faculty to grow their research instead of managing where a graduate student can sit. Institute Directors should be actively supplementing active faculty to grow research rather than competing for resources. Technical staff should be technical staff not movers, not painters, not sherpas. These are low/no cost management changes. These are changes in attitude. These are eliminating fiefdoms. These are empowering faculty and staff for research excellence.
All of the above are very much needed
"Empower faculty and staff for research.
All of these are important."

Empowering faculty for research excellence will have the most impact on research growth. UA currently does very little to reward research-active faculty and overburdens faculty with administrative duties. Modernizing research infrastructure is also desperately needed and should be an ongoing priority. Streamlining support systems like the multitude of administrative online forms that faculty now have to fill out for everything would also go a long way to free up faculty time. However, streamlining research infrastructure would have a negative impact on research growth - as administration appears to think that 'streamlining' means to get rid of instrumentation that does not support itself through user fees. This is one of the aspects where a change in course is clearly needed, by increasing user fees and not continuously investing in research infrastructure UA has hindered research growth during the last five years. The idea that research instrumentation are one-time investments is simply false, no major research university can support their research infrastructure through user fees (numerous studies have shown this). Successful research universities have heavily invested and continue to invest in modernizing and operating their research infrastructure. User fees need to be kept at a minimum to encourage use by faculty and help them be successful. A mere increase of grad to undergrad students is of no use if student quality is not improved or suffers.

I don't know what "Empower faculty and staff for research excellence" means, so I did not give it any points.

I don't know what is meant by empowering the faculty and staff and I don't think that is likely to happen regardless.

In my area of research, I cannot compete with researchers at other institutions because our instrumentation is old and no longer supports cutting edge research. The University must provide the basic equipment and instruments needed to support the academic mission (student training), and provide matching money plus technician lines to obtain external funding for research infrastructure acquisition.

It is critical to support growth of the graduate student population, as they are the engine that creates research productivity in science and engineering. Faculty also require modern research infrastructure. It makes sense to invest more heavily in areas of strength where the return is likely, although this should not preclude all investment in areas that have room to grow or new areas of potential impact.

Our infrastructure and support people are good. It's just the number of federal hoops we have to jump through that slows us down. Also, please quit harping on increasing the number of PhD students. The US and the world does not need every US university to churn out PhDs. All we are doing is diluting the worth of a PhD.

Research infrastructure and support is a necessity. Effectively empowering research faculty and staff subsumes the other three.

See previous comments. Research infrastructure must improve to move in the direction that is desired. The ratio of grad / total student population is one of the criteria for ranking, so it would be an easier, more accessible way to improve our standing over which we have somewhat more direct control.

We have come a long way in the 17 years that I have been at the university. However, our research support system needs additional resources. We need more statisticians dedicated to help researchers. As a graduate student at UT, I received 10 hours of statistical help per semester and our department had a named stats person who we worked with regularly. If we are going to continue to grow, then we need additional IRB staff and a better IRB computer system. Most of my protocols are 6 pages in a Word document....the same protocol printed from our current IRB computer system is 40 pages long. Who wants to read/review 34 pages of nonsense? Simplify!!!! Please.

Q4-NS-TT

"Empower faculty and staff for research excellence" is really vague - what would empower me the most is reducing my service load and reducing the number high-enrollment 100-level courses I teach.
I don't understand this question so I answered 20 across the board.
I see "promote research and graduate program" is a goal rather than an action. All the actions comes
down to "how" and "$". So, ultimately it comes down what type of investment the school is willing to
do on research.
I think we have a lot of good faculty but they end up beaten down by bureaucracy and negative feedback.
I think we have a lot of good staff but they end up underutilized and performing secretarial duties
instead of contributing to research.
More diversification is required instead of focusing on traditional research areas.
More support to graduate students recruitment. UA ranking is so low now to absorbing talent graduate
students. Lots of limitations and less support for graduate students growth. The junior faculty can not
grow without enough graduate students and postdoc. Waste money to have more junior faculty cannot
survive here.
Research takes a lot of time. If faculty don't have the time and resources they need to do research,
nothing else will be able to improve our research very much.
"Specific suggestions to positively impact research growth:
1. Increase graduate fellowship opportunities and pay for students so we can attract and retain better
applicants
2. Allow additional semester long teaching releases for tenured faculty so they can invest time in new
research areas.
3. Increase start-ups for new faculty
4. Run a capital campaign to raise funds for aging infrastructure for the sciences, arts and humanities.
5. Increase staff support for research and creative activity by increasing number of staff. For example,
determine how many proposals were rejected without review because there wasn't enough support
staff."
These are all platitudesxwithout any real meaning. This question is nonsense. There is exactly one thing
the university can do to foster research growth, and that is to provide internal funding opportunities to
directly support research. Anything else is a waste of money.
"These items seem to apply more to the large Institute/Center level activities targeting larger funding
opportunities. I think the G/UG ratio is a consequence of research growth not a driver of it.
Growth in research at a faculty members level is primarily driven by their (and small groups) own
experience and expertise - some of these items may slightly help but I think individual ideas and
reputation play a larger roll."
These options are pretty vague, but generally, if you want more research, invest more dollars in
research. Particularly in terms of equipment and technical support staff.
We need to support the faculty we currently have by providing additional resources, whether that be
seed funding or graduate student support.
While graduate students and undergraduate students have avenues both internally and externally to
find research and travel support, faculty, especially tenure track faculty, struggle to find research and
teaching support. It is unrealistic to provide low start up and tenuous lab spaces that are not fit for their
purpose, and then expect great results from new faculty. There needs to be more support and better
infrastructure for new ideas to be tested and take off. The new ASPIRE research-focused semester
program should help with some of this, at least granting more time to develop ideas.
Q4-NS-NTT
Confusing question -- empowering faculty means investing in them and supporting them, and reducing
their administrative burden.
Increasing the number of graduate students matters--not necessarily the ratio.
The money is not being put into basic equipment needs, service contracts and personnel to run the
facilities to support research. Admin wants level 1 research with 5th level support and funding where it
is really needed. Effective EHS staffing, functional buildings, and financial support for equipment.
Q4-SS-T
"Empower" is another bullshit term! As are "modernize" and "streamline." Meaningless verbiage! Again, perhaps the best results can be achieved by emphasizing the interrelationship of these factors. All of these seem important. Again, I think a balanced strategy will be most effective.

EMPOWER faculty & staff, but don't DEMAND things that are impossible (i.e., every discipline and area of research should be able to command big outside grants).

Empowerment here means providing resources and reducing responsibilities for mundane tasks that any educated person could do.

I am not sure what empower faculty and staff for research excellence means above, but it sounds good. For me this would mean allocating more funds to support faculty research, or to increase salaries so we can hire and retain top notch support staff. It would be great, for example, to have an office that supports faculty grant applications.

I don't know what empower means in this context and how this would be different than any of the other choices. They should all empower faculty. This is a poorly worded question because the choices are not mutually exclusive.

I have no idea what empower means here.

I scored Modernize and Empower low, because at R1 schools, these already exist and should already be in place before moving towards seeking R1...NOT while trying! I also believe that the empowering faculty is a facade at this point. Many colleges and departments stagnate growth of individuals directing programs and research because it leaves other program areas behind while shining light on unproductive areas. I have personally been part of multiple million dollar grants and been hamstrung by different administrators in making programmatic changes that would bring national attention and reputation to an area of historical mediocrity for decades.

I'm really not sure what "empower" means in no. 4 but if you mean give us more money and leave time, then I'm giving it 40%

If you want good research you need students who are challenged to think critically by faculty with real expertise. They do this at places like UC Berkeley and other great research institutions.

"In terms of infrastructure, what we need are specialists. Each college should have a person who directly oversees all grant work and aids people in submission rather than dealing with the crazy maze that is our Office of Sponsored Programs. Most people get so tired of dealing with OSP with all of the delays and delegation that many people (including myself) say grants aren't worth the headache. More than that, specialists are needed so we aren't spending substantial portions of our days on Concur, Digital Measures, and advising. Instead of having highly trained specialists in each area, we have a whole ton of faculty blindly and often inadequately filing financial reports, digital reports, and advising students. Free up faculty to research rather than now adding accounting and other administrative duties and then hold faculty accountable to a higher research standard because then they'd actually have time to do it.

I've heard people say they wanted to hit a grant deadline but their FAR was due. I've heard people say they couldn't complete a manuscript revision because they spent the morning trying to find the proper 5-digit Concur code and itinerary. This should not be."

It is my opinion that this question be prioritize verses weighted. All of these should be goals. Some of these will be an outcomes of others listed, specifically faculty and staff will be empowered for research excellence, as an outcome of others on the list.

More funding for graduate students so we can compete with other institutions -- maybe that's a piece of "invest" and "increase ratio" but it's critical.

Probably the single most factor in supporting research growth in my college has been to give faculty release-time for research and provide start-up packages.

Promote research and graduate programs also means increasing the funding for PhD students. They should at least be earning a living wage, and in the sciences their packages need to be competitive. The new research foci are useless. They are too broad and linking hiring to them has resulted in some extremely strange hiring which may meet the strategic plan, but screws our UGs.
The research infrastructure can be (and should be) improved quite a lot. The weighting system here makes it seem this is a zero sum game. I am not sure it is. These are false and overlapping categories???

We are badly in need of more faculty and staff with "modernized" Web-era technological skill sets within the context of research infrastructure and support systems. Graph computing/linked data, database programming, ("big") data sciences (especially academic disciplines outside of the Business School as they have a wonder data sciences program), and "foundational coding" skill development and support for faculty (see https://carpentries.org/ as an example of the latter).

What does a sentence "empower faculty and staff for research excellence" even mean? That is a throw away statement and can be interpreted in a lot of different ways, depending on the type of research that is privileged (particularly by who is in charge).

Q4-SS-TT
"The biggest hurdle I have experienced at Alabama for research excellence is an outdated and power-hungry IRB. They are inconsistent in handling applications both within and across reviewers, arbitrarily implement additional constraints beyond the common rule, and refuse to engage in dialog with faculty when questions arise on applications. I have colleagues at other universities that have protocols for the same projects approved in 24 hours and here it takes re-classification and 5 weeks. In my field most published papers take 5 data collections, so across a research project, this means our research is delayed 6 months compared to our competitive institutions and all the work I do is federally exempt. We need to get an actual researcher or academic in an executive director role that can explain to that office that their job is to facilitate faculty research while ensuring we abide by the common rule rather than getting high on their power and creating roadblocks. I have only been here a short-time and IRB frustrations are so bad that I have started looking into opportunities elsewhere."

Absolutely every one of these things is critical if we are serious about research at UA. This made it very difficult to weigh each component against the others.

I have a problem with what these words actually mean. What does "promote" mean? "Empower"? These need to be tied to actual practices and policies for this to mean anything. The clear issue at UA is the weak support for faculty research needs. Support and policies lag at least 10 years behind the quality of the researchers hired. It's like trying to build a house on a glacier.

I think the emphasis needs to be on the quality, not quantity, of graduate students.

I think the faculty and staff are empowered already—we need the resources necessary to do excellent research!

If empowering faculty for research excellence would include pre-tenure research semesters, then I would weight that category more.

if you hire good researchers support them.

Not clear how "promote research", "invest in research", and "empower faculty for research excellence" are similar or different

PhD students are the best vehicle to increase research productivity.

The IRB needs a complete overhaul. The amount of time it takes to get research approved (research that would be expedited and approved in 6 weeks at an R1) is ridiculous and hinders productivity.

This question seemed a little silly. How could one do some of these without also doing others? They aren't mutually exclusive.

With respect to the research infrastructure and support systems, our IRB is lacking. I have a collaborative project with colleagues from several other institutions. All of their IRBs labeled the project exempt. However, only we called it expedited. Further, many other institutions with similar projects are also exempt.

Q4-SS-NTT

Faculty empowerment could consist of "Idea Labs" that involve community stakeholders (the way NIH has begun fostering interdisciplinary research with new dimensions), and seed funding for new collaborations, within the university and with other universities. Time and funding for faculty to
participate in additional research training using new technologies, as well as NSF Days etc., would be very helpful.
I don't know why we're bothering with all this. We all know the money will go to engineering and sciences. The rest of us will be told to go suck an egg because the university won't be able to monetize our research.
Improve climate for diversity which impacts recruitment and retention of post docs, grad students and faculty
Non-tenured faculty with terminal degrees not on tenure tracks are untapped resources that already exist on campus.
Or . . . let's be really good teachers and help students and members of our community learn to be good citizens. Let's give people the skills that they need to be successful in life. Let's teach respect for each other and how to lift up one another.
Promoting research and graduate programs increases the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. Therefore, these are not exclusive.
The "empower" "promote" and "recognize" options were less clear in terms of what that actually means in practice whereas the other two are clear and would clearly aid in research growth (quality and quantity).
Q5: Weight the allocation of effort that should be put forth by the following groups to externally promote research, creative activity, and graduate programs.

Q5-HUM-T
Again, the faculty should be the heart of this institution.
I’m not sure I understand the question as written. Whose job should this be? Whose is it now?
I’m not sure I know what the word “promote” means in the context of this question.
Need a mix between trained professional promoters and people who understand the research being promoted.
Not a humanities-friendly question (no research staff in the humanities).
Our campus exclusively understands research = external funding/sponsored programs. Since I don’t agree with the narrow definition I’m unsure how to even answer this. And listing PR professionals as an option is just, well, I can’t even go into how problematic it is that this is even considered something worth considering....
PR professionals mostly highlight Business and Engineering
Research takes time and funding. Offer it and you will get more research. Support faculty conferences (easiest way to make outreach directly to the communities involved). Support more leave time for research faculty (you'll get more books).
There is far too much administration already.
This question is so poorly written I can't answer it
To whom are these things being promoted? And what do you mean by "promoted"? Are you talking about hoo-rah and snoozleberries? Or actually helping students and faculty get projects and events off the ground?
We DO NOT need more administrators, rather fewer. Get rid of those high-paid useless positions and convert them into full faculty positions. Focus on STREAMLINING the hiring process, removing time-consuming bureaucracy. We need to get job announcements out FAST and get interviews done in a timely manner; most really good people don't really want to come here, so we need to get ourselves to the head of the line and offer jobs before other institutions.

Q5-HUM-TT
I don’t know how to answer this without a clearer definition of what is meant by "externally promote." To whom?
I don’t really understand question #5.
I'm not sure
PR professionals need to have an understanding of research and be in dialogue with administration, faculty, and research staff to promote the correct message.1
Promotion should not fall to faculty. Faculty are busy doing the actual work that is being promoted! If this is not the job of the administration, then what is?
Those who are paid exorbitant salaries should work to externally seek and promote research, etc. The burden should not be placed on those faculty who working with limited resources, significant service (especially women and POC doing unpaid diversity work), and teaching. They are already stretched too thin, especially those in the humanities. Many of whom still manage to establish national and international scholarly reputations.

Q5-HUM-NTT
As long as the PR professionals know what they’re communicating
Faculty and students should be granted the freedom to pursue their scholarly pursuits; they can share their activities with others, but the burden should not be on them to advertise or promote. (However, if we’re looking at salaries, I’d rather faculty get raises with an understanding that they will need to do a bit more in terms of promotion, than hire non-academics to make pretty brochures.)
Get rid of all the PR professionals. Do it gently perhaps by not replacing them when they resign or retire.
The number of people who fall under the description, "University Administration," should shrink.
The people who are doing outstanding research should be positioned to promote their contributions to audiences beyond the scholarly community. PR professionals and administration can facilitate that effort but are not the ones to engage in the promotional efforts. We need to reemphasize that the reputation of a university comes from the educational value and the scholarly output, not from the athletic and other non-curricular components in the first place. "If your program is any good, it doesn’t need promoting. The faculty’s work speaks for itself. Time spent promoting the work is time wasted. Eliminate the PR professionals and put that money into research."

Q5-NS-T

Administration need to make the same type of commitment to improve graduate education as has been done with UG program. Another group of stakeholders in externally promoting our research activities are our former graduate students/alumni (especially former Ph.D. students) who can really advertise and vouchsafe UA's research excellence around the nation as well as internationally. Does UA have a continually updated directory of Ph.D. alumni who may be willing and able to help with external promotion of UA's research? These may be our best representatives outside of the university.

Current UA admin at Dean’s levels in STEM areas are not able to go out and press for research opportunities, compared to even other schools in state (there is a reason Auburn is a much higher ranked Engineering school...)

External promotion is clearly the responsibility of UA administration. Faculty do their part by carrying out excellent research. Faculty can easily promote their research through custom websites, research gate, attendance at national conference, and engagement in the community. It would be nice if PR people could help with participant recruitment for studies. Faculty have no time for extra duties as they are teaching ever increasing numbers of undergraduate students and are just trying to stay afloat with the additional 'reporting' that is being asked of them (e.g., assessment of teaching effectiveness, health and safety trainings, outreach efforts, international collaborations, ...). That said, unless you can use UA faculty and students, it seems odd to pay for advertising from an firm outside the university.

I hope the primary focus of our work is to actually conduct high quality research. Promotion of such research should come as a secondary concern. It is not entirely clear what "promote" means in this context. Our faculty are going to be the communicators of our research. Administration and PR professionals can help hone and promote the message, but it has to come from the researchers. PR professionals and administration are the best resources to promote programs. The meaning of this question is a little unclear: While it may be in the University and faculty general interest to raise UA's external visibility, this is something that will naturally come as a consequence of improvements in the level of UA research.

This is a shared effort. Unsure what is meant by Research Staff in the UA context. We have a really archaic administrative system to deal with a "must-needed" in research culture. OSP is highly dysfunctional and the recently created institutes are, in general, nonoperational and highly inaccessible to faculty (there is no clear communication of what they do or how a faculty/researcher can get involved)

Q5-NS-TT

As a faculty member, I would love to promote our research etc externally, but I only have so much time in the day. "Consider the growth of research as the theme, this is a tough problem as the faculty member is best equipped but has the least time to devote to this effort. Also, it isn't clear who this promotion is targeted towards. Community, political, funding agencies. Each group has different roles in each target audience."
I do not understand this question. I don’t see how PR professionals can promote research. Bragging does not make the research better. I don’t understand this question. Does this mean within our subdisciplines or to other constituencies? I answered 20 across the board.

more financial support/allowance to faculty to attend more conferences every year
More graduates for junior faculty
PR professionals can help with graduate recruitment.
The best promotion is organic, through twitter, social media and other faculty- and student-led sources.

Q5-NS-NTT
Researchers are not promoters. They should be focused on high-quality work, not publicity, which should be left to the administration and professionals. Researchers must, however, make the administration aware of their work.
We have a college of communication, film etc. Use student learning in those programs rather than hire PR firms. Empower our students and build their resume, complete waste of money to hire what we already have!

Q5-SS-T
Administrators should not be given responsibility for anything related to research. They abdicated their role as researchers when they became administrators.
And faculty should be provided incentives for their promotional efforts via social media, conferences, etc.
As I’m answering these questions it seems like this is all pushing in a business model direction - unless you hire PR people who understand research across all disciplines (in my experience here at UA they don’t) then I don’t know why you would waste resources on employing them.
Connecting with alums -- utilizing their resources in these efforts.
Different colleges have significantly different potential funding sources available. One size fits all approach is just silly.
Engaging in external promotion requires a significant investment of time. Although faculty should be actively engaged in research, creative activities, and impactful community/organizational enhancement efforts, using faculty time to promote such efforts takes them away from what they do best. Also, if faculty will be expected to engage in promotion efforts, evaluation and/or P&T requirements should recognize such activities.
Faculty who have the reputation for quality education draw the best students from the national pool....they are the people you want to study with because of their reputation and scholarship. Students are the most important recruiters....they know what really goes on in a university and what the quality of education is and their social network is international and probably intergalactic.
"Farming out research to mercenaries will not get UA to R1. Faculty research is not rewarded in the present climate and culture."
I am terrified to write administration or PR professionals because it would just create more bloat.
I don't know what you mean by "external promotion." If you mean those glossy magazines that come out ever so often, I'd recommend negative growth -- waste of resources that favors "sexy" topics over creative research. My ratings address outreach to the community and other institutions to build research infrastructure.
I think there are lots of opportunities for the university and PR professionals to seek out private donors for research topics.
If you are so gung ho on our conducting research (in my opinion to the detriment of teaching and service), you can’t expect faculty to spend our time on dog and pony shows, too.
Like said prior, PR professionals, admin, and staff ALL should already be in place before seeking R1. We already have those people in place at UA, so allocating more resources seems pointless to staff positions. Faculty cannot do more without reducing teaching load, particularly that at the undergrad level. Meaning, high quality doc students are needed and VERY high quality instructional faculty is
needed. At the upper undergrad level, instructional faculty do not help, so doc students and master instructors with higher pay than 100-200 level instructors are needed.

not a well phrased question

PR Folks and Admin are great, but Faculty telling their stories is most powerful. Need avenues to make this happen

PR people need to NOT be controlled by Strategic Communications, but rather by the Colleges and Schools

Since I do not believe in the strategic plan, this question is largely irrelevant for me. The pursuit of research funding is an extremely poor strategy given that many other universities have gone in that direction.

Stop asking questions that SPLIT INFINITIVES! What does "effort put forth" mean?????? "PR Professionals" are worthless.

There is a difference between promotion for research projects and graduate programs. Tying them together in this question is problematic.

This question is not expressed clearly. I have allocated weights based on the importance of the variables to the research mission of the University.

Q5-SS-TT

Don't understand the question.

I have had challenges in working with PR staff to promote my own research. I have tried to get media recognition for my research, but I'm not sure how effective current avenues for PR at our university really are. For instance, more work needs to be done to connect faculty with reporters so that they can build relationships.

I think the best way to promote research is to have faculty members presenting their research at international level conferences, publishing in top journals, and writing and disseminating research summaries or articles in non-peer reviewed, topically appropriate outlets. Publishing plain-English research summaries in topically appropriate outlets gets the message out to people outside of the semi-closed academic community about the real value of research at UA.

NO MORE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS. We are drowning in administrative positions/titles with people that do not add to the actual work.

Not sure what PR stands for?

The strategic communications group on this campus is extremely poor at promoting this as a research institution. They do almost nothing to promote the research that is happening here.

"This question doesn't make any sense. I literally don't know what you're asking me to do. PR, Faculty, and Admin are all involved in promoting research in very different ways, and each has an important part to play."

Undergrads can promote research, but I don't necessarily think that should be part of their "job"

Q5-SS-NTT

Administration can get buy-in from all stakeholders by presenting a coherent strategy for fostering research locally and connecting it with funders in successful ways. Bringing NIH, DOD, and NSF program officers on campus would assist faculty in connecting with priorities of funding agencies.

I find this question confusing. Faculty promote this through conferences and putting out good work (i.e., being research engaged and productive). Same for graduate students. Beyond that, in terms of "image" this is clearly a job for PR and University administration.

If we serve our students well the world will know of our good works.

Promotion of research needs to lie with PR and communications. They should have the news contacts and simply need to set up a system to interview key faculty in each department at regular intervals on projects and develop the press releases.

Students? Are you kidding? Invest in a concentrated program of promotion -- rapid response deployment of new research and the experts, focused on topical pitching (and landing) of major media.

Slow-burn research matters, but publication in academic journals is good for academics... and of
virtually no value to the reputation of UA with real people. This is not a criticism of the existing PR staff. I trust they are as understaffed as any other function and doing heroic work given existing resources and expertise. But if we want to start lifting our profile, then we will make an investment in straight-up, sustained, visibility of our experts and expertise. This is not optional. It's like anything else. If we want it, the question is what we are willing to pay to have it. Not willing to plop down $1000? Then you don't want the new iphone bad enough. Same thing here.
Q6: Rank the following in the order you expect will have the greatest impact on externally promoting research and graduate programs

Q6-HUM-T
All of these options seem like a secondary strategies to me, and even a misuse of money. The reputation of a research program--at least in the humanities--is generated by the reputation and work of the faculty in it, the competitiveness of the graduate program, and the engagement of that faculty in the research community. These ideas listed seem like undergraduate appeals--football and advertising?! I would recommend paying for more faculty, fund their research and conferences--make the graduate lines competitive with real research institutions and you will logically build sustained better programs, whose reputation will spread among graduate communities and professors who recommend their undergraduates where to go.

Graduate faculty should be well-supported to travel to meet prospective graduate students nationally and abroad. This should not have to be an extra volunteer thing. It takes a lot of time, effort, preparation, etc.

How about do something significant instead of paying people to promote it online--though maybe that's how the Novel is given out these days, based on website hits.

Like it or not, football drives a lot of what we do. Exploit it as you can.

The best recruiting tools for GRADUATE STUDENTS (not undergrads) are: Funding, funding, funding, and the quality and renown of potential advisors.

Websites no longer bring people on their own: people need to be drawn to them by something else. Academic conferencing and presentations should probably feature fairly highly on this list, but one Nick Saban conversation is going to get more external attention than a year's worth of brochures.

What's the goal of externally promoting research and grad programs? Is it spreading awareness? Increasing applications? Increasing donations? Different goals will be served by different strategies.

Q6-HUM-TT
Again, my answer would depend on what is meant, precisely, by "externally promote."

Email marketing is cost-effective and powerful. I get emails from my previous institutions all the time promoting the amazing research that is happening and I regularly click on links to the most interesting stories/ websites.

Funding graduate students would have a significant impact on promoting graduate students.

Stop just announcing those who receive major grants. It is insulting and encourages the persistence of a stereotype that faculty do not deserve our salaries to non-academic and ill-informed state government stakeholders and general populace. The number of publications (by type), faculty showcases of the diverse faculty, and other means should be promoted on the website, visible places including football games, recruitment events, and other high-traffic print and online venues.

There is very little publicity or recognition for faculty doing excellent research if that research does not bring in federal funding. It is great that Denny Chimes are rung for people who win NSF career awards - that is a big achievement, and they should be celebrated! But I and my other colleagues in the humanities get no recognition for the work that we do. I am gaining recognition in my field, and even brought in a $30,000+ grant a couple of years ago (this may not sound like a lot from the sciences, but for my humanities field it's huge). My dean did not even congratulate me, let alone include me in any publicity from the college or university. How can UA publicize the great work its faculty are doing if it will not even recognize it internally?

Q6-HUM-NTT
Faculty travel for research and creative activity can be coordinated with local recruiter efforts to reach prospective students in the area.

I don't understand the groupings. "Programs, brochures and handouts" are unrelated and have different functions. The best way to obtain an external impact is to develop research stars and expose what they do to the world. The same can be said about "teaching stars," people who have demonstrated that they are achieving results outside the university.
Lower teaching loads so that faculty can do better and UA can hire better faculty, so that UA can rise in rankings. Some schools, like business, require 2-2. My program recruiter is not competent. None of the proposed activities speak promote the quality of research at UA as well as research successes themselves. More support for research and graduate studies would aid recruitment of good graduate students more than any sporting event or PR. Social media will be a yet growing instance in the context of our attempts to reach out to potential students and donors to gain their attention. Especially the scholarly quality will create a better presence in the media when experts are asked of their opinion (e.g. NPR). This is not a core university mission and is a waste of money and a distraction. Again, if it needs promoting, it’s probably not very good. Find ways to attract the best researchers and the students will follow.

Q6-NS-T

For our program, Option 3-5 do not produce viable students. The recruiters typically do not know enough info about the program requirements or field to actually be helpful. If we want to use recruiters, we should focus on hiring graduates from the program to promote the program. Most of our current graduate students were recruited through word of mouth from satisfied customers. Our on campus students were recruited by faculty. Plus our field has several ways of recruiting within the field (our national association has a website that lists all of the credible graduate program in the US). We also pay for ads in a popular print journal in our field and in the brochure at our state conference. Engage external media consultants who will work to get UA researchers and research units featured/quoted regularly in major "news" publications outlets (not technical publications such as peer-reviewed journals). We should aim to have many of our researchers as the "go to" persons who the media will contact for information, comments, and quotes. External funding agencies, reviewers and potential graduate students tend to look at researchers and departmental websites. UA currently does a poor job in raising the visibility of research achievements of its faculty. In essence faculty currently also need to also promote their own research. For PhD student recruiting, the first 2 (websites and social media) are far and above the others. I do not see the others really helping much. I would say that research presentations by UA faculty and graduate students at national and international conferences and the publication of research in preeminent journals (e.g., Science, Nature) would have a greater impact on promoting research and graduate programs than any of the items listed in Q06. In relation to #2 above, recruiting at professional conferences/meetings. No real idea about this so you may want to exclude my input. None of these will have any appreciable impact. None of these would have an impact. Research excellence is recognized by the prestige of the research output of an university, such publishing in high-impact journals or outlets of public interest, research of national/international importance, having faculty members recognized by societies, institutions, and the general public, etc. Publications in the top journals must come before any of the above have impact. Th best way to promote graduate research and graduate programs is to invest in the people that will increase funding, publish, present, and attract PhD students. The main way to promote is to actually do world-changing research. The emphasis should be on quality. We should worry far less about promotion and instead invest to money it will take to produce more research worthy of attention. "The recent wave of website redesigns, while improving aesthetic character, destroyed a large amount of available online information. Websites take years to develop and refine, they cannot be re-done well in a matter of a couple of months. And most departments currently have no staff available to maintain
website content. It is left for the faculty to do, such that it will take years for the website to return to a similar level of information content.
The research mission and productivity of the University does not seem to be very strongly promoted in publicity."

UA recruiter presentations are only useful if they are done at events where there is likely to be a population of interested students. The University could make significant impact by providing resources to support travel by department faculty, students, or staff to professional meetings to present their research and recruit graduate students.

Website and faculty productivity is the real impact everything else is advertising that impact Website will have the greatest impact. Add-on to recruiter portfolio.

Q6-NS-TT

"Promoting" research as described above will not improve research at UA. The university needs to provide more money/infrastructure to support research.

Again, who is the target constituency? I don't understand this question.

All of these are extremely bad ideas. There is only one thing that will improve research at this university, and that is for the university to stop wasting money on nonsense promotional efforts like those listed and to invest directly in research. We need real internal funding opportunities. All of these ideas are abysmal.

Are these actually "an effort to recruit better students"? These effort do not directly promote research. It should be treated as minor efforts.

Developing core research strengths as well as breadth in research areas is important to the research visibility of the University and recruitment. Having access to new and updated infrastructure, science and engineering labs, creative activity spaces is also important to research productivity and recruitment.

University of Alabama trains great undergraduate students but we don't succeed in holding on to them for graduate school. We should be able to hold on to a larger fraction. We do want UA undergrads to go to other Universities and encourage students there to apply to UA.

I don't think any of these are particularly helpful. Who is the audience? To whom are you promoting the programs? What is the goal?

I think that the main promotion actually comes from students, postdocs and faculty engaged in strongly funded, world-leading research, presenting at national and international conferences and receiving media exposure through that rather than by advertisement campaigns.

"In science fields, I don't think anything will really make a difference on this list besides websites, and possibly handouts etc. from booths at major conferences.

Research programs are promoted because other faculty recognize good research is being done and recommend students apply, or by students finding interesting published science.

I don't know anyone who looks at PR materials."

more advanced publications on fundamental research, conference presentations is best way

"Similar to question 5, the faculty member website is probably ideal for promoting their work, but the burden for generating it has fallen on the faculty member. The people.ua tools are nice, but it is still a time consuming effort. Perhaps more resources could be directed to helping faculty build their sites.

Also, the question is not clearly focused on who the promoting is being targeted towards. I have ranked them assuming the goal is to promote growth in research.

It is possible that by leveraging the UG recruiting network to be more active in assisting G recruiting at regional universities we could streamline great students to contact professors here at UA.

Without the active recruiting on other campus's, it seems that ultimately promoting UA as a place for external graduate students to attends seems to lie with faculty developing reputations of excellence that their colleagues at other universities may encourage their students to attend UA."

We need to externally promote research and graduate programs to the people who matter, which for my field is other scientists. They will review our grants and papers and send their students to programs
that are perceived as 'good.' This is not going to happen through UA recruiters, UA is going to have to understand this as fundamentally different from undergraduate recruiting.

**Q6-NS-NTT**

I would consider the top 4 of my selections to be pretty equally weighted as far as effectiveness if conducted properly.

The best promotional tool is really having excellent research to promote. Then, you must have an infrastructure to publicize it.

**Q6-SS-T**

Again, poorly thought-out question and alternatives.

All of the above are ridiculous. Invest in faculty research and senior faculty hires, that's how you attract and keep graduate students. Everything above is a complete waste of money based on a business model not applicable to hire education. NO STUDENT CHOOSES A PhD PROGRAM FOR A FOOTBALL TEAM.

Are you kidding with the sports one? Why would that have anything to do with wanting to attend an institution for a graduate degree? Frankly, if that was a motivating factor for a potential graduate student it would be a huge red flag. I mean why not ask about Greek culture.

Get rid of all the hard copy stuff. Spend money on networking and people who have contacts to get our work placed in high visibility outlets.

Giving faculty the resources and encouragement to grow nationally known research traditions, labs, etc.

Establishing these kinds of (substantive) reputation will move the needle on promotion by ("Oh yes, Alabama, that's where Smith and Jones are, who do the X research . . ")

Grad students attract other grad students.....we underestimate their network. Faculty reputation also makes a difference....grad students talk about the faculty to other students and that enhances our reputation or sends it into the tank.

I can order these but if I had to put a number from 1-10 on how effective any of these would be I would put 3 on impactful websites and 1 on the rest. You have to proactively do this. There are places who do it well, why not follow their lead?

I don't know what is meant by "UA recruiter add-on presentations on graduate programs at recruiting events."

My goodness but none of the above. The way to have greater impact and promotion is to publish in top journals and presses and get competitive external funding. I hate all of these options above.

None of the above are particularly useful.

None of the above...

None of these seems to be a particularly effective way to externally promote research and graduate programs. The external audience should be prospective students and faculty, funders, researchers at other institutions.

Setting up at conference expos would be one of my top recommendations.

Social media, by far.

The most important element may not be listed. That is, conducting and sharing high quality research that makes news because of its real-world implications or impact.

There are many folks with significant funds who attend sporting events. Greater awareness of research activities could help with donations.

There are too many questions here about public promotion of research work. First promote quality research, THEN worry how to get brand credit for it.

To enhance rankings, need better communication to deans of peer institutions.

University websites need to be accurate. There are not adequate resources provided to upkeep these sites. Potential students use these sites to seek out faculty to study with and we are not doing a good job of using these as a tool.

What will have the greatest impact is faculty getting external funding as then they can advertise in all of the above to recruit graduate students for their funded researcher. Listservs used by professional associations are a good way to also let others know about your research staff needs.
College- or even department-specific research symposia to target attendance from alumni, employers, state government, funding agencies, companies, etc.
Faculty encouraged to recruit at professional conferences and provided with flyers to do so.
Impactful is a terrible buzzword. That kind of business-lite speak is alienating. (It's probably obnoxious, but it's true.)
In my line of research, one of the best ways to get research results out to a wider audience is by publishing summaries for industry practitioners in the area. For example, research on retirement savings behaviors can be summarized and posted/published in trade magazines and websites dedicated to personal financial planning.
No idea
Faculty can engage potential students through presentations at conferences and in presentations.
I have no idea what this question means.
I think you left out the most important outlets. Most critical is organically developed news content. Our communications staff need to establish reporter contacts for faculty to contribute as experts on news stories, but also develop press releases for forthcoming research. Faculty research will get lost in the clutter in other channels.
More faculty publications in high-ranking peer-reviewed journal and presence at professional conferences will contribute to faculty becoming "known" externally
None of the above. Stop wasting money on these superfluous things.
One of our graduate students conducting research attended a recruiting event to discuss research. He was on a panel, gave a brief synopsis of being a graduate student and conducting research, then answered questions.
Sad though it may be, students often grow to consider a given university due to athletic prominence, so sporting events and similar public-facing activities will likely be critical in promoting our research and graduate education.
Stop thinking of print. At face value, all that stuff carries a connotation of "dated." This is a world of immediacy, and micro-burst consumption of information. That's where our energies should be concentrated.
UA faculty and students are the greatest recruitment tool- if they are happy that is positive, if they are not, that impacts negatively
What about recruiting at major conferences by discipline or area? Or offering competitive scholarships?
Q7: Rank in order the priorities UA should have to develop relationships with sponsors and/or decision makers

Q7-HUM-T
I have exhausted my interest in this survey—from which nothing will come anyway. Better use of existing resources over trying to lure new ones in. Lobbying can be effective because we want peanuts in comparison to actual budgets at the federal level, but we need to convince people who will get invested in UA specifically to get invested, and that means engagement and partnerships, not getting 1% of a congressperson's attention.
Industry and business usually don't support the Humanities
It seems this survey is forgetting about research in the humanities
Not sure about this ordering...
These 5 options are skewed too much toward STEM. The bias is in the questions.
These are all great, but unless the quality of research is there to back these up, they’re meaningless.
Spend on supporting faculty, NOT on additional admin.
This does not seem to involve humanities, so I am not much interested in answering.

Q7-HUM-TT
Alabama has a lot of alumni capable of making big donations - instead of (or in addition to) steering that money into athletics/construction of new buildings/undergraduate scholarships/etc., we REALLY need to harness some of that for research. Federal funding is always going to be important, and we should continue to prioritize that too, but I think alumni with deep pockets are an opportunity to fund research that is currently being missed.
Alumni will be an increasingly valuable group as the last decade of graduates advance in their careers. Tuscaloosa needs more industry that can benefit the local economy and UA. Greater communication and partnership with the City.
Use you Alumni, specifically those who become professional athletes, to create research centers on topics like the mass incarceration, slavery and its legacy, social justice, and not just STEM topics. Alumni outreach is pretty anemic among African Americans, non-Greeks, and other marginalized communities.

Q7-HUM-NTT
Humanities research is cheap. If University of Alabama would stop wasting money on these kind of outreach efforts, the humanities could be funded without these distractions.
Partnerships with sponsorships should not lead to the loss of scholarly and ideological independence.
There is plenty of money out there for faculty who are entrepreneurial and demonstrate that they are doing something that helps business, industry, or whatever. The problem is that universities don’t practice specialization of labor. They want everyone to be a "triple threat" and end up with suboptimizing in all three areas.

Q7-NS-T
Improving alumni outreach for research does not mean just assigning it to faculty, which appears to have been the model so far.
Make case for research to various targets.
Strategic partnerships with other universities
The availability of direct flights to Washington is a very positive development and should be continued and enhanced. Administrators need to talk to faculty more to find out what is really needed. Bringing program managers on campus is something that is missing on this list - meeting faculty in person here at UA can be very beneficial for developing a relationship between faculty and program managers.
The faculty must be encouraged to publish in top journals. There should be an incentive program for top publications,
The main challenge is that most of the administrators are completely disengaged from the research enterprise. Most of the administrators in the research colleges/departments were the weakest researchers. This puts us in a tenuous position when trying to improve research.
UA has relied on lobbying without much Return-on-Investment (see Shelby-Quad, Institutes). Invest in people, partnerships, and collaborations not free money. We don't tap into our alumni nearly as much as we should in my opinion.

Q7-NS-TT

"- Capital campaigns will depend on community and economic outreach.
- It is not clear how much federal funding or state funding is available for research but increase in support is needed.
- Collaborations with industry is likely to bring in more research funds. This may then bring in more state funds.
- If the federal entitlement program does restart then lobbying DC becomes more important and it should move up in the rank order.
- Alumni outreach doesn't involve faculty often. Other Universities have better strategies to foster interactions between donors and faculty. For example, during sports games at MSU, some faculty are encouraged to interact with potential donors, alumni. Faculty only discuss their research and never bring up funding. Still, donors are made aware of the research being conducted at the University."

I don't understand the difference between "Research partnerships / collaborations with industry/business" and "Strategic efforts to attract new industry/business"

I know the South Alabama congressional liaison gets a lot done when he gets engaged. These are all horrible ideas. Invest directly in research. Give the faculty the opportunity to build productive research programs, and then let the natural strengths of the university do the work.

We really need to improve our alumni relationships and put forth a progressive research and teaching agenda. The image as it is now appears to be one of little change despite growth at the university level. We need to improve this and attract private companies to support our students through scholarships and fellowships, and research consortia.

Q7-NS-NTT

All are important. I'm hesitant to rank.

Q7-SS-T

Again, publish in appropriate outlets is the way to advance. No new administrators are needed. Alabama has a PR problem. I have colleagues who would make excellent faculty members at this university but won't even consider it because of Alabama (e.g. Roy Moore, stance on illegal immigrants, general conservative Christian values). We are more than this and I try to tell them this. Tuscaloosa needs to start to brand itself apart from the state if it wants to attract new industry and business or we will be left with the finite businesses etc that are within the state.

Alabama ranks so low are major social issues that it is hard to take it seriously. To get people to invest in Alabama we have to have a proven, visible, talked about impact on improving the lives of Alabama citizens. George Wallace is still in the schoolhouse door, our fraternities and sororities remain segregated, our poorness in the state and lack of quality education is legendary....To have good relationships with anyone your own house has to be in good shape....ours is not.

Get UA System to get out of our way!

Honestly my ranking here is pretty arbitrary. I'm not sure that Montgomery has any interest in funding higher education.

I don't really understand what is meant by "sponsors and/or decision makers."

In my area of research, there are no productive partnerships with industry/business as might be true in say, engineering.

It's "research partnerships" and "alumni outreach" and nothing else. And between them it's 80/20 to the former. Alumni outreach only is effective is the outreach is to those who can be research partners. Networking is key.

Partnering with major businesses is perhaps our best approach. Federally funded research funds are simply too scarce and there are too many other competitors out there. We need to focus on where WE add value and not follow a bullshit me too strategy that we currently have.
The focus is so heavy on grants that we seemingly forget alumni gifts. Get them excited about more than just providing another student scholarship and reward faculty who facilitate gifts in the same manner that faculty are rewarded for facilitating and attaining grants.

The monies we need are federal dollars and rather than having faculty focus on the above, faculty should be focused on writing grants and let the university figure out what else they can do like the things above. Please do not distract research faculty from their task of writing grants to get them to participate in lobbying, seeking community partners, or working with business unless UA is interested in small business grants.

The options in Q07 should have equal priority. Relationship development necessitates a multifaceted approach.

Why are these priorities all about government and business dollars, except for the one about alumni? Wow, let's all be complicit in the military-industrial pollution complex

Q7-SS-TT
Honestly, these are all enormously important.
Media relations should be on this list.
Need to lobby for more resources necessary to do high-quality research!
Research funding follows research productivity, so the most important facilitator of research influence is investment in the faculty. Faculty should be allowed to work to the top of their training, which means that they should be protected from participation in grading assignments, wrangling with unhelpful staff, or even conducting all the elements of research by themselves. Failing to do this also dries up streams of undergrads to grads to postdocs to new faculty and wards off potential new hires. Those of us who have come to UA are guided by ambition and belief that UA can be an awesome place to do research. A lot has to happen to bring us in line with that faith.

The level of integration that this school has with the local and national business community is poor.
Universities should not be run as businesses.

Q7-SS-NTT
Collaboration with industry is a bad idea. It tends to influence the science/information that is presented toward the good of the industry, not the people. It takes away the neutrality of university-backed science.

Our local community hates us. Local folks complain about us. Maybe we should try to be better neighbors.

relationships with major media should be first on this list.
Q8: Rank the following in the order you expect will strengthen research engagement of the UA community
Q8-HUM-T
"I wouldn't include company executives in the category of Eminent scholars. This is something that needs to change. Increase funding for exact and social sciences, and the Humanities"
I'm not sure if I support any of the above items. I think we cannot encourage graduate students to participate in regional and national level research events unless we provide some monetary support for them to get to these events.
Most people who visit from outside the South are very impressed when they come here. It will only help to bring more outside visitors.
There is no substitute for bringing people here to see what is happening, always assuming that we do not let the quality of our programs slip in the process of trying to market them.
This survey is so very problematic. As about teaching loads, ask about conditions that impact research productivity, ask about what faculty man by research, ask us about the relationship between teaching and research -- instead, the senior admin has set the parameters and we play nicely within them. Faculty senate could take such a more proactive role but, sadly, it hasn't in decades.
Q8-HUM-TT
Any and all of these things!
Provide housing options for short-term scholars
Several departments in A&S already do this but these series should be endowed (like the Dept of GRS Lecture series). Without boosting the local series, the others will not generate the necessary buy-in to guarantee success.
We would LOVE to have seminar series in my department, but the money is not there. A lot of us are doing good and important work in our fields, and if we could strengthen our ties to the rest of the world by having a dedicated fund for bringing in external speakers/collaborators, that would do a lot to raise our profile.
Q8-HUM-NTT
The strategies in this group are the best of any question so far. All have promise and #5 is not far behind #1.
This is a list of things that money is being wasted on, money that could be used to fix the travesty that is the use of adjunct instructors.
"Hosting eminent scholars for long-term visits; one semester to one year.
Swapping scholars with other institutions for a semester or year."
Q8-NS-T
all of these are important.
Anything but more time and expensive on the 3-MT competition. That is so very superficial and does nothing for really supporting research. If this is to continue, USE THE STUDENTS to meet with potential donors and donor groups to explain their research.
Does UA have an active visiting faculty program? If not, this should be made a priority to attract the best researchers from all over the world to collaborate with UA faculty on on-campus research activities as well as to teach our undergraduate and graduate students for 1-2 semesters. Funding for this could be either a fixed (across-the-board, university-wide) salary for visiting faculty or a 50-50 faculty model with the visiting faculty member’s home institution. This is a strategically excellent way to attract the best academic researchers to UA and to gain global recognition for UA at minimal expense.
From my own experience hosting conferences is a vital part to strengthen research at UA. Workshops (not necessarily during summer) are another excellent way to promote the visibility of research done here at UA in particular for young faculty. However, obtaining funding is unnecessarily difficult. The usual answer goes something like: I'll give you $x if A and B also pitch in $y. When asking A and B the
answer will be similar asking for support from C, D, E & F. The VP for research should be able to handle this and figure out those details once faculty ask for support (isn't this what administrators rather than faculty are supposed to do?)
"Higher-tier institutions have not only department, but also sub-department (sub-discipline) level external seminar series.
It is unclear to me what is meant by research competitions for graduate students."
Hold seminars in the community on topics that people are interested in
I would strongly appreciate UA encouraging grad students to DISSEMINATE their research nationwide, but emphatically NOT through participation in "competitions", rather through regular conferences and seminars.
Is the goal here generally strengthening research efforts by individual faculty (to help those not currently research active?), is it encourage growth of interdisciplinary research? or is it to provide opportunities for faculty to grow and promote their research?
We need a mini-series on how to complete clinical trials. We also need a stats series. We also need more opportunities to learn about other researchers on campus. I liked the speed dating programs we had.
Writing workshops for graduate students and postdocs.

**Q8-NS-TT**
I do not see how hosting a "summer workshop" is different from hosting a conference; what we need to do is to host internationally relevant research events (no matter if we call those workshops or conferences or whatever) "If this were a weight question, the different topics would all be considered important. Hosting regional, national and international conferences or workshops will bring in people to UA and highlight the facilities and research strengths of the campus and should then help with recruitment of faculty, postdocs and graduate students.
- One way to host eminent scholars could be to encourage faculty exchanges for example during sabbatical years. If nothing else, it could help set up research collaborations between Universities.
- Graduate students participating in regional and national conferences is important to highlight the quality of graduate education."
The existing ALLELE seminar series is a great outlet for hosting eminent scholars but funding is often a limiting factor to secure truly eminent scholars who charge high speaking fees. Also, small regional conferences are not very impactful in my field, in my opinion.
The top two ideas here are not bad, and are part of successful programs. But they are several orders of magnitude less important than internal support.
These all sound like good ideas.
What does "strengthen research engagement of the UA community" mean? Getting faculty to do their jobs? Or do you mean some other constituency at UA?

**Q8-NS-NTT**
**Q8-SS-T**
Absent from this list is journal editorships. There should be more institutional support for this at the level of the VP for Research and the Colleges. For example, my college provides no support for journal editorships.
Departments, centers and institutes are going to do seminars as their resources permit simply because that's how academics have traditionally disseminated information among ourselves. Thus, although it's important, it doesn't need "nurturing" as much as some of the other options.
Direct one-on-one or group coaching and mentoring on research design, research partnerships, and grant funding accompanied by seed grants may be as or more effective.
Graduate students need help with funding to attend regional and national competitions and conferences.
I like all of these ideas!
If you really want to support research by faculty then you have to seriously examine the workload. My workload is 40% research, 40% scholarship and the rest is assumed to be teaching. This is a JOKE. I spend a good amount of time in class up date and preparation, giving students quality feedback on their work, creating meaningful assessments of their knowledge and meeting with them outside of the classroom. This time is under credited and not valued. I do it because it is the right way to educate. I have four teaching awards from students but that has no value in my department. I spend a good amount of time advising honors students and helping them develop their capstone projects. I work with doctoral students and that is a time laboring effort that is not valued. It takes time and energy to help them develop into researchers if you do it right. I spend a lot of time doing administrative work that is NEVER recognized as part of my workload and way too much time on senseless committees. I received my PH.D. from a national institution that has a long-standing international reputation for its research, research funding and contributions to society. I know what it take to do good research ....and the above will have to change if you want to strengthen research engagement of the UA community. I have to steal time for my research and scholarship do much of it on weekends .....it ought to be part of my daily work. I am totally discouraged.

In terms of speakers and events, we need to do half as many things twice as well. Big events are better than many smaller, lesser attended events.

Incentivize faculty to value research

Summer is when I visit other universities to work with colleagues on research.

Sure, if you make outreach intelligible.

There is no support for journal editorships, conferences, etc, and the CARSCA is a joke with too little money. I don't think any department in the College has increased their ranking in the last 20 years.

There are plenty of regional, national and international conferences. Providing funding along with support among graduate students and faculty would need to be a priority. I love the idea of summer workshops with outcomes, not just having a speaker.

What will strengthen our research engagement the most is having NIH Program Officers come to UA to speak to faculty and having faculty write 1 to 3 federal grant proposals every year.

Why not hire eminent scholars? That would make it no. 1. Short term visits don't do anything of lasting value - great for the students who get to engage these scholars while they are here, not so much for those who come later.

Q8-SS-TT

All good ideas. Bringing successful researchers to UA (through conferences or speaker series) will be more effective than having UA faculty talk to other UA faculty and students. Representation at conferences helps as well.

Provide funding for faculty to support research.

Research engagement will be increased by well-funded and supported research labs.

Q8-SS-NTT

Community incentives

I think one of the most impactful things that could be done would be for the university to make it clear that it prioritizes and supports research to all faculty. There is a much larger emphasis on undergraduate teaching for TT faculty than is necessary.

None of the above. Do more applied and transformational research; engage with members of our community. Help to improve the lives of the people around us. Work with schools, community centers, and local health practices. Take students out in to the community to positively impact our area.

These are all important. Not easy to rank. All should be done.
Q9: Weight the following strategies to recognize productive faculty in research and creative activity

Q9-HUM-T
All faculty would benefit from REAL raises. It would make us feel as if the state valued collegiality and a nurturing environment. We might think we were working together for the greater good of all the state's citizens.
I'm not sure if I like any of the aforementioned items. Overall, faculty needs more support for research, especially time. There is no point in providing extra support to those who already have large salaries and continue to receive reduced teaching loads. Oftentimes the humanities and arts receive very little compensation when it comes to reducing teaching load.
If reducing teaching load for research faculty is a priority, then funds MUST be put back into the departments to hire new faculty to cover the classes for the department.
On the other side of the coin if faculty are teaching a lot, there's no way they can “excel in research.”
Plaques are a waste of money. Donate that money in the winner's name to a local charity chosen by the winner, even if it's only $50.
Researchers need more time (less teaching, less service) and money. Having to write proposals to have research funded/rewarded or to present research to non-experts takes time away from research. This would be better done on time devoted to teaching and service.
Short-term measures do not qualify as a meaningful investment in faculty, and faculty in turn cannot be expected to invest deeply in UA.
The issue is how "top" is determined. It shouldn't be just $$ in grants.
This survey shows that you guys know what we should be doing!
We are already having trouble hiring faculty given teaching loads.

Q9-HUM-TT
Recognizing excellent early/mid-career faculty with teaching release and named chairs would also help a lot with retention. I know that I personally am currently pursuing jobs elsewhere, mostly because in my 5 years at the university I have received almost no recognition for my research from anyone at UA, and have had to pursue external grants to get any kind of research support/teaching release.
Reduced teaching loads are not feasible for some programs with undergraduate course sequences that need to be covered (mathematics, languages).
These incentives must represent the diversity of the faculty and should not be awarded to those in certain STEM fields.

Q9-HUM-NTT
All above are appropriate ways to recognize outstanding work at UA.
Financial incentives will be most effective.
Recognize instructors and staff who research with monetary compensation.
Stop trying to run the University like a business. The traditional academic path, in which a distinguished professor might receive a chair in the last years of her career, is sufficient to recognize excellence.
The problem with endowed chairs is that the real value of the corpus declines over time. The university pays a fixed amount that can't be added to corpus if it is not spent. The university also invests in equities but none of the capital appreciation is added to the chair. There has to be a better way.
"Additional funding from the university itself in recognition of excellence in research.
Provide grant research and writing for all researchers."

Q9-NS-T
All of these should be done. The reduced teaching load is something that departments can already do on their own. Department heads should be encouraged to do this now.
All seem important.
Associates are driven to reach full. Create incentives for fulls to remain active and highly-competitive.
Then give the support and time to bring in and manage work that supports junior faculty, PhD students, etc.
Compared to even other universities in the state, we have very few named chair positions at UA in the STEM areas. I know several faculty who would have such positions if at places like Auburn or UAB. Currently, there are immense differences on how funds are allocated to faculty and departments within and across Colleges that do not reflect research productivity and excellence, yet rather historical or "who you know" reasons.

Incentives for refereed publications.

Personal notes from department chairs and deans is an important, low-cost way to recognize faculty accomplishments. Public recognition is also a good motivation technique.

Productive faculty in research and creative activity should be given some amount of leadership role in further building the research enterprise - they should be put in a position to help inform the administration about future research policies and programs because they know how to make things work.

Some form of endowed chair for ASSISTANT professors (only until their promotion) would enormously improve our recruiting of the best and brightest, who would be attracted by the extra opportunities and prestige of the position (it would also help them secure external funding).

The reality is that none of these really need to be considered.

This list makes me laugh. In Engineering, there are only 4-5 "chairs" for 150 faculty. In addition, the faculty that actually have the chairs are not necessarily the most productive. That's it. Any additional research "resources" will just get pissed away in Engineering.

While named chair positions may be an excellent motivation for full professors and associate professors awarding this to assistant professors seems too early (hence the 0). Short-term annual supplement in the form of bonuses would also be excellent motivations. Similarly, GRA support can be helpful if this is handled flexible - often productive faculty have sufficient funding but would benefit if they could supplement GRA lines when the need arises, i.e. this may only arise a few semesters down the line. Productive faculty typically have sufficient research support, therefore additional research support (of the order few $k) does not seem a good use of the available funds. Rewarding faculty themselves in the form of bonuses or additional raises is a much better use of available funds.

Q9-NS-TT

"Above question is difficult to answer. All faculty need more GRAs to do well in research. No GRAs= no research = no GRAs should not be the case. Everyone is capable of high quality research. Intention, excitement about research should be enough to allot more GRAs."

"All exceptionally bad ideas. Spend the money on internal funding opportunities and let the faculty decide how to use the money most effectively in their own programs. These ideas are almost insulting. If you think that the problem is that faculty are not motivated enough then I am angry and insulted. The problem is a lack of support opportunities due to the incredibly competitive nature of external funding and the almost complete lack of internal support opportunities. No carrots are needed, just real research support in the form of standard internal funding opportunities and funding for support personnel. Use the standard model of awarding support - grant proposals."

"Awarding bonuses or plaques to celebrate achievements is a great way to incentivize excellence in research. Further, making your most productive faculty feel valued (or at the minimum acknowledged for their efforts) will improve retention. I’m not sure that a chaired position would be as effective at incentivizing high productivity year after year."

I ranked reduced teaching load highly because that will hopefully allow the faculty more time to do research and thus to improve their research. However, with the large number of students we have, I don't think it is feasible in all departments at the moment. I also think it is important to encourage younger faculty especially.
I would take it a step further and have a semester release from teaching and service. Or provide summer salary and travel support so faculty can move into new directions. More carrots and more resources to researchers who are kicking butt.

My impression is that by the time faculty get to a senior level teaching is not a big burden and financial compensation is a big motivator. A named chair position with high salary and research budget would be huge.

Unclear what "named chair position" means... did not include in weighting scheme.

**Q9-NS-NTT**

Reduced teaching load only if faculty is still being productive in research. Too many work to earn tenure, then productivity decreases. Policy should be created to review tenure status.

Young, hungry faculty are very productive. They should have the room to maximize that productivity.

**Q9-SS-T**

Honestly, all of these are great ideas. However, they are not comparable in the way you have it set up in this question. BTW, finally a question that doesn't appear to have administrator input.

I just realized that I may have ranked some of the previous items instead of weighing them. Go ahead and change my rankings to 1=40, 2=25, 3=15, 4=10 and 5=10.

I would normally write named chair to attract outside candidates, but I have no faith in the support of the College or their ability to decide.

"I would not support additional research awards as two colleges politically dominate them for their own gain because they are the biggest and make others (with much higher research profiles) feel lesser when they lose them. I also think named chairs for people below the level of Full Professor is a bad idea--these should be the end goals, not things that people get early in their careers often based on a fortuitous grant application that will never be duplicated.

I'll also note that having contract faculty with Assistant and Associate Professor titles is making tenure-line faculty feel less respect. The fact that contract faculty can have the same promotion without having to go through the rigors of tenure waters down the process and makes people feel research is not actually a priority."

Identifying productive people early in their careers may help us keep them.

If we want to increase grant submissions and research activity, teaching reduction is critical. At least in my field, departments who are more research-oriented than our department have lower teaching loads. In all of these, selection of recipients is the challenge. How will "top researchers" be identified? Those who already receive large external grants? How will the funding inequalities between disciplines be addressed?

In my school we have most of the things listed here, but they tend to be handed out based on seniority (length of service) rather than merit. There is a concern that less productive scholars will feel slighted if they don't have the same fancy title, or get their turn at an annual award. In short, this means there is little incentive to produce scholarship, except to pursue a better job opportunity elsewhere. There is also an idea in my school that "productive scholars" do not need to perform service and get the plum teaching times (one day a week, or all classes in the same semester). Those that agree to perform service tasks are given a crushing amount of committee work, perpetuating the idea that they are "not scholars."

"Keep in mind it is hard to excel if you are not provided some of the same opportunities of others on campus. You are adding to a cycle. Interested faculty should be provided opportunities to excel, if not then teaching loads could be potentially increased.

Rotating chair positions may be considered to help provide leadership opportunities and support to those who are interested. A note of concern and major consideration is administrative positions could result in a major issue or distraction among early career faculty who are not tenured."

Money and 100% research time is what we need to be more productive so the more we have of those two things, the more productive we will be.
More is needed. This is just the beginning. A change in culture is needed at UA. Research and funding is not rewarded at present. Only publications are rewarded currently. Putting junior faculty in endowed chairs cheapens the prestige of the appointment. Some things we should have to work for.

regularly convene your Blackmon Moody Award winners, who have already achieved exemplary success in research as your sounding board

Retention, retention, retention. More money set aside for retention of good faculty and aggressive, preemptive strategies to act.
sabbatical term every four years is common at research universities. We need that policy here.
Supplements come from grants and summer funding. No need for that!
There is very little support for Associate Professors -- they are the "forgotten" group. I would support a "reduced teaching load" for research faculty ONLY if there is additional compensation for the teaching faculty who are forced to pick up their teaching load. UA is rapidly approaching a place where teaching is under-valued. Undergraduates fund UA and should be a major focus, not an after-thought.
There needs to be more done to encourage, help, and support less productive faculty members.
Increasing teaching loads and over rewarding the top producers does nothing to help tenured faculty to increase their productivity.
This is a silly list. It takes time to develop your ideas, translate them into a proposal, obtain IRB approval and funding if there is any......most of our time does not allow us to participate in the normal research process. It then takes time to conduct the research analyze and interpret findings and then writing and presenting and submitting. The biggest factor is time....you have to have it.
This is not the way to encourage productive work by the faculty. It is based on a faulty premise.
Recognizing and giving perks to the tall poppies will not encourage all of the poppies to grow and thrive.
How old-fashioned and backward can we be? Tired old formulations.
Too often awards go to political professors rather than those who actually do the work.

Q9-SS-TT
A bonus for top publications is a great short-term incentive to focus research on quality outlets. However, the reduced teaching load is probably more meaningful in generating better research long-term.
In my experience, salary and recognitions (named chairs) are either unrelated to or negatively related to actual productivity.
Increase teaching load for senior faculty who do not produce the minimum expected by junior faculty per RTP guidelines. For instance, if junior faculty are expected to publish 2 peer-reviewed manuscripts each year, increase the teaching load for senior faculty who do not regularly meet the 2 manuscript expectation. Otherwise, senior faculty who do not produce research yet remain on a low or normal teaching load are taking advantage of the system.
Look at what other universities do. Professors have budgets to supper their research - can hire people or buy data etc.
Plaque is really nothing. It needs to be important for furthering future research, not feel like an empty gesture. It doesn't have to come with a lot--say, a one-course reduction in teaching for a semester, or a guaranteed annual top-up of research funds in a small amount (say, $1,500/year for arts/social sciences). But glad-handing and empty praise actually only fuels the feeling that the university is asking more but giving less.
Suggest having faculty submit proposals for reduced research load and supplements that a faculty committee judges rather than having administration decide or using bibliometrics
The two main areas you can help faculty are by reduced teaching loads and GRA support. Senior level researchers are able to manage their workloads with much more ease than junior faculty, so these types of assistance are much better targeted at early faculty. For example, many of those faculty with research success are able to develop their own GRA support or recruit high-quality graduate students.
Who will teach classes if top researchers aren't? More adjuncts and instructors? I think our students deserve to be taught by our top researchers.

Q9-SS-NTT
couple any of this will an engineered PR program to lift the profiles, reputations and eminence of UA experts. And.... pay. Money matters.
I bet some stats person had a field day working on this.
I personally think time and money are more practical and helpful than some 'name'.
I would also suggest reduced teaching load up front faculty just starting to write grants.
"These are all great ideas!
To remain competitive nationally, we need to find other ways to recognize elite faculty at all stages of their career. Annual raises simply can't keep up with the market demand for elite faculty, so having supplements and recognition like this will help us keep top talent."
We need tenured/tenure track faculty in the classroom.
You want to increase research output and external funding? Give contingent faculty the support and time that they need to do the work for which they have been trained.
Q10: Rank the following approaches for establishing research areas of strength

Q10-HUM-T
"Align all research with the four new research institutes" : this is terrible and frightening! Does it mean research unreleased to these four things couldn't happen? That leaves out vast areas of our most important work! Also I think it's important that new proposals come from the faculty and not the administration.
Again, not a humanities-friendly question. And competing with each other at UA-level in more pointless proposals is a very bad idea. Please strike #2, 3, and 4.
Building from scratch isn't just more expensive; it has no reason to work. Why would a Cyber Security specialist come to Tuscaloosa AL to lead a start-up when there's plenty of well-established programs vying for them? This isn't a major metropolis nor is the weather idyllic.
Faculty should be guiding this university!
Forget administration-driving strategies; they don't work, and they don't necessarily take current strengths into account. There is already far too much administrative burden; don't add any more. I do not think that any of the above are good ideas, limited and ridiculous, in fact.
Please do not try to dictate what we research. This reduces creativity and is not very scientific.
The 4 institutes are there to generate income. This doesn't help the overall research of the university and seems very removed from it.

Q10-HUM-TT
Administration ideally should have no role in deciding what the institutes/research clusters should be! Faculty - the ones ACTUALLY doing the research - should decide what the focuses should be.
Administrators exist merely to facilitate those goals.
Humanities research centers must be created.
I would 100% disagree with "align all research with the four new research institutes." Enacting this would have an acutely negative impact on my view of the university's seriousness as a comprehensive research institution.
Research priorities should be driven by faculty, not administrators. And the administration should be supportive of a broad range of faculty research-- going well beyond the four new research institutes.

Q10-HUM-NTT
Any of the above are viable options. Given the culture of the university, #4 probably won't work, although it could be the best if done properly. It is the way that research in industry succeeds.
If you force faculty to align their research with the four institutions, I don't think it would go over well. Some research areas just don't line up with those four.
Let those who research and are in the trenches have a voice in the decision-making process.
This is the kind of management theory cruft that the University should not be wasting money on devising or implementing.
"I can't think of any good reasons to align all research with the four new research institutes.
I can't think of any good reasons to do anything based on strategic initiatives of the administration."

Q10-NS-T
"Aligning all research with the four new research institutes" - whoever thought of this can't be serious! However, there is no trash bin that I could put this approach in. Similarly "Align research institutes with existing research strengths"?! I thought those were supposed to have their own strengths? It would be interesting to see what ideas faculty can come up with to create new research clusters. However, this is best done based on proven funding success. I.e. administration should look at existing funding success and contact faculty to see how those areas can be grown in the future.
""New research clusters" is simply a bad ideal in any form Invest in areas of strengths or currently identified priorities. Changing now will cost too much.
It is amusing that ""research strengths of the faculty"" does not assume ""four new research institutes"" meaning why are areas of strength NOT the new research institutes? That says all you need to say about research growth at UA."
"strategic initiatives of the administration" and "align with the four institutes" is the same thing, in my opinion
A much more faculty-integrated effort is needed to best identify research program areas and to build on existing faculty expertise. Within the ultimate structure with some institute structure, there need to be significant SEED programs to foster the recruiting of new faculty projects into the institute. Administrators SHOULD NOT impose research directions/initiatives, etc. upon the faculty. Let the faculty be creative and innovative - we know what needs to be done to enhance and promote research on this campus, not administrators.
Again...I am tired of giving credit to an institute (in digital measures) for the writing of a publication or a grant when I don't even know where the institute is located or who works there. These people need to reside in my college and actually help me.
Establishing research areas of strength should be performed at the departmental level. This could be used as an incentive for external hiring of department chairs in engineering, for example, where some departments have struggled to fill and maintain chair positions.
Frankly, there seems to be a disconnect between administration-driven initiatives and those that actually bring in the most research money. The one I'm most familiar with is the Water Center, which hasn't been terribly successful in bringing in grant funding. A closer assessment of what research programs actually contribute substantial funding to UA and support of those programs by the administration would improve growth.
I caution against using the phrase "align all research with ..."; we should strive to align most (not all) of the research with the institutes, but be open to developing excellence in select other areas and take advantage of potential opportunities.
I think the cluster/institute approach is not going to succeed. They rarely do at other institutions or at UA. Too often these efforts chase fads long after they have peaked. Instead focus on hiring top young faculty, give them good start-up funds and research support, and hold them to high expectations in the tenure process.
If you want to do something based on competing proposals, make sure to give faculty enough time to thoroughly develop the idea. This would ideally be a 3 month window. Asking for faculty proposal with a two-week timeline will get you ideas that sound good on a white paper, but after more thought are not really great fits for UA.
In my opinion, research directions should always be set by the faculty members who are active in seeking research grants and performing research activities. The institutes/centers must be facilitators of multidisciplinary research proposals and provide administrative support and encouragement for seamless collaboration between faculty members from diverse research backgrounds.
Initiatives must be driven (if not led) by faculty or groups of faculty. Some of the issues with the new institutes derives from too much "top down" approach.
Institutes and research initiatives of administration are basically the same.
Research driven by the ideas of administration is NEVER going to work. Successful research is driven by the bottom -- the people who do the actual work.
See earlier comments on Cyber Security. Drastic changes needed, or UA should not even try. Technical skills needed in the area, not soft cyber focus and institutes that bring in little to no funding, but have high admin costs.
The centers have yet to really do much that is visible. Until the existing centers have more of a presence, they seem very artificial and created by people who are not conducting research. The current institutes seem to have been generated with no input from colleges or departments. While in some cases they do recognize areas of strength, they also have missed other significant research strengths on campus.
The research institutes are not effect and should be disbanded. They are not aiding in advance the university research profile. This is specially true for the Water Center under the direction of Sobecky.
Top-down alignment of existing research to external priorities, no matter how important or successful those priorities are elsewhere, is not effective. We need to play to our strength. The most successful among us do not compete in the same enormous, oversaturated fields where the top-10 compete; instead we have found a niche, an important-yet-uncommon problem to solve. Given our funding level and output, we should try to foster a diversification of our efforts, rather than trying to go after the fashionable topics everybody is working on.

What does "creating a new cluster" mean. A new listserv? A lunch date? Unless you are talking about investments of $1 million+, these are just net wastes of time. We have hired several faculty based on "cluster searches". I do not believe that any of them were able to get tenure. You always end up settling for the lowest common denominator. A net waste of resources.

"Why are research institutes and clusters the only way to go?"

"Add to existing clusters to make them more competitive" should be a good approach also."

Q10-NS-TT

Administrators shouldn't be picking winners.
Have faculty design interdisciplinary projects and have the university (or institutes) allocate resources to those integrated projects
I don’t care. This is a silly question.
I would like to encourage the VPR office to solicit proposals from faculty or department chairs about both individual and interdisciplinary research clusters they feel would be beneficial to their own research and would align with the strategic initiatives of the administration.
If all our research strengths have to deal with the four new research institutes, we will be severely limited in what research we pursue. I think it is most important to support the people and areas we already have.
It is a bad idea trying to align research with these new research institutes. Most research areas have nothing to do with these four institutes.
Not all research will fit well in the four new research centers. We shouldn't be marginalizing that research by focusing only on the four centers.
Research has to be bottom-up, driven by faculty and not top-down, based on administration needs or priorities. The problem is that faculty are the ones who actually do the research. Setting administration priorities and trying to hire people into those will not succeed because people will not want to come here if there isn't already strong research.

Q10-NS-NTT

The institutes seem to be feel good for board and not really functional for most. Why concentrate on one are or other. What ask for diversity in our population, classes hire a diversity officer etc then turn research focus to 4 areas. Diversity in research and exposure to students and allowing faculty to make connections is as important in research as populations.

top-down is recipe for disaster here.
Transforming research culture requires a vision. That vision doesn't usually come from a bunch of disparate areas of research. It comes from a unity of vision. It would be better for the university to decide what it wants its strengths to be and then support faculty to advance those strengths in their research, while at the same time coordinating hires to enhance that line of inquiry.

Q10-SS-T

Administrative strategic initiatives are notoriously ephemeral. We need solid infrastructure to support the very talented people who are already on campus. Over the past few years, many faculty have begun to feel neglected and devalued by administration's focus on bringing in new, "better" faculty.
Administration needs to support those whom departments feel best complement existing resources -- not chase shiny objects that are tangential to existing strengths.
Again, this is all very business model and science oriented.
Faculty members should have independence in choosing their area of interest. Some alignment is good.
Go with our existing strengths. Health care could be a major thrust given our proximity to UAB and our own medical branch and excellent nursing program.
I have never seen a more hideous suggestion than aligning ALL research with the four new research clusters.
I really don't agree with these choices. Why should we make any significant decisions based upon the strategic initiatives of the administration. We didn't have input on those initiatives. Who knows what they are. And who had input on the creation of these new research institutes.
I really hope we stop thinking that the best way to advance research is to get a whole ton of faculty from disparate areas to somehow find something in common and advance it. The number of square peg/round hole situations now being facilitated at UA is at an all-time high. People should be encouraged to connect with people outside of UA far more than with other departments at the university itself. We can't be a global power by thinking locally.
If you want to establish research areas of strength go to the source and ask. Faculty will tell you, students will tell you....the community will tell you what they need....if someone will listen.
It is generally a smart strategy to build on existing areas of strength because it minimizes the amount of the investment needed to reach the very highest level of excellence within a field. But we also need to consider the output side - the return on the investment. We need figure out where we need to be strong to best promote UA's national profile and this may very well mean lifting traditionally weaker research areas on this campus to a much stronger position. This may require more investment in the short term, but the long term payoff may be much greater than investing in a research area that is not nationally visible.
Missing here is CENTER creation. Seems we have basically stopped creation of centers. An open competition to teams who have large history of funding across multiple departments and colleges should have the opportunity to establish a center of need much more easily than currently exists. Number one is the only non-bullshit idea
Oh, well, the administrators are back. None of these ideas are good and in fact all are awful. What about simply supporting the research needs of the faculty we have? In most departments "clusters" already exist. Within our department we have a world class group of scholars in a particular area. There is no telling how good we could be with the appropriate support to do what we do without worrying about whether it fits into one of the FOUR PILLARS OF KNOWLEDGE.
Please do not engage in cluster hiring. It never works, and is a huge waste of time and money. Hire quality faculty and let them do what they do. All the other suggestions will lead to nothing.
Provide research support in the initiatives set by administration based on competitive ptoposals
The centers are meaningless to my continued development of my research and likewise my international research reputation
The University should do 1) and 2) above simultaneously and continuously. Research disciplines and federal granting agencies identify "excellence" with publications and research grants. The University should attend to this. But it should also attend to existing and developing foci of research excellence that arise or could arise in departments with appropriate support. Departments should be allowed to compete for such attention through reports or proposals.
University-wide coordination of research seems pointless and will have the (hopefully unintended) consequence of expressly de-valuing pockets of research on campus that do not align with the larger coordinated effort.
Q10-SS-TT
hire good people and get them resources they need to get the job done. These initiatives only work well if faculty want to do the work
I don't think any of these are good ideas except the first one ranked above. Faculty should not be "expected" to conform their research interests to anything except their own interests, and should be encouraged to excel in that area (whatever it may be). Again, a university is NOT a business and should
not be run as such. Otherwise, only research areas that are more in line with grant funding will prevail and be held as "more important" over research that can be done with out million dollar grants.

If you align all research/research funding with the four new institutes, a) roughly 80% of faculty production will go to waste, and b) you won't innovate. Don't let the research clusters become shibboleths.

It is important to devote resources to strategic initiatives such as the four new institutes. However, expecting all UA research to align with these is unrealistic and may mitigate our strengths in other areas. The appeal of a research career lies largely in autonomy. I suspect few professors want (or need) guidance on what they should be researching. US has strengths in many areas, and asking faculty members to ignore their strengths and preferences in favor of areas the administration deems important seems unwise.

It would be helpful if there were resources to connect methodologists (e.g., in the Research Methods department in the College of Education) to researchers in need of their skills on grant proposals. For example, many of these faculty members have skills related to instrument development (surveys, tests, etc.) and data analysis (quantitative and qualitative) that may be very helpful in the development of strong proposals.

Really important to leverage existing research strengths of faculty

The new research institutes are too broad/vague to be identified as research strengths. I also don't know if "administration" knows enough about the individual researchers to identify strengths.

To align "all research" with the four new institutes can severely stifle faculty with innovative research outside of these areas.

Why would we want to align "all research" with the 4 research initiatives? How does that make any sense?

Q10-SS-NTT

Again, not sure why we cannot do all of the 4.

"At my old University, we had a really simple saying. Cross-disciplinary research is like a house boat. You end up with a bad house and a bad boat. I know University Administrators love this idea, but when you force collaborations through financial incentives, both sides have to sacrifice their science and often you are left with a research output that falls short of the hurdle for aspirational publications in each home department.

The best way to get better is to simply identify top performers, incentivize them to collaborate with people in their area of expertise and ride them to the top. Forcing top researchers to bend their research to fit a generic priority just derails their progress and hurts their international reputation."

I have worked at R1 institutions where top-down strategic research initiatives from upper administration completely flopped. These initiatives were too broad, poorly defined and implemented, disorganized, coercive, and out-of-touch with both faculty strengths and current directions of various disciplines, creating resentment, confusion, and fear among faculty and staff and harming relationships with upper admin.

It would be a very bad idea to force all research to align with the four new research institutes. Doing so would merely homogenize research at the university, stifling rather than fostering innovation and likely driving away some of our best faculty members and students once their work is devalued. While these institutes are important to provide opportunities and support in conjunction with identified priorities, they cannot function as the end-all, be-all definition of what research at UA should be. Please do not do this.

None of the above. Align research with community needs.
Q11: Rank in order the priorities UA should put in place for investment in personnel

Q11-HUM-T

All these options are of paramount importance. Many other questions on this survey seem unimportant to me, and none of the options they contain are compelling or particularly relevant. However, ALL options on this question are extremely important. (I wish we had a way on the survey to say certain questions are more or less important than others.)

Better sabbaticals attract better faculty and keep productive faculty, as well as increasing productivity. Ideally, find visiting positions to replace those on sabbatical with top scholars who can then return to their home institutions and pass along how great their experiences were here.

Raising GTA stipends has to be a priority.

Sabbatical is a right not a privilege. No other single measure was more beneficial to my own academic growth and productivity.

Student funding in our area is miserable; this has a direct effect on the quality of the students. We regularly loose good students to other institutions that offer more.

The distinction between # 1 and 4 makes no sense. Salaries need to be competitive and enhanced for both existing and new faculty.

The top three of these are of equal importance in my view.

We are grossly underpaying and overtaxing graduate students. In addition to more fellowships, we must raise GTA compensation and lower GTA workload across the board.

We aren't competitive with comparable institutions for any graduate students, much less top ones, because our teaching load is so high and our stipend so low.

Q11-HUM-TT

Graduate stipend levels in the humanities (and across the board) *must* be increased if we are going to be competitive in attracting top graduate students to UA. This needs to be done at a base level-- not just for a few outstanding graduate recruits (although competitive fellowships are certainly also a highly useful recruiting tool).

Salary packages and support are not competitive with peer institutions. This is especially true in the humanities, where support lags far behind other A&S programs. (Why, for example, do some programs guarantee conference travel while others offer 50% less support and solely on an application basis?)

UA is not retaining faculty because of the low salaries and lack of research support.

Q11-HUM-NTT

Additionally, ample funds for researching.

Faculty and graduate students need to be paid more. This is a major thing that I keep hearing--we should be competitive by paying people a living wage. Prioritize the humanities, even thought they're not pulling in the big grant money. Look at who is teaching the majority of this university's students and compensate those faculty and grad students fairly.

The most important investment in personnel would be to replace adjunct positions with tenure track lines.

This question should be based on weighting, not prioritization. Everyone (me included) will want to retain existing faculty by offering decent raises. Salary compression (inversion) is a common problem that results in people moving. The ones who don't move after inversion are those who can't or who are kept here by something else.

Create funded opportunities for top performing undergraduates.

Q11-NS-T

...actually think increased sabbatical not a good idea. I have seen in my area (Engineering) professors allowed "extra" sabbatical opportunities, but have not seen any fruit from that tree.

All of these are important priorities, and apply at different stages of a faculty member's career. I placed these in order of importance for existing faculty. Competitive salary/startup packages and increased sabbatical opportunities are important for recruitment of new faculty and enabling them to be successful.
Every single one of these is important. If I could put 100% on every single one of them I would.

Faculty salary/startup is easily the #1 issue for getting top research faculty. Nothing else comes close.

In STEM topics, we need to retain and recruit top United States students. I strongly support increasing graduate fellowships for such students.

Increase focus on graduate students.

Our startup levels in the sciences severely trail the regional averages and routinely cause us to lose out on hiring promising researchers, even when they have an interest in the southeastern region.

Regarding 1, I have personally thought about leaving UA several times, but the salary and retirement has helped in retention.

Searches at UA repeatedly fail because of the lack of adequate startup funds. Funds need to be made available for the departments to provide these startup funds.

The most critical thing that the university can do is find a way to provide competitive startups for hires at the junior and senior level. Current startup offers are less than half those of regional peers. We frankly cannot compete to hire the best faculty because our packages are laughably low compared to even our sister campus (UAB). Ways to fund these need to be found that are not ruinous to department and college budgets. Without addressing this issue, none of the rest really matters.

These are all important. But besides salary and stipend, there can also be research infrastructure that can be used as a major investment in personnel - the easier it is to do research, the happier and more energized the research faculty and students will be.

This was the most difficult ranking. In the short term, the University should invest in current active faculty and assisting graduate students. In the long term, salary packages and start-up, especially for senior or mid-career faculty, has the highest potential to make significant growth in research.

When I came to the university 17 years ago, I got a computer as my package. Last year's hire received 2 guaranteed GRAs, $100,000 equipment package, and start up funds. It would be nice to ask if I need anything.

Q11-NS-TT

All of these are critical. It is impossible to rank these. The UA is extremely deficient in all of these areas and these are the only things that will matter in terms of actually increasing research productivity.

All of these are wonderful and more of any/all of these would make our faculty so happy. The ASPIRE program, for example, is a really wonderful thing.

All of these things are important and can be improved at UA, especially start up.

Funds to out-compete other schools for top grad students is a major need. No one in my department has been granted sabbatical in about 20 years.

Graduate student fellowships need to be significantly increased for STEM PhD students. While grateful what we currently have, they are too low to be competitive with other nationally ranked research schools.

If this were a weight question, 1 and 2 would be worth 23 points apiece and the other three would be equally weighted with 18 points.

One of our major problems is that we do not consider early or mid-career scientists for early tenure. It is very, very difficult to attract mid-career scientists and then ask them to do a full 5/6 year tenure process. What is the risk/reward balance?

Our department suffers on start-up and it's often not much - really 50k or 100k - that limits us from getting our top candidates. A single federal grant puts way more than that into our research system and it seems like there must be a way to fund these gaps if we are to compete in hiring.

Rankings 1 - 4 are very close to one another - all of these have to be in place to create a successful environment.

Should have some sort of match for external grants, particular with GTA / GRA ..... it is extremely difficult and expensive to have graduate student right now for departments that do not have a lot of TA.

For example, a standard 300k NSF grant can only support 1 graduate student right now. The school
should consider supporting more graduate students for those departments, or have sort of matching for "big" external grants. These are hard to rank, as investment in any of these would be effective. UA probably lags behind the schools we would like to compare with in all of these categories. We have a lot of trouble hiring new faculty. However, we also want to support our current faculty. More time for sabbaticals would give more time for research. We have very low start up at UA, and we are not competitive at the national level. Offering more sabbatical opportunities will boost research productivity.

**Q11-NS-NTT**

Faculty PI's that bring in grants and have requested set amounts that he/she would like to pay research technicians/managers need to be able to pay said technician/manager the amount that was requested without HR restricting this amount. Other research institutions (i.e. UAB within the University of Alabama's system) pay their technicians significantly higher than at UA at Tuscaloosa. Also, technicians/managers in research labs handling chemicals and in areas that could pose hazards to health should be paid considerably more than are currently being paid. HR should consider that the same job titles don't necessarily deem equal job responsibilities and hence the same pay across colleges/departments.

Hire Deans that put money in their faculty and start-ups rather than Etech, more administrators and some completely ineffective assistant and associate Deans. A 1.25% raise for someone making 40K is an insult. Hiring more VP's, creating multiple VP positions at 300K is wasteful. UA is EXTREMELY administrative heavy and much less efficient than 15-20 years ago. More work is pushed down to faculty and staff without money or help. Look at reasons faculty are not staying. Multiple retirements with no new faculty hired. Dean's pushing 25% of startoff to Departments. The biggest issue is attracting faculty and retaining them. UA needs to do more to be competitive with the top institutions and that starts with hiring and retention. these are all very important!

**Q11-SS-T**

Adequate child care for faculty at the University.
"Dual career programs
Better maternity leave"

"First of all, end the university-wide fellowship program and simply give each college N of fellowships to distribute as they like. Stop making a dietician, a historian, and an engineer try to evaluate which candidate is better when they don’t know and the committee is working to balance the fellowships across colleges anyway. Save time!

Also, the practice of not counter-offering when offers to current faculty come from non-peer universities needs to end. If a university that has less status than UA is willing to pay a UA professor more, that says something. Harvard would not simply let UA outbid them because Alabama is not a peer. This is nonsense."

HR 101 pay the people you have well for doing good work, and they will stay and do good work. Improving our national research ranking is actually very simple. We need to hire good people and retain them. By far, the most important factor here is salary. It is easier to hire good people, especially at the assistant level, because the job market is favorable for employers. But it is difficult for us to retain our best faculty because our assistant and associate salaries are too low and we use the wrong university benchmarks (SUG data). If we want to get better, our goal should not be to look like the other SUG research universities, we should strive to pay MORE than the other SUG research universities. People here do not appreciate the fact that most of the best researchers are produced from OUTSIDE the south and all else equal they would prefer to live elsewhere. We need to pay MORE to keep the best people here because they are the ones who have options.

In my field, our start-up packages are not competing with peer institutions/departments. We are at least 50K-100K less than our peers (even more in some cases).
It is important to hire at competitive salaries, but in order to retain good people and allow them to be more productive we need money and time, which is why I chose the two that are 1 and 2. Make sure there is support for spouses. We lose too many good faculty because we don’t help two-career couples—much more the norm these days.

Many of us are below market. I could have a salary that is $30,000 higher if I went back on the market. However, I have been loyal to UA at a great personal cost. Frankly, I will retire when I hit the 25 year mark and leave the stupidity that is the new administration behind.

More money for grad students. More money for grad students......[fill the page]

Research .....good research takes time and you have to have time to do it.

retain what you have should be first priority.

Salary (and research support) is critical. Why run off great faculty who can get more elsewhere and continue to provide too much support for new faculty who may not pay off?

We really need to enhance graduate student fellowships and assistantships

Q11-SS-TT

All of these are important!

Current policies make it difficult for faculty who transfer to UA from another institution to utilize sabbaticals to support research, because you have to wait so long to utilize them. Also, existing faculty will be frustrated if new faculty are provided with competitive salary packages and salary compression becomes an issue with existing faculty.

I had a very productive years in terms of research. My efforts were recognized, but my merit increase was minuscule. It’s disheartening.

It seems like all of these options could use improvement at UA. One big issue is that it seems like UA administration does little to negotiate with a faculty member who has offer(s) to go elsewhere.

Retaining outstanding research faculty is important.

Obviously, all of it. We’re never going to want less money for our research. But you might think about using salary enhancement for current faculty as a kind of carrot to make sure production doesn’t go downhill post-tenure.

Salary and research support enhancement to retain existing faculty is by far the most important

Salary to retain existing faculty will only help research if those existing faculty are highly productive.

Some of the older faculty at UA are not very productive and therefore enhancing their salary will not benefit the university.

UA does not seem very invested in recruiting or retaining top faculty. Or graduate students. Our salary levels are below peer institutions. Our research incentives are near non-existent. And the graduate student stipends are now nearly 40% below that of our "peers".

We need more of all of these as the core of a major initiative to solidify the faculty base of the university. Without these, we will continue to fail to reach our potential and to lose faculty who contribute importantly to our research culture. I say that people who come to UA come for ambition or family (or both). Those who come for ambition eventually leave. We need to change that.

Q1-SS-NTT

I like this order, but I would add the addition of more professional instructors to carry even more of the teaching load (between 2 and 3)

None of the above. Give fair wages to continent faculty. Provide opportunities and support for promotion, recognition, and pay increases for those who most serve our students. Do away with the caste system. Be a responsible employer.

Not just competitive salary and start up but also competitive teaching loads, especially in research productive departments.

One of the biggest challenges for hires in my college is non-competitive salaries for new hires. This has made it difficult to recruit top talent in order to boost research within our program. Until this problem is addressed, we can do little more than tread water.

same point. if we really want it, how much are we willing to pay to have it.
These are all high priorities to attract, retain, develop, and promote the productivity of the best researchers.
"You need to start by keeping your best talent and then supplement them with new rockstars. Each college should likely do an audit of losses versus additions and then calibrate among these top two priorities.
Students are nice, but top students will come regardless of the package if you have the best researchers."
Q12: Weight the optimum allocation of investments by UA in research and creative activity infrastructure

Q12-HUM-T
Not a humanities-friendly question.
We need a centralized, overhauled Social Science Research Institute to support research by faculty and graduate students. The current institute is severely underfunded in human and technical resources. It looks like an afterthought from Administration.

Q12-HUM-TT
Faculty in the humanities and the sciences are going to give very different answers to this question. It would be more effective to ask the humanities faculty what would be most beneficial to them, and to ask the sciences the same.

Q12-HUM-NTT
This is not germane to the humanities so I won't answer.
When you upgrade central and university-wide infrastructure, all research faculty benefit.

Q12-NS-T
All critical for widespread and sustained success in research at UA.
"I think doing anything other than favoring research-productive labs would violate overhead rules, given that current definitions of research-productive are typically based on external funding. The options are not well distinguished. Enhancing IT or analytical infrastructure without alignment with research priorities doesn't make sense."
Invest in people.
Must hire well-trained support staff as well
Need more core facilities with major equipment to support specific research disciplines. The serious lack of research infrastructure inhibits research productivity. Different departments have different needs, a single facility is not sufficient.
There is currently no way to maintain and replace equipment in individual research-productive labs, this is one of the biggest flaws in the current system at UA. Lumping together 'research capabilities of library' with IT and high-performance computing is not helpful. While there is an urgent need to enhance our high-performance computing capabilities the libraries do not need such an investment and their role and importance for research should be expected to further decrease with time.
These items are very specific to certain types of research. For me, instrumentation is critical, but the most efficient use of University resources is establishing and maintaining central analytical instrumentation and infrastructure. Instrument service contracts must be supported from indirect funds and salaries for technical support staff must be hard-line items. Fundraising efforts for obtain Corporate/industrial support for research infrastructure is something UA has not attempted, but should. Industry will 'buy into' academic research if joint research initiatives can be identified and exploited. Texas universities have established large endowments through this strategy.
We need a statistical consulting group for each college to help with grants, thesis, and dissertation. "We need for high quality grad students, as much as the equipment. Otherwise, we just have expensive labs that are not being put to use...invest as much in high quality PhD students, and retain productive faculty. Allow departments to have technicians and staff to support research infrastructure. My department lacks that compared to even 4-year schools across the state. OIT also needs a shakeup..."

Q12-NS-TT
"above question difficult to answer.
Should invest in diverse areas, instead of dumping all money in one area of research
Give more GRAs to new faculty.
The most important issue at UA is new faculty should spend startup money within a year. A lot of mistakes are made in spending the money. More time 2-3 years should be given to spend the money. We buy wrong things in a hurry and regret later. Nobody benefits."
Enhancing high-performance computing would be particularly valuable to faculty across campus in STEM fields.
I don't have a good sense because my research does not require a lot of equipment.
It is not clear how many faculty utilize the centralized research facilities, how important it is to their research productivity, and what oversight these facilities have or how supportive they are to faculty research needs.
It's weird that the maintenance of the overall utility infrastructure is not mentioned, as this is critical to most of the above and has been neglected before.
Productive faculty should not be struggling to find lab space! We should not have to rely on surplus to get furniture and equipment that is essential to conducting lab work. I've now waited over two years to have a functioning lab.
We need to have functioning labs for incoming faculty. Adequate lab space and timely availability are key to research productivity.
We need to move UA into the modern age to compete with other research universities. That means modernizing our facilities and support, particularly for computing.

Q12-NS-NTT
Greenhouse
Put model in place to help with service contracts on equipment. Empower facilities to work on some of the equipment rather than hiring expensive outside repair people. Buy quality equipment during construction and talk to final users for actual needs. Low cost is often low quality and costs significant amounts more in the long run. Also, hire construction managers etc that can see more than 2 months ahead in planning. They redid SEC courtyard about 4 times, knew there was 4-5 building planned. Build infrastructure to recognize that. Millions being spent to retrofit Biology for computers when knew they were tearing down Tutwiler. Waste of money because will build computer lab few years later. Waste of money is shameful and taking away from ability to fund salary and research structures.

Q12-SS-T
ALL
All have been given equal weights because I simply don't know. Do we have an "Animal Care Facility"? Why choose to "Enhance arts research infrastructure" at the expense of "Maintain and replace equipment" or vice versa? Both are important.
Centers with classroom space for programs and faculty who are part of the center centralized to one building!
I think from what I have seen, we are doing well in terms of equipment and IT, library, etc., We may need more "free" statistical consultants however.
It is all important.
It is an embarrassment that we do not have expected equipment— e.g., fMRI
More books in the library, and better grant staff that are actually able to advise people working with large funded projects instead of making more work for faculty managing a budget.
None of the above. I'm answering from my perspective, which is field research that takes a huge amount of time but does not really require much equipment.
not really applicable to the law school
This is a poor question because it is very discipline-specific.
We must hire statisticians to support research faculty!
We need a neuroimaging facility (MRI).

Q12-SS-TT
Any improvement of equipment in the library must bring with it an improvement and expansion of the stack space for books. A library MUST have books at the center of their mission.
Increase existing salaries for research productive faculty!
More access to research lab space
MRI x100. We missed an opportunity to break this lock on our research that puts us 20 years behind other institutions. Everything else is secondary to this.

No opinion on these options

Recruiting and retaining top talent is FAR more important than almost any of these. The majority of the infrastructure investment should be done in the interest of recruiting and retaining top scientific talent. Research that requires equipment and technology should be funded with grant dollars, but also supported (supplemented) by UA.

The library is really suffering, and current moves seem to encourage that. (Really disappointed at some of the library renovation ideas, including moving stacks off campus. If I had known that, I honestly might not have come to the university, and I know it would alienate new hires.)

This is difficult for me to rank, because I do not know enough about the arts research on campus. What about fields that don’t fall into these areas?

**Q12-SS-NTT**

All these concepts are really biased away from the social sciences. I understand hard sciences and engineering have much bigger requirements, but you could fund an entire social science department and increase its ranking to national prominence for the cost of outfitting a single hard science faculty members lab.

Individual research productive labs can typically find money to maintain their own equipment. None of the above. Provide all faculty the ability to do the work for which they have been trained.

Not sure if this would fall under infrastructure, but increase research-related national and international travel & training supports for individual faculty and teams. Also, support home-/road-based technology (computers, etc.) for faculty to facilitate productivity off campus.

Place more emphasis on collaboration and institutional spaces rather than individual labs.

There is strong need for IT support that does something in response to faculty requests besides saying "we don't do that". To originate quality research lines, the faculty has to outsource something; outsourcing IT/programming/equipment maintenance to well-qualified staff who can deal with the fact that there is a continuous learning curve as equipment changes and improves is the most efficient way forward.

This survey is too long
Q13: Weight the following options for percentage of graduate and professional

Q13-HUM-T
"I can no longer in good conscience recruit new graduate students to my department, when I know how underpaid and overworked they are. Again, their stipends are $13,500. They teach 2/2. They RA. They take classes. And many live on food stamps and can’t go to the dentist. Good leadership=taking care of workers first."
I do not understand this question. It might not be displayed properly on my android. Not sure how to do this question. Increasing to 15% or 20% would be good for increasing research. This is another question that makes no sense. I have no idea what you are asking for. This is pointless unless we can recruit good students. Better to recruit fewer, better students than more and poorer students. This question makes no sense.

Q13-HUM-TT
I don’t understand the framing of this question. Only if the programs are grown gradually, thoughtfully, and ethically. This is unclear. why stop at 25%?

Q13-HUM-NTT
Have no idea of what the question is asking in this scenario? Just go speak to a PhD student or new PhD in the humanities who knows that she is competing with 300 people for 50 tenure track jobs in the country; see the sadness and anxiety in her eyes; and then you go tell me that we need to increase the number of graduate students. If you want to find a person like this to talk to, just look up the adjunct faculty right here at UA. This question is unclear. This question doesn’t make any sense.

Q13-NS-T
Doing this in a way that doesn’t distinguish between different classes of student doesn’t really seem meaningful. I think the number of law school students has relatively little impact on the research productivity of the university. don’t really care
Full disclosure: I did not understand how to answer Q13; I simply put in numbers so that the column added up to 100. I don’t understand Q13. Improve quality not only quantity. Improving the quality is more important than having more graduate students Law students do not really do research. Need more investment in PhDs in STEM areas to produce more research. Question makes no sense. Question not clear.
R1 institutions typically have more graduate students than undergraduate students, so 25% is pretty modest. Our main problem with increasing our graduate student enrollment is State legislators and Board of Trustees members who insist that UA should focus on undergraduate education. This is one AWKWARDLY worded question and answer. What does it even mean to weigh these options? "this survey is important but is too long. I don’t have opinion about this question." To be a relevant research institution, the graduate student population needs to be 25% of campus. This is the standard for similar institutions. We are wrongly emphasizing number of grad students over quality of grad students. The push for ever-more PhD degrees awarded doesn’t make sense; neither the US nor the world needs each American university to pump out more PhDs -- we need higher quality, not higher quantity.
Q13-NS-TT
I think it would be worth increasing graduate enrollment in research fields. I don’t think business
degrees provide any real net benefit to society.
I’m not sure I understand what you want here. What percentage of our students should be graduate
students?
Professional students do not contribute productively to our research culture.
Professional students should be excluded in these ratios. Their contribution to research is almost zero
compared to PhD students.
These ratios may be indicators of success but are not enablers of success. Certainly monitor, but
focusing on them is a mistake in my opinion.
This question doesn't make any sense. What does it even mean to weight mutually exclusive options?
This question is confusing.
We definitely want more graduate students. With nearly 35,000 undergraduates, 10,000 graduate
students does not seem unreasonable. This would imply doubling the current graduate student body.
Q13-NS-NTT
didn’t understand the question
Q13-SS-T
Focus on UG with limited graduate enrollment. Do what we have traditionally done extremely well.
I don’t have a good enough sense of this to distinguish among these (close) percentages -- but generally,
I think higher is better.
I don’t understand this question??
I don’t understand this question.
no opinion
The question wasn’t clear.
This is a poorly constructed question.
This is a poorly written question
This makes no sense
This question is unclear.
Unfortunately, by lumping graduate with professional students, this becomes a double-barrel question.
Needed are high quality, residential PhD students.
What a weird question.
What an oddly framed question.
You cannot reach and maintain R1 with only 14%
You have to have faculty who will help these people develop across the time they are here. We have
enlarged undergraduates and their classroom size reflects the attention they get. The faculty to student
ratio matters and so does class size. You want good research tomorrow you have to develop the brains
to do it today and you need dedicated faculty to do that.
Q13-SS-TT
Confusing question.
Do not include online graduate students as they are unavailable for research opportunities and/or help
with faculty
Don’t understand question
I do not understand what this question is asking/how to weight the options.
Some of the best research universities actually have their graduate population outnumber their
undergraduate population, which isn't even close to an option here.
This question is odd
This was a weird question format. Why not just ask what we believe the ideal percentage to be (and
bound answers between 0 and 25 or 10 and 25)?
Why lump graduate and professional students together? They are quite different. For example, 100% of
nursing’s graduate students are online. Increasing them would do almost nothing for campus culture or
research. Those programs are still worthwhile, especially for UA reputation and influence, but they are meaningless in a research survey.

why not just have us type a number?

Q13-SS-NTT

Graduate student enrollment should not be increased without commensurate increase in faculty. Additionally, if research is the priority then graduate programs that produce research and researchers should be prioritized over professional degrees.

I did not understand this question.

I don’t understand the question.

Ignore the percentages, I’m trying to get done with this.

More graduate students will help with R1 status, but we are an incredibly effective university at the undergraduate level, so I would hate to spread faculty too thin chasing the graduate dream at the expense of our great undergraduates.

This is a poorly written question.
Q14: Weight the allocation of where UA should focus its efforts to recruit graduate students

Q14-HUM-T

Although, during the disaster that is the xenophobic Trump administration, maybe we should focus on national rather than international students.

Makes no difference whatsoever WHERE the students come from, as long as they are good students. You have to focus on places where you have a better chance of getting the best students.

Q14-HUM-TT

Creating some pipelines from national universities would increase our reputation. Faculty contacts at other institutions might be most powerful tool if our faculty can brag to them about the amazing support UA has for a particular graduate program and graduate students in general.

None.

Q14-HUM-NTT

I would recommend a very diverse approach as seen above.

Q14-NS-T

Develop an in-state tuition mechanisms for BS/MS students. Develop means for faculty to use research overhead to pay tuition without out-of-state costs; could enable these students (most being out of state) to stay for, at least a MS degree. After having a full or nearly full paid ride at UA, and then told to pay $50k for a MS, many will leave to go elsewhere. Low hanging fruit to increase the grad numbers by developing incentives to keep these 1-yr MS students here, if the goal is to increase the grad number. But PhD students will make the biggest dent in research scholarship.

From Alabama and surrounding states
In STEM fields the UA "Brand" does not carry a premium, so the biggest determinant for getting the "best and brightest" to come to UA is to make our GTA and GRA stipends more competitive.

Realistically, we are best able to attract graduate students from regional schools. This must be our priority.

There are plenty of opportunities to recruit domestically.

This is bigger than an UA issue. Tuscaloosa needs to grow/evolve/change in order to be an attractive place for students from major metro areas in the US and international students from developed countries. Many Tuscaloosa businesses and residents are notoriously resistant to change, even if it would benefit them economically.

To provide better US faculty in the future, we need to be producing more American PhDs.

UA undergrads not the best source - let them go on and do great things somewhere else. Hurts their chances if they do all degrees in one place through PhD

We want more PhD students, not simply any graduate students, to increase research output. In the US, it is customary for students to complete their ugrad and grad studies at different institutions, to the point that staying at the same institution can be a stigma in some disciplines, so we should push out best students out to the best graduate schools, while at the same time attracting THEIR best students to us.

why do we need to recruit our own students if they want to stay anyway?

Q14-NS-TT

Increasing number of domestic graduate students will increase the opportunity for external fellowships. "most US students dont want to go for graduate studies. If they go, the go for high rank universities, not UA.

UA should improve the quality of graduate studies, more graduate courses, more GRAs, more fundamental studies than applied similar to top universities."

None of the above. Let faculty do the recruiting by financially supporting healthy research programs.

To recruit and retain high performing Master’s students, UA needs to provide some GA support (or flexibility with funding them)

Why not start a BS-PhD program? We have some really excellent, ambitious incoming freshmen. Why not create a program that tries to attract the absolute best to choose to pursue a career in research from the start?
Fewer non-native-English speakers!!!!
None...we need to focus on a fewer, but higher quality graduate programs and focus our resources on what we do best...UG education.
Taking on grad students who have language challenges requires substantially more resources (e.g., time) on the part of faculty working with them. We need to pursue diversity. We also need to recognize the language challenge too. It's real and has real daily impact on overall productivity (i.e., there is loss associated with this gain).
Unfortunately, getting international students from developing countries is perilous. We can easily get flooded with applications from students of dubious actual interest in the discipline or PhD.
We have a large pool of students .....many in honors programs. We have a pool to identify the students best prepared and suited (included the unusual student) for graduate work. We don't have good education in the state....why not improve it while we are doing this so we create grad students right here at home.

Focusing on PUIs might be productive—esp. ones with national reputations
I think we can already get UA undergrads and regional universities simply by our own networking, where UA administration can really help out is the broader levels.
The majority of the applicants for our program are unqualified. We need to start sourcing out where our recruiting efforts will be most efficient. We don't want just lots of applicants. We want applicants that we can accept.
Thriving research labs recruit the brightest students from UA, so put that money to faculty research programs.
We should be confident that we are graduating undergraduates capable of succeeding in graduate programs. However, ideally, we should have a positive reputation that will allow us to recruit somewhat easily on the national (and international) level.

For PhD recruiting efforts, this should have specific focus on colleges/schools at universities with programs that end at a Master's Degree (i.e. do not have PhD programs). These students are typically treated with similar rigor to PhD students, so their ability to thrive and perpetuate UA's name into their careers is much higher.
There should also be more wraparound support for international students. Ensuring they have a positive experience.
We are a state funded university. We should work to provide services for local people.
Q15: Weight the importance of the following sources of funding to support graduate students

Q15-HUM-T
Base levels for university funded GTA lines are embarrassingly, unjustly low. Students who teach generate significant amounts of revenue for the university and they deserve to be paid MUCH more (a 50% rise in stipends over five years would barely make us competitive, and would still make such student-teachers revenue generators.
How much money would it take to increase English dept GTAs' stipends from $13,500 to $15,000? Pay all GRA/GTAs enough to survive or better. We can't get good people without doing so. Stipend for GTAs needs to be increased immediately, we are losing competitiveness in attracting top candidates.

Q15-HUM-TT
GRA/GTA salaries need to be increased in general and more opportunities available for departments. See above comment about raising minimum stipend level for graduate students, especially in the humanities and social sciences.
The only way I can compete with other graduate programs for the best doctoral students is with full funding through either a GTA or Fellowship. The top graduate students will go where they are funded. We seem to be limited to GTAs in art history. Faculty research and professional development of grad students would be enhanced if we had the option of GRA support.

Q15-HUM-NTT
Pay graduate students a living wage. Some of ours are on food stamps. Some take out massive loans to support themselves. (Or both.) Give them adequate health care. They could make more money working retail, and yet they choose to come here to enhance the life and status of the university. Value their contributions.
Pay students and they'll come. I keep hearing that we're just not competitive with our offerings. Sponsored research is a slippery slope. If organizations want to donate money for research, that's fine. But, that needs to be indirect.

Q15-NS-T
Current Graduate Council Fellowship stipends are inadequate/uncompetitive and must be raised to at least $18K/year.
External research report should ideally the major source of funding, but GTAs and fellowships play an important role in enhancing productivity on externally funded project as well as those seeking funding. Fellowships, fellowships to attract good students. Thats what we did for undergraduate students to raise both quality and quantity.
Need much more GRA/GTA support to build up pipeline to enable pool of students for sponsored research when it hits.
Please don't underestimate the importance of Graduate Teaching Assistant Support. Class sizes have ballooned in recent years, and GTAs are indispensable to teach labs, to grade papers, etc.
Please increase the stipend for graduate students to be more competitive.
Tuition waivers for departmental- or professor-sponsored students (using research overhead or discretionary funds) will be very helpful.
UA could help improve graduate student quality by providing additional support for sponsored research. This support would have to be flexible.
Waive application fees for international applicants (not foreign students who are already in the US).

Q15-NS-TT
The vast majority of our graduate students are supported on GTA. Though most funding for graduate students in the STEM areas should come from external funding, the level of support for GTAs is embarrassingly low considering the growth in UG population. University funded GRA's are critical.

Q15-NS-NTT
Q15-SS-T
And the stipend must be increased.
Find a way to get the costs down and the competition will be even greater for applicants trying to get into our programs.
Make sure that the stipends and fellowships offered to graduate students are remotely competitive (they currently are not) and work to create multi-year funding packages for PhD students in line with most research universities.
My department struggles with out-of-state tuition issues for our graduate students. The university has made it increasingly difficult for grad students to get waivers, which is a huge disincentive for the best and brightest to come to UA. Graduate students should be viewed as an investment, not a revenue center.
n/a to law school
Sponsored research funds are great, but not available across all disciplines.

**Q15-SS-TT**
First priority - grad students have to have a compelling reason to come here (i.e., great research/researchers/education). Second, once they want to come, make attendance here cheap (i.e. "good value" by reducing grad tuition for great students). Third, if possible, make it more lucrative than our competitors (i.e., pay better for GRA/GTA/Fellowships).
Graduate students are the engines that keep research labs running. Especially for early career researchers, they are critical to productivity. Similarly, the research start-up money for new hires (first year project) followed by RGC money in their second year allows researchers to develop two research studies by their third year applications. Without that, we're making researchers find water in a desert to try to survive.

**Q15-SS-NTT**
"At my prior university, the Provost office would provide 100% tuition waivers for doctoral students PLUS $18,000 in funding for each student (within reason), which allowed colleges and departments to retain their funds to supplement student experiences.
This approach shows a clear commitment from the University as they put their money where there mouth is and creates a system with much better checks and balances. Specifically, all programs then had to report out on percentage of R1 and R2 job placements for PhDs and departments that performed better were allowed to grow their programs with University funding and underperforming departments had to go back to self-funding until they improved."
Funding needs to be research assistantships if goal is more research productivity
It should be noted that tuition waivers for GRAs/GTAs are critically important. Many students would not be able to reasonably pursue a graduate degree without such support. This should be standard for all graduate students with a research or teaching assistantship.
Sustained funding is needed to attract graduate students
Teach them how to teach. Let them practice their craft in lower level courses. Let the current pool of contingent faculty have valued, tenure-track jobs. Stop treating contingent faculty like throw-away people.
Q16: Weight the steps that should be taken to raise the profile of graduate studies on the UA campus

Q16-HUM-T
Allow for life/work experience, approved by department committees, to count in some way towards degree requirements.
If we can't afford good graduate students, spend more or accept fewer.
It is near impossible to finish a Ph.D. in four years in many departments. The restriction to four years of funding is silly and puts pressure on the departments.
Our salaries for graduate students are shameful and the workloads are unreasonable. We lose almost all of our top applicants because they get reasonable pay/workload offers at other competing universities. GTA salaries/workload should be determined not in broad swaths (e.g., all humanities) but rather looking at comparable programs at peer institutions. Not all humanities/arts programs are equally competitive at UA.
Supporting departments in developing curricula and educational experiences that improve the quality of their graduate programs would be a huge help. This could include one-time stipends or time releases for faculty to work closely with graduate students or undertake new initiatives.
The only other thing I'd add here, is that you should review the pay for the Directors of Graduate Studies, which is a key position in recruiting, improving programs, and retaining good graduate students.
In many humanities divisions the pay has gone down every year for the last 20 years. For the cost to the university, this seems like the wrong place to try to save a few thousand dollars.

Q16-HUM-TT
None.
The policies and procedures of UA's Graduate School are among the most byzantine (not to say dystopian or Kafkaesque) I have ever seen at any institute of higher education. I think Susan Carvalho is doing a lot of good work to turn the culture around over there, and it's been good to see it moving in the right direction - long may it continue. The #1 thing we need to do is offer graduate students more money! We are losing students to places like UT Knoxville and UGA - institutions we SHOULD be able to compete with - because they offer more money.
We lose excellent graduate student recruits every year because our workload and salary packages are not competitive with our regional and national peers.

Q16-HUM-NTT
Why is the focus of this questionnaire on graduate studies. Should it investigate the question of how important they are relative to other components of the mission? I'm not impressed with the quality of grad students which I think reflects the research horsepower of the faculty. I would reduce emphasis on grad students and increase emphasis on getting and retaining faculty to whom good grad students would flock.
You shouldn't hire racist Faculty like [redacted] who openly admits he has a problem with black people!

Q16-NS-T
no strong opinion about this
Offer "topper" offers to strong PhD candidates and more guaranteed years of support.
Provide meaningful career guidance and opportunities for job search for PhD students that want a job OUTSIDE of academia, which is the majority of STEM grad students here. Let's make UA the place to come to for graduate studies, not only because of the quality of the research, but also because we will provide connections and tools for them to find a job once they graduate.
The most critical component for attracting more and better students is to provide them with competitive stipends and workloads.
We need to offer more than competitive. What if we offered Saban a "competitive" package? We need to buy talent for several years (sort of a loss leader) so that those high-calibre students enhance the productivity of the faculty. This will result in higher-quality scholarly output (and more of it) that will initiate the positive feedback referred to in a previous answer.
We require 48 hours for course work for a PhD. If we are about research and scholarship, we need the
students in the lab and not in the classroom for the first 2.5 years. Look at other universities and hours
and re-evaluate. Consider cutting the coarse work to 36 hrs for a PhD.
We require too much coursework.

Q16-NS-TT
But only if these are substantive forms of support. A few thousand dollars does not cut it. We need
programs that offer real support for graduate research.
I may not understand the question, but the profile of graduate studies at a university is based on the
research reputation in a field. The options given are only issues once a student arrives (besides salary).

Q16-NS-NTT
Q16-SS-T
Improve the time Faculty spend with Grad Students.
Elevate graduate students by creating an independent Graduate Student Council
no opinion
Offer more money for travel for graduate students (on top of the internal research grant opportunities).
That's a huge factor.
Pay them market....we are so below market in so many areas.
Recruit really top-flight faculty - the most important ingredient. Everything else is just window-dressing.
Supporting the people who already work in this area and have the most expertise and stake in it is
critical and makes the most sense to me, as an initial step.
The policy of the Graduate School which matches college funding for conferences, etc. needs to stop.
What it does is makes the rich richer, doubling their advantage already and making humanities areas
unable to compete.
We need to stop hiring department chairs and deans that have never done research. And, the Provost
should use research productivity prior to appointment, as well as some ongoing research, as part of a
review for department chairs. It is impossible to be reviewed by a department chair who has never done
research herself or himself. They have no clue what they’re talking about, and then try to mentor or tell
others what to do. Even Dean’s need some research experience. Otherwise, we will never get anywhere

Q16-SS-TT
I do not like the phrase "cater to"
If the option was just to identify and cater to career needs of the grad students, I would have allocated
some points to the option.
It's really all about the money here. I have lost all my best prospects because the salaries are so much
lower, especially in line for the exceptional workload (far higher GTA load, e.g., than many other similar
institutions. The scale is small here--5k a year a student would put us much more in a competitive line.
(You don’t have to go Ivy-League $32k for a humanities grad.) But right now, they're just above the
poverty line and are eligible for Medicaid. That's embarrassing and unacceptable.
The Graduate School has been doing a terrible job on recruiting and assisting graduate students.
The university needs a Center for Graduate Life that serves as a hub for graduate student services. As a
graduate student, I helped start one at UNC Charlotte (https://gradlife.uncc.edu/). Aside from that,
supporting faculty research drives graduate student success after school. Then, we respect good
applicants by paying them what they're worth.

Q16-SS-NTT
We can provide research and social mentorship. We just need the University to pay them a competitive
wage, so they aren't stressed out about paying rent or working a second job as a graduate student.
Currently, our doctoral program pays less than half the stipend of schools like Arkansas, Tennessee, and
Florida State which is just an embarrassment. I know we can provide a better student experience and
career options, but it hard for a student to rationalize coming here when they will need to take out
student loans to complete a PhD here when they could live easily at other schools.
We say we value work-life balance, but paying people at a subsistence level does not positively correlate with happiness and success. Many students, staff, and contingent faculty work multiple jobs just to be able to pay their bills. This is not a way to build a legacy of greatness. We need to support the real lives of real people.
Q17:  Rank in order of the importance of the following to improve Proposal Submission Support

Q17-HUM-T
One strategy that I have seen work at other institutions is to have staff from the office of research actively communicate with program officers at national organizations such as NSF/NIH and those who manage/award grants at private foundations to determine what topics/questions are of greatest priority/interest to the organization. Ideally this information would be used to find researchers at UA with interests aligned with these priority areas and work with them to develop subsequently and submit a proposal.

Other institutions provide tremendous support in writing grants, including having specific staff who find the grants and write the proposals for faculty. That would be very beneficial for faculty who have more teaching responsibilities.

People are largely focused on their own work: administration can seek connections and put together big-picture research grants involving multiple researchers in multiple departments, if they are willing to invest the resources to do so. This will also train grant experts in departments where grant writing is rarely worth the effort.

Pro-active!

Time releases and funding support would be very helpful as well.

You cannot expect people to focus on grants when they have had no prior background. The costs are too high. If you are serious, you need to have full-time staff that will write these up.

Q17-HUM-TT

I have colleagues who have FAR more support than we do here at UA. Their staff scouts, writes, and submits research grant proposals with minimal assistance from the faculty. As a result, they have more time for the actual research projects (in addition to their other already busy loads), and when the project is funded and completed, the press coverage they receive is high profile. The benefits for having an office of people who actually assist (not just proof read) grant proposals would pay dividends in the impact it would have on UA.

None.

OSP has no one with expertise in the humanities! I have never gone to them for grant-writing support because they don’t seem to be at all interested in trying to understand the needs of a researcher like me.

Q17-HUM-NTT
Not an issue in the humanities.

Q17-NS-T
Don’t depend on faculty for miscellaneous support functions.
Finding opportunities is not an issue for those that want to find opportunities. Responding to opportunities for an active faculty member is an issue.

Good researchers seek out their own opportunities and know how/where to do it. OSP, etc. should then be there to facilitate the administrative parts of proposal development such as: budgets, boiler plate info (facilities description, institutional stats, etc.), and, most importantly navigate proposal systems (e.g., FastLane) for the researchers.

Hire more staff at the office for sponsored research! We have the same staff we had when the institution was half the size.

Honestly, the most difficult part is the fact that the Office of Sponsored Programs, Finance, Provost as well as the lawyer do not communicate. The people in all the different departments make it extremely difficult to set up proposals, collaborations as well as consortia. We are supposed to be doing research but are forced to do administration, finance, as well as trying to make the lawyers work on our project and at the same time being a top rate researcher, teacher and mentor.

I do not perceive OSP as a problem in writing standard proposals to federal agencies. OSP has been a problem with intellectual property issues: under current guidance UA seems to expect IP to reside with UA even if a sponsor pays for the research. Which means that companies have little interest in
supporting research here if they have to turn around and then negotiate for the rights to the IP they have already paid to develop.

I rated 'Proposal development, writing, and editorial support' rather low. The reason is that we already do a pretty good job of writing and developing budgets, and review inside our own research areas is probably preferable to review from a generic reviewer. What we need help on is boilerplate: 'describe your university’s research lab square footage' or 'what percent of your student body is female' or other questions about how indirect costs or calculated, etc.

If you are a top researcher all of the above are not helpful. Improvements in these areas will be crucial for the university to improve its funding profile. For instance, navigating websites like NIH an NIOSH can be daunting and extremely time consuming. Having personnel in place who can weed through the complexities to find specific funding opportunities to alert faculty would be very helpful and more efficient.

Love the program that John H started where you could go to DC and meet program officers. Changed my attitudes about them. Plus the face to face time discussing our grant proposal was so worth the trip.

More transparent internal competition processes for limited submission opportunities.

None of the above really matters if the biggest problem is finding sufficient time to develop effective proposals.

NUMBER ONE HELP: Make the IRB process much easier! That would be better than all of the above combined...

OSP could be greatly improved if we hire more people and pay them better so they stay longer. OSP is highly dysfunctional and the improvement of OSP is essential to the research culture of UA proposal development support hired full time at the department and college levels

Release time from teaching, academic advising, ordering of all of my supplies from myriad companies required for research,, and managing all of my existing grant budgets, would be more helpful than any of these other items. Taken together, these things take a lot of my time. If active researchers could have shared admins to help with their day-to-day operations, that would be incredibly helpful. Also, help with manuscript submissions, as this takes a lot of time.

"While seminars and training may be helpful for young faculty established faculty do not need more seminars or training. Spending money on external workshop organizers is also not making good use of our resources - we have plenty of successful faculty that would be happy to assist younger faculty, why not pay them to do this? This way established faculty can further develop their skills while at the same time helping younger faculty.

Proposal development could be improved significantly by having administrative staff do more of the internal and external paperwork. Most of the online forms now have numerous pdf pages explaining how to fill them out. A lot of faculty time can be saved by having administrative staff do this - all the information is available to them."

Q17-NS-7T

"- More staff (not currently listed). I have heard stories of proposals being returned without review because OSP did not submit all the documents requested even though the PI provided all the documents. Most of these errors seem to be due to not enough qualified staff at OSP and too much workload on current staff. This is something the new VPR will need to look into.

- For collaborative team proposals, the make up of the team should be reached via consensus and the input of the PI and their core team."

Expand the current RGC Small Grant Program to support more internal awards. The current project funding is $6K. This is quite small, compared with the other state research universities. Please consider a meaningful increase, like $20 to $30.

I get a lot of emails from the Office of Sponsored Programs and &gt;90% are garbage. The most helpful thing was they employed TIG to review CAREER proposals, TIG was amazing and they said they will work with faculty on other submissions too.
"I know there are some editorial staff that support the larger proposal submissions. Expanding this would be the most impactful action that could be taken. The budget development procedures (at least though Lisa Joiner) is easy, but retaining and finding more people like her should be a high priority to balance workloads while maintaining high quality work.

I appreciate the training/PIVOT resources, but as with a number of these questions the faculty members know where funding opps are posted and who they might collaborate with already in most cases. The larger centers and institutes are already facilitating the larger collaborations.”

It's very hard to get grants, so if we could have help in finding opportunities that are collaborative or we may not have thought of ourselves, that could be a big help.

Less turn over in OSP... Our department has had multiple OSP managers in the last two years.

More investment, more infrastructures, more student support, more preliminary results, more successful proposals.... I don't think "proposal editing, budget procedure, and seminar about OSP" help at all.

Office of Sponsored Programs must be greatly improved. They are always out of date in regards to FAR reporting and individuals are not familiar with solicitation specifics. There should be one person dedicated to a single department proposal submission.

Pay OSP people more money so they actually stay in their jobs longer and get to learn their departments and aren't persuaded away by other opportunities. Reduce their departmental coverage so they're not so overworked and can spend more time on each proposal. R1 institutions have a separate OSP person for each department.

UA is the first institution I’ve worked in that does not have dedicated OSP staff for each department.

We've had so much turn over we never know who to contact. Almost no help on budgets, and have seen rejected without review issues because lacking support from OSP. The OSP staff don’t appear to be compensated very well and are overworked (again- they are stretched among different departments). We need dedicated and supportive support staff! This is the fastest and most direct way that we could increase research funding to UA.

We are having issues with post-award timeliness. We need to make sure that as we hire more research-oriented faculty that we have the appropriate levels of staffing at OSP and C&GA.

Q17-NS-NTT

Q17-SS-T

Above does not apply to me.

Assign a full-time grant specialist to each grant-active department, or shared across two departments, with their office physically in the department.

Hard to say the value of learning about resources when it is unclear what resources OSP has?

I've stopped answering because the survey was so long.

It's not the submission process that's broken; it's the post-award handling of grants. I don't know a single grant-funded investigator who can make sense of CG&A's process, nor of the accounting system. We run detailed shadow budgets and still can't reconcile them with what's in the system. Accounting staff are, with a few exceptions, arbitrary and condescending. The fiscal staff appear to be running the grant process, and PIs seem to be regarded generally as necessary pains in the butt to be given as little information and as much grief as possible.

Make sure that those in the budget office work more flexible hours than 8-4:45 and can actually properly manage budgets and not cause additional work for faculty members who should be concentrating on research, not fixing problems not of their own making re: money management.

Make the University take a small cut for so-called "overhead."

Proposal process needs to be streamlined with fewer administrative add ins and "strings attached."

Basically, all tenure-track faculty with record of research should get a small non-competitive research stipend, equally distributed across disciplines. This is particularly important for A&S due to decreased external grant funding.

Rank in order from top to bottom? Bottom to top? Unclear.
Stop making faculty seek out OSP and other people for workshops. Have these grant professionals have 30 minute visits with faculty to find out what they do and then suggest funding opportunities that match once they see them.
"the online tools are not good. Face time is better.
Pivot is of very, very limited value."
This is a poorly written question
We do not begin to have the infrastructure or human capital to be competitive.
We have a pretty good system....IRB process needs improvement.

**Q17-SS-TT**
For those areas where research funding is prioritized and available, I suspect many faculty members would benefit from a website or listserv where federal and private funding opportunities were listed. It would be more helpful if this could be customized by research topic (i.e., area of research, not department). I believe this would be most effective as a centralized university-wide resource, not as a college- or department-specific resource.
I believe that having a groups of grant specialist familiar with different fields is a CRUCIAL step to increase the grant success rate of faculty and improve the university's visibility nationally, as recipient of those grants and fellowships. The School of Education at the University of Wisconsin has a group of editors and they have seen a great improvement in their outcomes.
I participated in the Junior Investigators Program and found it very helpful. I didn’t understand why it was a ‘selective’ group of new faculty who participated. It seemed to me that it should have been open, or even mandatory, for all new tenure track from the relevant disciplines.
If any of the offices/programs currently in OSP/ORED did what they said they did, we would be fine. Currently these offices are either unmotivated or not capable of providing the services that they say they offer.
People need time to write proposals more than anything.
Provide a streamlined system for methodologists to "advertise" (not sure if that's the right word) their expertise to researchers in other departments/colleges who are developing proposals for potential collaborations.
Some centers have staff that their sole job is to write grants. We need more of that!
The biggest need - by far - is to make the system less painful - every aspect is difficult and opaque. Very frustrating.
The three biggest needs are (1) help finding on-campus experts, (2) assistance building out comprehensive budgets that include all the costs needed [administration costs like advertising can be difficult to know before gaining experience], and (3) internal review processes by experts to steepen the training curve.

**Q17-SS-NTT**
Hardest part about grants is finding the money and developing the budget. If each college could have a University-funded grant liason that met with top faculty and identified their areas of expertise and then identified opportunities, it would really help. Then, if this same person could help faculty with University budget and paperwork, we all could complete a lot more applications.
Make promotion and raises contingent on successfully garnering external funding. FYI -- there are contingent faculty who have earned a million plus dollars in external funding yet they are paid poorly and treated badly as inferior faculty.
These are all important to improve proposal submission rates and success.
Q18: Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Research Compliance Support

Q18-HUM-T
Do not know
Does this question take into account the realities of research in the humanities, including the scarcity of funding for humanities?
I can't vote on this question (rank the options) because this area has nothing to do with my work, and I don't know what the jargon means.
Make IRB approval process consistent across different IRB personnel
The IRB process here is inconsistent and takes entirely too long. I am also concerned that many research protocols - i.e., natural field experiments that involve the waiver of informed consent - which are viewed as acceptable at other Universities would not be approved here. It often appears as if social science research is evaluated through the lens of a medical trial and that the criteria used to determine what is acceptable are more stringent than the federal guidelines. As such I am concerned that I may be unable to conduct the type of research that I was brought to UA to do.
This doesn't affect me at all.
You should have a "don't know how to rank" choice here since these are out of areas and many, such as me, will leave the choices as presented, giving you misweighted data.

Q18-HUM-TT
IRB must be quicker and more transparent. Causing loss of grants.
None.
Not applicable to my research.
Research compliance support is excellent and needs no improvement.

Q18-HUM-NTT
I don't know enough about this question to rank the options.
Not an issue in the humanities.

Q18-NS-T
"Policing" is a good word. Research compliance is not about assisting the researcher in doing the "right thing". It is perceived to be protecting the University at the cost of the researcher. Researchers need assistance in doing the "right thing" not brow-beat into "assimilation". For example, IRB should be a process that highlights collaborative, best practices and best technologies in conjunction with compliance not a dreaded, time consuming process.
Facilitate researchers focusing on research and administrative talents on administrative tasks. Too often researchers are bogged down in research administration limiting productivity and quality.
Faculty have to fill out too many online forms that are badly designed. Administrative staff should fill those out and ask faculty to review those. If someone passes the test of a training session they should not be forced to watch and click through the material.
Have not needed to worry about IRB for some time, but having had COI issues, progress has been made in streamlining this.
I am not familiar enough with research compliance to evaluate these items.
I didn't rank-order items in question 18 because everything feels like such a mess to us researchers -- there's so much red tape now. IRB is a disaster. I had a project that included surveying experts in the field (not the general public) and IRB folks wanted me to go through the whole process because somehow my surveying professionals in the field was going to harm or warp their minds or something.
maybe hire more people for EHS and other support departments?
no opinion on this
Our current research compliance office seems to approach working with faculty antagonistically, almost like faculty are trying to 'get away with something'. Rather than working to find ways to promote compliant research, they seem to find ways to inhibit compliant research endeavors.
Reducing IRB burden and all of the training videos needed would be a big help! Seems like I am doing some training every other month!
The Office for Research Compliance is a huge hindrance at UA. Their goal should be to promote research while educating faculty about federal guidelines so that the faculty may perform research aligned with those guidelines. Faculty WANT to follow the guidelines. UA Research Compliance seems to find it easier to hold up research rather than to educate faculty on how to perform compliant research. If they would just work with us, instead of against us, their jobs would actually get easier as faculty learn the guidelines.

The research compliance administration should be fired as they lack sufficient background and training and are in over their heads, covering up innumerable mistakes. The same goes for here. Train the people better in Research Compliance Support and pay them better so that they will help the faculty instead of offloading all of the work onto the faculty. This goes for all of the research support offices. We are supposed to be supported yet they don't help...they ask us to do the work so they can *check* it or send it back and say *do this or that* instead of helping us change it. These folks are overworked. I would have quit long ago. Get them some help!!!! The university needs to get a new program to input IRB that reduces the protocol to only the needed items. I can't imagine reading these documents. I would pluck my eyes out!!! Plus...there needs to be a system in place regarding when a modification needs to go to a reviewer and when it can just be approved. This system needs to be transparent. Plus, there needs to be a way to update researchers on IRB changes. Yes...please decrease the training to something reasonable. I have freshmen students trying to pass the quizzes in the training program so that they can work in my lab. Let's have reasonable expectations regarding their level of involvement and their training needs.

Very poor outfit.

Q18-NS-TT
Again, the byzantine bureaucracy surrounding research just beats people down. Staff in accounting, grants, and budget offices seem to feel it's their job to police 'bad' faculty instead of helping us with procedures, budgets and accounting. I really doubt there is much if any faculty corruption or grant misuse but we spend 10x the time necessary proving that to our own internal budget people. The best part is that during the summer I receive no pay and I pay $5000 to keep my kids in childcare so I can write grants and do research. I doubt the people sending me emails every day demanding multiple budget justifications for lab supplies are volunteering their time and paying 5k in childcare to do it. UA can't grow our research if everyone involved isn't actively trying to promote research. It is good now. No need to deviate the effort on this subject.

No opinion here.

Q18-NS-NTT
Provide money for EHS hires to help research labs. Rules are made for ones that follow them. No consequence if not following. Problems are submitted about non compliance for issues and nothing is done, especially if they have research funding. Turning a blind eye will eventually cost the University in fines and lawsuits but too short sited to address the issues.

Q18-SS-T
Adjust institutional policies to comply with federal rules when the new guidelines for oral history go into effect in January 2019, reducing unnecessary barriers to oral history research.

Hire more staff in there to speed things up. I find some of the wording of these questions to be offensive (e.g., "Change from policing research" and "Proper training and oversight.") I think our staff in research compliance do a great job. Perhaps having opportunities for faculty who are having problems to express their frustration with an independent third party to find ways to work around issues would help. I have experienced some issues that I think could be resolved with more clarification on both the part of the IRB staff and the faculty member. I have very little sense of what any of the above means, so I did not rank the options.

I moved nothing; no opinion

I've stopped answering because the survey was so long.

"If cow college can have CITI training last for five years, why can't we?
What is value of my learning protocols for prisoners when I don't deal with prisoners,...and asking 2,000 other faculty and 4000 graduate students to waste their time with that? UA is not using technology to save our time."

IRB is a major hindrance in doing good research. The only function is to ensure that human subjects are protected. They have gone way to far in ensuring "compliance."

IRB needs serious training about what is "normal educative settings" in which observational data or concrete work in these is does not require consent in many instances when the units of measure are NOT the individuals themselves. Permissions to enter those settings is one thing but consent is only for participants who are the units of analysis. Research in the social sciences has been severely hamstrung in securing federal grants in certain situations for research, not evaluation to be clear.

IRB process is considerably more complex and lengthy than other universities with similar size and structure.

IRB protocols are so inconsistent. Some don't care about spelling while other reviewers literally ask for a colon to be changed to a semicolon or vice versa. Time is still slow and keeps us from partnering with industry who need data more quickly.

My single greatest barrier to research is IRB. My research almost always involves minimal risk and often times my data are collected anonymously, yet IRB still remains a tremendous barrier to my research. I have "given up" at times on complex research ideas because of the hurdles from IRB.

OMG. Why does the IRB not have an exempt category? Do they not recognize why it is useful to have an exempt category. I put in the exact same protocol as a colleague at a peer university. Their protocol is exempt. Mine is not--because that category does not exist here. If we could PLEASE not make research any harder than it needs to be...

Our IRB office is a trainwreck. The entire office needs to a communication and efficiency audit to address the problems in this office.

Research Compliance has already changed from policing to facilitating. Really #1 is the only choice.

Respect the role of Research Compliance and learn to work with them. We talk about these people as if they are idiots; they are not. They are carrying out and enforcing federal policy; we need to better the understand the "why" of their work.

The IRB office insistence on creating more processes and requirements beyond the federal expectations, especially in the social sciences, inhibits inquiry.

The IRB process is ridiculous slow and tedious especially non-evasive research (i.e. surveys). The pedantic changes that the committee asks for are unnecessary. There are people on the committee who do not understand the discipline that the application is coming from and thus ask for changes that are quite frankly ludicrous. This process could be much easier and streamlined with IRB committee structures changed to better reflect the pool they are reviewing. If we are aspiring to be a Research 1 let's start acting like one.

The item about Research Compliance Personnel has a very negative connotation, and I don't believe that's appropriate in this survey.

The ORC has improved markedly since I arrived at UA some years ago.

There has to be good knowledge about which peer schools are best at this. Rather than critique or quibble internally, simply move to best practices and have everyone adjust.

We seem to do an ok job here except for IRB....way to slow.

Yes as is!

Q18-SS-TT

A major restriction on research is how overzealous the IRB office is. In an effort to establish legitimacy, they seem more strict on proposals than I have seen at other institutions. IRB is way too slow and cumbersome. Hire more people. Train them on what can easily be expedited, and move along with the process.

As mentioned earlier, the IRB process stands to be improved greatly.
I've heard nightmares about IRB, but I always just speak to my compliance person over the phone to find out what I need to do, I do it, and my project sails through. I think the hardest parts are when intersectional conflict arises, such as between IRB and C&G. I had a project delayed over 3 months because they dodged actually helping me. Three months.

IRB here is way too long and complex and difficult. Been at an Ivy League school and two top ten schools - nothing as cumbersome as what I see here.

IRB needs to be a little more "common-sense" about what types of research do and do not have the capacity to harm participants, and the non-medical, expedited IRB procedures should be VERY streamlined.

It seems like the Research compliance could benefit from more staff.

Mainly focus on speeding up the IRB process and procedures as well as facilitating to ensuring compliance, rather than questioning the science and protocols that are completed by the scientist/expert in the field.

My top two (speeding up the process and ensuring that the process facilitates rather than hinders research) are integral to ensuring we have productive research faculty.

Our IRB process is the worst I've ever experienced at any institution. It needs to be overhauled, and it makes no sense that Psychology is allowed to have their own IRB process. If one department has their own, each department should be allowed to consider having their own IRB fast-track.

There's so many problems here. IRB should be helping us do research and do it ethically. Right now, the staff treats it as a policing or gatekeeping function and focuses on irrelevant details. I believe that this is because the people staffing that office are not familiar with research and instead have become committed to bureaucracy. Focus on what is important.

This, to me, is a huge one. Our IRB regularly overextends their authority by, for example, insisting on reviewing research that is not human subjects research (e.g., completely de-identified secondary data) and reviewing/requesting revisions what they perceive to be as "quality" issues rather than "ethics" issues, which should be sorted out in the peer-review process by colleagues who are experts in our respective fields and more qualified to comment on quality.

Q18-SS-NTT

"I am a newer hire and the only thing that has completely disappointed me is the IRB office. They are rigid, inconsistent, and simply combative when interacting with research faculty. I have not had a worse service experience in my professional career. I have several protocols under review that were arbitrarily required to be reviewed as expedited despite the fact that my co-authors were all exempted in 24 - 48 hours at better Universities.

You can't be a research university with an IRB that is run by staff that don't conduct or understand research. I know we are looking for a new VP, but it seems like there needs to be an executive board comprised of chaired research faculty that need to set University-Specific policies for the IRB that the current org. chart would report to. Right now they are on a power trip that hurts our research. Making sure we hold up the Common Rule is paramount, but creating hurdles for exempt research is insane. I am confident they force exempt protocols to go through as expedited as it is the only way they can showcase reasonable turnaround times compared to peer schools, because if they took 4 weeks to review research that is exempt this would be worst in class and they have cleverly leveraged their power to hide their inability to due their jobs efficiently."

The process is built to help the IRB folks and not the folks trying to do research. Support units should support those doing the research. Online forms and an inability to talk to IRB folks is not a great way to get things done.

We need good oversight for compliance but it must be organized, efficient, professional, adequately staffed, supported by technology (e.g., streamlined proposal submission websites where all procedures and submitted documents are well-organized and readily available, automated notices) and supportive to facilitate research productivity. Many R1 institutions have this down to a science. Having to wait weeks for IRB review and approval kills researcher productivity.
Q19: Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Grant Management Support

Q19-HUM-T
I can't vote on this question (rank the options) because this area has nothing to do with my work, and I don't know what the jargon means.
I have no opinion on this.
N/A do not know
Not a humanities-friendly question (no research staff in the humanities), I am not answering.
This doesn't affect me.
You should have a "don't know how to rank" choice here since these are out of areas and many, such as me, will leave the choices as presented, giving you misweighted data.

Q19-HUM-TT
At UA we have terrible things happen (like postdocs not being paid for months at a time - true story!) because something fell through the cracks with someone's grant renewal/continuation because Grant Management staff are not keeping up. Do we need to hire more people? better people? But it's ridiculous that these things happen - we will never reach R1 status this way.
None.
This survey is too long and involved, even for someone who cares a lot about these issues.

Q19-HUM-NTT
Not a humanities issue

Q19-NS-T
"Seek PI input" and "Collaborate with PI to improve" should be the beginning of any conversation regarding Grant Management. Grant Management would not be necessary without PIs. This is a relationship that seems to be lost at times. As a PI, I want help and assistance "staying in the lines" but if the grant management is not assistive, why would I write the next proposal?
All of the above would be very helpful
All of these are of equal importance, except for "seminars, training..." which faculty typically learn from each other, not admins.
Grant management should not unnecessarily impede research productivity compared to peer institutions. We seem to have several policies, such as purchase of research supplies, that are considerably more conservative than other research institutions.
Grant management support (i.e., OSP) at UA is poor. The department is largely unresponsive and does not accomplish tasks in a timely manner. New grant submissions are not reviewed carefully, and it takes an unreasonably long time to get new awards in place for purchases, etc. to be made.
Had only just learned how to run one electronic "Coordination sheet" system so then have to turn around and learn a second. This seems to be a case of pushing the paperwork out of OSP onto the PIs - who are busy trying to take care of doing their jobs.
I didn't supply a ranking for Question 19. Instead, may I say two things: 1. Why do we keep buying such crazy software that's supposed to make things easier but doesn't? 2. I have always had great support from our Contracts and Grants and Sponsored Research personnel.
I wish there was a trash bin for 'Offer seminars...' we do not need more of these! Communicating with PIs about improvements and then acting on those would be great. Don't have them fill out another survey (like this one) instead send a personal email and ask them. Maybe even give them a call.
Needs a lot of improvements.
option on this
None of the PIs have ever received official training in budget management so help is appreciated as we are tasked with this duty. However, we are the ones identifying where to purchase requisite items so need to included in the discussion for ways to improve the process and transparency. The speed with which new accounts are set up needs to dramatically improve, as it is currently taking months to be able to access externally awarded funds.
OSP data on grant submissions and awards should be uploaded weekly and checked for accuracy. Faculty putting together their retention/promotion dossiers are constantly frustrated by missing, incomplete, or inaccurate postings from OSP. I'm not sure if this is a staffing or training issue. It could also be a software/programming limitation. Whatever the problem is, it needs to be fixed! Please provide training on Cayuse!!! Please streamline this paperwork. I bought an item for $14 on a grant and my secretary needed to fill out all kinds of paperwork.
The current tools are arcane and close to unusable.
The Office of Sponsored Programs appears to work independently from the PI's. Administration tells them what to do instead of getting input from the PI's about what they need help with.

**Q19-NS-TT**
I usually have to wildly guess if I'm filling in the Cayuse forms correctly. No one teaches you this stuff. Also, several of my grants are missing from Cayuse so I just had to manually enter them in on my FAR. It is okay now. No need to deviate the effort on this subject.
Purchasing anything for research is a miserable, tedious time sink at UA. I did not submit a proposal this semester because I had to deal with back and forth of confusing emails about expenses in Concur. It is unreasonable to ask faculty to spend so much time on this. We are trying to do research with our hands tied.
The purchasing procedures are unacceptably burdensome in my opinion. Improving this should be a high priority.
We need more in-house, departmental accountants to help track grant spending. Monthly reports to the PI should be mandatory to help track grants.

**Q19-NS-NTT**

**Q19-SS-T**
Again this is all so science based I cannot answer in any meaningful way.
Any grant below $150,000 should have a streamlined process to get through, with different IDC rates.
We spend more time with UA paperwork than is worth it.
Assign a full-time grant specialist to each grant-active department, or shared across two departments, with their office physically in the department.
Build human capital....technology is helpful, but it people investments will return far more than technology.
I've stopped answering because the survey was so long.
Make OSP more college-based rather than university-based. The minute grant applications and emails head over there, they die. Colleges won't let that happen.
No suggestions
Note that my top priorities all start with "Seek PI input...". Response to Q17a is relevant here.
Put people in the grants office who understand the process and who are willing to work proactively for the faculty member. The current staff has a 9-5 mentality.
Serious, purchasing is a joke at UA. It takes a month to purchase something under $5000 sometimes. That is ridiculous. Also, paid participants on grants sometimes do not receive stipends or scholarships for months. This needs to be set as within 5 business days that checks or direct deposits are issued from PI request without exception. Why write a grant when participants rely on their time being compensated but UA drags their feet issuing payments sometimes for months.
There has to be good knowledge about which peer schools are best at this. Rather than asking local PIs or administrators, simply move to best practices and move all of us in that direction.
Yes as is!

**Q19-SS-TT**
All of the above seem like good ideas. I had a hard time ranking them.
OSP personnel should be there to facilitate research. They should act like they are interested and invested in getting grants and contracts, NOT that you are inconveniencing them. They should pursue getting grants and contracts signed and active, not wait for someone to remind them that it isn't done.
Related, I regularly have to make several follow-up emails and supports to gain access to funds and such when securing small external grants. It is possible that CGA staff are more efficient when "big" funding is secured, but these sour experiences on small external funding certainly do not provide a researcher with confidence about the office's infrastructure and responsiveness.

Seminars based on the input of experienced PIs would be ideal for newer PIs

This question is worthless to anyone who is not obtaining external research funding, so much of this data will be worthless. As a result, I'll just say that the biggest problem with C&G is that they treat researchers like we are their staff, instead of the opposite. There is no accountability for how they treat us. That needs to change. When I say I need something, their response should be to tell me how we can make it happen, not simply answer that I can't do that, which is their first response to everything. They are meant to facilitate our work, not restrict it. Across multiple projects, they have been a barely competent nightmare to work with. I dread working with them on my next research project.

Q19-SS-NTT

Get rid of Concur. Pushing out all travel/expense work to faculty kills time to work on research!

I have not received grant management support so I don't feel comfortable ranking.

I think relative importance here varies, e.g., new faculty would benefit more from training on grant management than senior faculty.

More face-to-face communication, Build teams and trusted relationships not online portals and systems.

Some training when new software is used or PI input on procedures, such as when Fleet changed several procedures. Not a smooth process, but does work now. Working with OSP has been great this past year with the DHR grants.
Q20: Rank in order the importance of the following to improve Information Technology Support

Q20-HUM-T
I just need a better computer. I don't see that option above.
IT remains so siloed on this campus that communication is key.
Most of this is worthless other than data and computing.
Training is more useful if faculty have release time to complete said training.
We need more statistical support via a UA consultation office (beyond what we have so far)
You should have a "don't know how to rank" choice here since these are out of areas and many, such as me, will leave the choices as presented, giving you misweighted data.

Q20-HUM-NTT
We don't really need this in the humanities and should spend as little money as possible on it.

Q20-NS-T
Academic software and computer support is appreciated, particularly with the push by vendors to require constant "upgrading". Otherwise OIT does not do much to solve my problems.
I come from an area where there's lots of funding, and we can pretty much pay for what we need in IT support, so my comment may be colored by that. A big problem for me is academic software and computer hardware support. We have pretty much done away with computer labs, so students' individual computers are important to be able to handle large, technical software. At least in technical areas, we need to tell students to come to university with PCs, not Apple products. Large, technical CAD programs are less compatible with Apple products. Additionally, we need tech support to help the students work with their individual computers to load and run large CAD software.
Improve the wifi access for guest visitors. It is embarrassing!
None of the options in question Q20 rank as high as direct, personal support for research needs. If you have a proposal due in 12 hours and need a specific software license to edit/draw a diagram or perform a computation, submitting a "help ticket" is useless. Using University approved cloud-based resources that are not common among the research community is frustrating when working with national and international collaborators that use more common commercial and enterprise-level cloud resources. "Regarding the web video conferencing tools and facilities - it would be nice to have a usable phone in the office. When switching to an internet-based phone system UA went with an outdated system, that does not provide a usable answering machine nor a wireless option that allows one to use the phone while working on other things. Modern internet-based phone systems also allow users to use different end-devices (PC, cell-phone, etc.) to serve as the 'phone' providing much greater flexibility. Did I mention that we do not need more seminars and training!"
We have no real IT support on this campus. OIT is practically worthless. Good customer service should not involve impersonal email communications to resolve computer issues. The eTech Office in A&S has some good people in it, but too many stupid rules about what can and can't be purchased. Faculty know what they need, so don't second guess or limit their choices.

Q20-NS-TT
At other institutions we had high-level people trained to provide support within the department or institute. At UA I don't even have anyone to call, most of the people at OIT and eTech know less than I do about sysadmin and I end up doing everything myself. Again, all that is time that I could be writing grants or papers.
Faculty should be in charge of their own data storage with options to buy RAIDs / data servers as part of UAHPC. UA Box is great in theory but it's so slow / unreliable when uploading more than just a few files. It is okay now. No need to deviate the effort on this subject.
The University provided Zoom conferencing system is very useful.
Web video conferencing facilities are great, but can't we just get access to webex (or something similar) or basic teleconferencing tools. It is difficult to conduct collaborative, external research when we don't have access to basic communications tools.

Zoom is great!

Q20-NS-NTT

Q20-SS-T

Each grant-active department should have an in-house video-conference facility for cross-site collaboration.

I am happy with IT support so far . . .

I've stopped answering because the survey was so long.

More training.

No comments

Not an expert, and neither are most of the people replying. Get expert or best practices and move in the direction of the best peer schools.

Stop changing the f---ing software every other semester because somebody's son-in-law needs to make a sale! Try to find a suitable (if possible) software, and stick with it. Blackboard, for example, is crap.

This is not an issue for me. However, again, it would be helpful if I didn't have to explain on an annual basis to skeptical accounting personnel why I need a copy of statistical software on my personal computers in order to work efficiently.

We need a research version of UA-Box that has clear cut backup and recovery for our data.

web video conferencing tools are not good investment

Yes as is!

Q20-SS-TT

Offer access to statistical programs to all students and faculty for a small fee renewable each year.

OIT is great.

Our computers are so old that they can't even run the software that we need to do our work.

The recent acquisition of a university-wide MATLAB license was an excellent step forward.

We need to stop signing contracts that require annual renewal licenses and cloud licensed software. I have to pay an extra $40/month to ensure I have a hotspot so that I can log into my VPN so I can license software that is sitting on my hard drive. That is insane. It is literally the only reason I have a hotspot.

Q20-SS-NTT

All important.

Hire staff to do this stuff. Let faculty do research and not spend time inputting data and filling out reports.
Q21: Weight the importance of the following groups that should be evaluated by faculty feedback

Q21-HUM-T
I have no idea who many of these people are.
Much too much emphasis is placed on administration. It's not important.
The Deans are in the central position and getting executive compensation. Faculty are their shareholders.

Q21-HUM-TT
None.

Q21-HUM-NTT
Call me a cynic but I think this question is a waste of time because it won't happen.
We should get rid of as many of these positions as possible.

Q21-NS-T
(2) VP for Research and Economic Development
All of these people should be helping research faculty....instead there are a million forms to file out and check. These office do not communicate with each other so we are asked for things a couple of times.
The worst in finance. I've already given feedback about OSP but finance is horrible. They expect the faculty to do all of the accounting on projects instead of helping. We have to do everything now. Instead of helping research faculty, the financial people just want us to do things their way and need more and more paperwork from us. How can we be good at research and teaching if we are continually expected to be accountants and financial experts as well as everything else that is required. UA does not make it easy to be a PI.
All part of a system that has to function together to be effective
Directors of Centers and Institutes also need to be evaluated periodically by faculty (say every 3 or 4 years).
I didn't answer question 21a. I couldn't decide whether you were asking how important the groups are or whether you were asking how important it was to have them evaluated by faculty.
I never feel like the evaluations really result in any change. Deans and admins should have to produce a report on how they plan to adapt based on the evaluations.
I'm not sure that true evaluations are needed but there needs to be some way to have repeated issues be addressed; that mechanism is currently lacking and it is difficult to determine who evaluates the personnel within the various offices and why these issues persist.
In the 12 years I have been at UA the above staff has not improved and each year move time commitment are place on the faculty instead of improving the above departments.
One important level is missing that should also be evaluated by faculty: center directors!!!
Personally, I think the compliance office personnel do a good job, but for my research I do not have to deal with the IRB or IACUC review.

Q21-NS-TT
REALLY?? We can provide this feedback, but does it EVER change anything??
The performance of all ADRs need to be thoroughly evaluated ASAP.
There needs to be much more involvement of faculty in evaluating all of these groups! They all should be evaluated to change to customer driven service.
Why does the VPR not appear here? Decisions by our previous VPR had a strong negative impact on my ability to do research and generate the preliminary results needed for competitive proposals.

Q21-NS- TT
It is good now. No need to deviate the effort on this subject.
Purchasing at this university is too restrictive and cumbersome with too many necessary approvals. Let the PIs choose who the best vendors are based on their needs and best practices in their fields.
We should be reporting purchasing department, financial admin, and OSP effectiveness on a yearly basis. Some accountability may improve the surprising lack of support (and in fact increased unnecessary faculty work load) from these departments.
We struggle to keep good accounting people, likely because they are not being paid competitive salaries.

**Q21-NS-NTT**

**Q21-SS-T**
All of the above should each be 100, ie. all of these bozos need to stop being bean-counting pseudo-intellectual, academic-manque lickspittles.

Faculty are not experts in most of these things. So you just get individualized, poorly informed complaints. There are metrics that can be identified to evaluate effectiveness in comparison to peer schools. For instance, average time for IRB expedited review, IRB personnel-faculty ratio, IT personnel-faculty ratio, etc.

Faculty have too little input. Too much bureaucracy.....
I don't think there needs to be a formal process of evaluation for these groups
I don't want to evaluate these people, but I can appreciate having a mechanism to report problems or particularly good experiences. For example, whenever I submit a grant, perhaps I could get the opportunity to complete a survey about the grant specialist who helped me -- similarly whenever dealing with accounting personnel, etc.
I have no strong opinions here.
Important to set up and accomplish all.
No Comment
See earlier comments.

**Q21-SS-TT**
OSP staff and administration needs to be evaluated as many of these individuals are not fulfilling their jobs.

Shouldn't ALL of these people be evaluated in terms of how well they are doing their jobs? Wouldn't it make sense to ask the consumers of their work (the faculty) for input? These numbers should all be set to 100.

The problem is that our evaluations do not mean anything to the administration. People who perform poorly at their jobs should not be kept in those jobs. Period. People who make faculty unhappy are performing poorly. We should be treated with respect and understanding. We are the talent.

VP for research and those that fall under the new hire should be evaluated, in addition to IRB. Tanta is great, but the overall IRB process/oversight/requirements/procedures for non-psych professors is horrible.

**Q21-SS-NTT**
All impact faculty research productivity, so it's hard to rate relative importance.

Clunky question. Do you mean: how much faculty input should be used to evaluate the following? What are you trying to get at? Unclear.

Faculty evaluation of support staff who are not their directs reports would be disastrous in practice.

Most faculty have little or no idea of what people in these positions due or the constraints/policies under which they operate. Giving faculty an evaluative role for these groups would kill what little morale they have. Supervising these groups is the role of the Chairs, Deans and VPs. Build more accountability of folks at these levels to their faculty to improve performance.

I have had lovely experiences with all other support groups on campus. Compliance is just in desperate need of oversight and feedback. Each protocol should have an associated survey capturing feedback on the process that is reviewed by a faculty-led executive board.

I think they should work together, not be evaluated by in some hierarchical fashion. They all should be evaluated. Accounting is the most complex and not transparent.

To move to R1, UA has to compete with other universities (R2s and R1s) for funding. The activities of Assoc. Deans, compliance office, and accounting are on par with other (R1) universities I have experience with. IT at UA is a joke, it might as well not exist. I do not know if IT staff here are unqualified or unmotivated, but UA loses out to other universities by huge margins in IT support. Dealing with IT and
technical lab issues takes up faculty time that can be spent interacting with program officers and
developing competitive research programs for funding. Faculty at other universities do just that, and can
become successful faster than UA faculty, who are hand-holding IT in program installation (!?). If UA
wants to move to R1, this situation is untenable.
Q22: Weight the importance of the following factors that should be considered for reducing teaching load

**Q22-HUM-T**
My FTE's could address the need for student supervision by having my thesis and dissertation direction count towards course releases. This is a pressing need, and this solution would keep the FTE's original organization. It should be easy but it doesn't happen. As a result I feel the university doesn't value my supervision of students, which requires significant work. I feel that work is expected of me now on a completely volunteer basis.

Reduced loads should be temporary in all but a few cases. Use chairs to reduce loads permanently.

**Q22-HUM-TT**
External funding opportunities vary significantly by discipline. Therefore, scholarly output should be an important gauge of success, not monetary measures.

If securing external funding is the only criterion here, then no one in the arts or humanities will ever get a reduction in teaching load. That's not right.

Need to also think about a comprehensive and fair system of assessing quality of research, especially of the Humanities faculty.

"This may not be able to be standard across departments and colleges. For instances, areas where faculty are already expected to seek large amounts of external funding should continue to be evaluated on that for reduced teaching load -- where as departments where faculty are already evaluated and expected to have high levels of service to professional organizations and local community may have different criteria to quality for a reduced teaching load.

Hard sciences are not the same as the humanities. We should have the same criteria."

**Q22-HUM-NTT**
Everyone should have basically the same teaching load.

Hire and incent great teachers, some of whom can engage with appropriate publics outside the university. Hire and incent great researchers.

**Q22-NS-T**
Differential teaching must be standard.

Evaluating the quality scholarly output can be subjective and hard to come up with a metric for it.

"Faculty who do no research and have no funding have a course load just one course less than those who are very productive. Needs fixing.

UA REALLY needs to get more "'Professors of Practice'" - PhDs who teach undergrad courses."

I put external funding at the top of Q22a because it is most objectively evaluated.

If faculty with external funding &gt;$100K/year.teach less, then other faculty with less/no funding will have to teach more. Until very recently, my dean would not consider different FTE assignments for faculty based on their interests and abilities. Teaching loads are the same, regardless of the level (or even existence) of external funding. Faculty who are actively seeking external funding, but so far unsuccessful, should get consideration for that effort. I also feel setting the faculty FTE assignment to 20% for everyone, regardless of how much or how little service they perform is unfair. I know that some departments count graduate student supervision (research hour credits) as part of faculty FTE assignment to teaching. Other than getting credit on annual FAR reviews, there is no release time given for student research supervision in my department. All faculty have the same teaching load, regardless of the number of students supervised. That needs to change if UA is serious about increasing research productivity and funding.

In disciplines where external funding is not a reasonable expectation, the external funding expectation should only be nominal. Instead, there should be increased emphasis on nationally recognized scholarly / creative outcomes and mentoring of students, and service activities (in that order of priority).

Quality is more important than quantity. Quality of research publications, amount/quality of external funding, and most important quality of supervision for graduate students. Many faculty *advise* teams
of graduates and undergraduate but really don't do anything for them. They offload those advising
duties to post docs or more advance graduate students. Having a huge team is not a favorable.
However, if your students publish or earn grants --these are factors that should be most important.
Teaching load is misleading because it depends tremendously on class size.
The problem with using the quality and quantity of research publications is that the number of
publications can be very different for different disciplines and even subfields (a faculty member with 100
publications working as part of a large collaboration would not be considered very productive while
another faculty member with 4 publications a yeat may). Who would be able to judge the quality of the
research? External funding should provide a good measure of the quality of the work of a faculty
member as perceived by their community.
Trying to come up with something like this is like comparing apples and oranges. All research is not the
same, so there is no way to make accurate judgements like this.

Q22-NS-TT
I think the application procedure for asking for reduced teaching load should be formalized. There are
many reasons why a lower teaching load in a semester could help increase future/current research
funding and productivity. Or it can benefit the prestige of the University without directly impacting
research ranking.
This is relative minor.... unless it is a huge research group. But most of these items are very subjective
and hard to have a clear cut across different departments and different research areas.
UA has to bring in money whether through teaching or research funding. Other aspects like
'quality/quantity' or 'service' are too squishy and can be implemented unfairly. For example, maybe one
person has 15 graduate students but never works with them while a second person has 3 and spends a
lot of time training them. One person may publish 15 low value papers while another may publish 1 high
value paper.

Q22-NS-NTT

Q22-SS-T
"Quality" should be emphasized here, over quantity.
Compensation for teaching faculty who must pick up the slack.
I don't think the teaching load is the problem. Valuing teaching is.
It is absurd to put dissertation hours into off-load.
My college at least doesn't have any mechanism for reducing teaching loads to function as Editors of
major journals. These are major commitments and now people at UA have to decline because there is
no way to do it without the reduced teaching load (hundreds of manuscripts and potentially thousands
or reviewers to coordinate). It sends a message that Alabama is still playing smallball.
Research output gets rewarded quite well with base salary, and if it is not, the person can directly cash it
in, but getting an external offer/counter offer, if they think they are under compensated. No additional
rewards should be targeted for research productivity.
Supervision of graduate and undergraduate research should count--by some reasonable formula--in
assessment of faculty teaching responsibilities. Faculty with external funding should "buy themselves
out" of teaching as part of grants. Publications and the like are already rewarded in the merit pay
scheme. Service is already compensated in salary--except for extraordinary service assignments (e.g., in
dean level appointments and major service to country or state).

Q22-SS-TT
Again, don’t rely on bibliometrics or Academic Analytics to judge research quality, rely on peer
evaluations (from faculty at or outside UA).
Again, this depends largely on the college/department.
We should also establish a university wide standard that research faculty operate on a 2:2 standard or a
2:1 with a mandatory course release if certain performance criteria are met. I have been told during
negotiations with my Dean that the starting standard is a 4:4 and that other mandatory obligations I
have related to my role in the department are "clinical hours" and don't count separately. I am still teaching a 2:1 and possibly 2:2 with those significant mandatory departmental obligations despite having externally funded research. Next year, I will be on the job market.

**Q22-SS-NTT**

"In my field, quality research publications are the only currency. External grants have no external value, so forcing this as a priority simply hurts our competitiveness nationally. The editors of our most elite journals often have less than $1M in external funding for their careers when you combine all their funding!"

the individual's ability to drive reputation.
Q23: Weight the importance of the following priorities to improve faculty recruitment and retention

**Q23-HUM-T**

"1. Opening Tuscaloosa airport would help put UA on the map, thus improving faculty (including research faculty) recruitment and retention. Can one even think of a major international university without an airport? As of now, travelling from/to UA for research is time- and resource- consuming. Consequently:

2. Funding research travel at a realistic level, so that faculty involved in international conferences will no longer have to cover expenses for 3 or 4 international conferences with a ridiculous annual budget of $1900 max."

How about offering salaries that are commensurate with peer institutions? We've lost so many great candidates because we can't come to terms.

None of the above are really important. Remove administrative burdens on faculty and improve funding. Allow them to do their jobs without administrative interference. Have administrators consult faculty before making decisions. Get rid of the redundant numbers of deans.

Rec center is fine. Family leave policy is shameful. Fix it.

Seems like there are support gaps at the Associate level (pay leveling), less research support etc. That could be fixed.

Work-life balance is essential to excellent teaching and research.

**Q23-HUM-TT**

Free access to recreational facilities.

I have kids and finding quality childcare is very difficult in Tuscaloosa.

If I could have, I would have ranked spousal employment, child care, and maternity leave all at 100%.

It is 2018. Why are we still arguing about how maternity leave should happen? The terms of this need to be laid out clearly and applied universally to all faculty/staff. As it is, maternity leave is an ad hoc arrangement - whatever you can get your dean/department to agree to.

Lack of child care facilities is a major problem for new hires.

The university needs to be more involved in the local community, supporting family-friendly neighborhoods close to campus, including developing a university lab school.

**Q23-HUM-NTT**

Are there options for faculty who do not have families or spouses? Things that might be important to single faculty could be competitive moving expenses, startup funds, travel funds (separate from startup), formal workshops and collaborations with peers and colleagues to help get adjusted to campus (area, facilities, opportunities, and technology on campus).

Child care facilities should be our number one priority here.

More competitive salaries

The university preschool is wonderful, but we need at least one more child care facility with more flexible options (part time, drop in, etc).

**Q23-NS-T**

"Spousal employment" means spousal employment commensurate with qualifications, not "we've got you over the coals because you want this job so we'll offer your spouse whatever dregs we can get away with".

I am not ranking the options above. In my view one of the most important aspects isn't on this list: competitive start-up packages.

I don't think most of these would really help THAT much for actual recruitment, but it'd be really nice to have free rec center membership

Improve and clarify the sabbatical process. Proactively encourage sabbaticals and visiting scholar opportunities. Improve mid-career mentoring, administrative opportunities, and alternate career paths.

Improve K-12 education at Tuscaloosa! The high school sucks.

It is very clear UA does not care about spousal employment. How many spouses and families pf faculty suffer in Tuscaloosa because there are no meaningful job opportunities for spouses who are very
talented but do not hold a PhD or are not interested in being faculty. This is very serious and it is likely one of the most significant reasons UA loses faculty. The University provides no help and Tuscaloosa companies resist hiring "outsiders".

Missing are: 'Adequate startup & salary' 
More competitive start up packages,
Spousal employment should not necessarily mean an additional tenure-track position, but some position (if feasible)
The University needs to commit to building and operating a childcare center on campus within the next 3 years as a material sign of its commitment to employee work/life balance. The capital cost for construction of a childcare facility is modest, compared to the academic buildings that have been built over the past 13 years, and could be at least partially supported by donations. A parental leave policy is needed for all staff that does not penalize two UA employee couples. In my opinion, this should take precedence over construction of a faculty/staff recreation facility. There is very uneven application of existing maternity leave and tenure clock reset policies across campus, and even between departments within the same college. University-level oversight and training of deans, department heads and supervisors is needed to ensure uniform and fair treatment of all employees.

Tuscaloosa area needs more day cares. Expand university offered services.
UA has been getting more and more family unfriendly toward families -- with the latest insult being that fact that families now have to pay more for health care coverage. This will encourage faculty to leave and go where benefits are better. Faculties families should also get 100% of their tuition paid for. This will help with retention. UA needs to be getting better ...not worse.

UA should engage with the City of Tuscaloosa to continue to make the city more diverse in its cultural/community offerings to its residents, most of whom are part of the university community. For example, UA can work with the city to organize/subsidize annual science fairs and art fairs for children and adults, co-develop a local theater to invite international musical orchestras and operas, and enhance city museums and exhibits. This will clearly address the work-life balance that is being targeted at the university level and definitely improve faculty recruitment, and more importantly, retention by imbuing a sense of belonging in faculty members. UA may look toward Austin, TX (and the Univ. of Texas) as a model for such improvements.

Q23-NS-TT
All of these are important, but it most often going to be a win/win to help facilitate spouses finding employment. I personally struggled with this for the first year or so after arriving at UA.
Arts & Sciences is amazing with spousal employment, everyone I know at other universities has been amazed by how responsive [redacted] is.
"I did not take maternity leave, and went without childcare for 8 months while waiting on a daycare spot this year. I submitted over a million dollars in grant proposals during that time, and submitted new papers and produced original research. Imagine how much more productive your faculty could be if you provided good, reliable childcare on campus!
The tier 1 institutions provide childcare options for their faculty and students. If we want to be tier 1, let’s make it possible for our faculty to lead balanced lives, so that they can become leaders in their fields!"

I think a formal policy on child-birth etc would help. Right now, we just sort of guess what will happen each time, and no one can say for sure. About child care: there seem to be lots of good private and church child care places, so I don't know if the University needs to provide this.
If we are really serious in faculty retention, the University needs to examine the need for a high quality K-12 school for the children of faculty/staff families, as well as for the local community. Right now, Tuscaloosa does not have good middle or high school options. Look at Auburn, Huntersville, Mobile, and Birmingham. They all have top K-12 schools, some of which are nationally ranked. Many of faculty families send their children to Birmingham or Mobile for better high schools. A quality middle/high school will fill the needs of many faculty families. The availability of a high quality K-12 school, just like...
the UA daycare, will be an excellent recruiting tool to attract new faculty members, who generally care about education of their children. Start up package needs to be more competitive.

Why are changes to our early tenure policy not on this list? Our inability or lack of willingness to consider faculty candidates for early tenure is really hampering our recruiting activities.

Q23-NS-NTT
Retention would be best accomplished by something that's not on the list -- which is increased salaries and reduced teaching/service loads for the most productive research faculty.

Q23-SS-T
100%: Reasonably priced health insurance
A REAL FACULTY CLUB

All of the above are important, but I don't know that one "trumps" another.

Competitive salaries
Daycare in Tuscaloosa is abysmal. Nearly all of them are ran by religious organizations, meaning that your child is likely to receive some religious indoctrination whether you want it or not. Religious daycare providers are also largely exempt from state regulation. Most don't have another other measures (like cameras) to ensure that the children are safe. The University daycare has a long waiting list that is far from transparent. Thus is appears they play favorites when admitting students. I am actively looking for a job at another university so that our daycare nightmare can end. Of course, when you have a small child it is not the most convenient time to job search. The University also does very little to help spouses with employment. The Tuscaloosa community outside the university is not terribly welcoming meaning that the University provides no support, you are not likely to find anything. I have colleagues that commute to Tuscaloosa from other states because there are not good opportunities for their spouse and kids in Tuscaloosa or Alabama.

From personal experience and having a number of colleagues "in the same boat," child care in Tuscaloosa is woefully lacking. I and a colleague had to wait months to finally find a spot for our babies - her spouse ended up having to stay home (significant financial loss) to care for the child. My spouse had to take FMLA to cover the weeks that we were on the waiting lists (several lists all across town).

How about finding a way to improve the local K-12 public schools. This is huge. We have faculty who move to and stay in Birmingham for this reason alone. We lose job candidates for this reason alone. I hate all of these choices. My choice seemed the least disruptive.

I have a faculty wife that taught at another school AND was unable to get a job with UA despite a good research record while other faculty, politically active faculty got accommodated.

Increased opportunities for pre and post tenure sabbatical leave. Perhaps a banking system where in lieu of summer salary or interim salary, faculty have option to accrue that money toward a sabbatical leave (buy out).

No Comment
NONE of the above. Perhaps think about being more inclusive - what if you come here without a significant other, without children, and your parents are dead/live elsewhere. Might the university want to consider what would attract a person in those circumstances?

Once again the university completely overlooks those of us who come here without families. Pay attention to those of us who consistently pick up the slack for those above and get no recognition for it beyond the assumption that we have the time to do so.

Our institution needs to have a formal spousal hire policy where money can come from the Provost's office to support spousal hires. We are so behind other institutions on that front. We also need more childcare options on campus. We waited 4 years to get our child into the Childrens' Program at UA when this program was marketed to new faculty as a great option for faculty with kids. Finally, we need to keep up with other institutions regarding tenure-clock stoppages. Other SEC schools allow faculty to go up on their original clock without penalty (i.e., early tenure) after having a clock stoppage. These policies should be in place to encourage success and should not be punitive if a faculty member is productive
enough to be able to go up on their original timeline. At least in my college (Arts and Sciences), faculty going up on their original clock are considered as "early tenure" if they previously had a clock stoppage. Really, none of these.

Spousal employment is ONLY when the primary hire has a strong record warranting a must need hire. Many new assist or early career asst professors are trying to negotiate that with little record to warrant such a negotiation. Hiring obviously as clinical faculty or staff is one thing but not trying to leverage a tenure track spousal hire. After the primary hire has done exceptional things, then maybe a tenure track line is warranted.

Spousal hires are top priorities, but having some real benefits for faculty where they wouldn’t have to pay for parking, be entry level members of TidePride (where they could upgrade to better seats), or complimentary rec center memberships would show the university cares about quality of life of the faculty.

The business community will catch up to the general family needs. The University could partner, but should not get directly into things where business will fill the void if the market exist.

We have a formal policy in place, encourage reading of policies among all faculty and deans.

We have lost 3 faculty members in the last year because their spouse was unable to find a job in the area. These were professionals and UA did little to nothing to help the spouse navigate a job search, where who you know is almost as important as what you know. UA needs to develop better relationships with area businesses. We also need a dual-career office in HR for two academic couples.

Again, if we are striving to be an R1, let's start acting like it.

We need a university-level policy for spouse/partner employment - both academic and non-academic. Many universities have them!

Q23-SS-TT
Can we really not get rec center access, parking that is affordable, and access to sporting events. All of these contribute to our placement in the community of the campus.

Clearer and more visible external messaging about diversity, inclusion and equity efforts

Faculty affinity groups based on social identities; More support for minoritized faculty members

Faculty DESPERATELY NEED access to childcare facilities. Spousal employment is critical too, though not as much so (since spouses can stay home alone, after all, whereas our children cannot). When we moved here, my husband was unemployed and my son was on all the daycare waitlists (quality aside) for 9 and 6 months, respectively. It's now 2 years later and we’re still on many of those waitlists with no call-backs, and he - and now my daughter too - is/was in the daycare that I do not consider of any reasonable quality. It is beyond my comprehension how the university runs a daycare (that is, notably, what I would consider the only quality daycare in Tuscaloosa) but that faculty still cannot get their children into that daycare (expand the facility, open another one, increase tuition, expand opportunities for education majors). Between my son and my daughter, we're now on our 3rd year on that waitlist. For my daughter, I got on the waitlist as soon as I found out I was pregnant - and before she was even born I was already 16th on the waitlist, and was recently told that I'd be lucky if she got in when she's 3 years old. That's completely unacceptable. For faculty children to not have quality childcare (with the exception of families who have a stay-at-home spouse or family nearby to use for childcare - which many faculty do not have, having moved from elsewhere) until they're 3 years old ("if they're lucky") is a massive, massive problem that directly impedes upon faculty functioning and productivity.

Higher quality education in city.

I’m single and feel extremely socially isolated in Tuscaloosa and that my social needs are invisible or ignored. The dating market in Tuscaloosa sucks, and I’m considering leaving partly for this reason. Having a monthly faculty happy hour (not explicitly for the purpose of dating) would be a huge step toward making my needs feel recognized and retaining me.

Include paternal leave and student loan forgiveness!

More competitive salaries to offset the high cost of living (including state income tax) relative to other states to encourage new faculty from across the country to come to UA
Salaries commensurate with aspirational institutions. The university *has* to realize that for most modern academics and spouses, *both* partners are professionals with careers. This means that a trailing spouse needs support to find a job, particularly to move away from an urban center where most graduate training takes place; there also needs to be support for two-working parent families. Frankly, most of the university's responses seem to assume an outdated (and often sexist) model with a trailing spouse who is willing to sacrifice a career for their academic partner's—we have lost several candidates in this regard. These are desperately needed. The university should open a child care facility based on the model of the Early Childhood Development Center (it doesn't need to conduct research, but it should use the approach of the daycare as a model for its own policies). There should also be someone responsible to help with spousal employment to boost faculty recruitment and retention - a little bit of help would go a long way - frankly, a website could also help with this, as it could be a place to look for jobs as well as housing. Finally, formal policies on family leave is a must - it's shocking that this is done on an ad hoc basis by each department. "These are interesting options, but I do not believe they solve retention issues. People want to be treated well and recognized for their efforts. They want to achieve their goals, not become buried in busy work and committees for the sake of faculty governance." We are so behind in our family-friendly policies, despite that our faculty are weighting more and more heavily toward women. This directly affects recruitment. We should also be touting support for same-sex relationships and benefits.

We've lost several strong junior faculty in my college because their spouses did not find quality employment opportunities here. Childcare, and the university's lack of support in finding it, has also been an issue.

Q23-SS-NTT

4 out of the 6 options focus only on faculty who have family. This either assumes all faculty have a family or values those faculty with family over faculty without. I would urge the leaders of the faculty senate to consider options for retaining faculty who do not have family. For example, if a department offers spousal hires for newly hired faculty, then they might also consider giving additional compensation for new faculty who do not request spousal support--as the department is clearly supporting two incomes for a single job opening.

As a university who promotes work/life balance and wellness, it is a shame we do not offer free recreation facilities for our faculty/staff. If there was a devoted faculty/staff rec center, it would be LOVELY so we don't have to work out with our students, and we could easily go during our lunch breaks or before/after work. If we have to pay to use the services, then I'm going to choose to use places where fewer students attend.

Diversity climate key factor in recruitment and retention

How about hiring from within? Local people are connected to community and families in the area. They are going to be loyal, long-term employees. External people are going to follow the money and the title. They will leave as soon as they get a better offer. You are throwing away valuable talent by overlooking what you already have. Stop hiring spouses!!!! In the corporate world folks do not get their spouses hired. Every spousal hire is a job lost to a long-term contingent faculty member.

pay/compensation packages. what are the exclusives UA can create that can't be matched by other schools. waive parking fees; preferred sports packages (existing offers could not be considered "preferred"), improved admin support (for people other than department heads)... again, how bad do we want a step-change improvement.

Quality of Tuscaloosa schools (from elementary to high) is a big concern of faculty who interview on campus. Right now, faculty choose to live in Birmingham to ensure quality high school education for children. On many other campuses, there are several schools closely affiliated with university that are highly ranked, and that faculty choose for their kids. Recreation and Social Needs are handled well at UA
The modifications to accommodate life circumstances is very important to me. I waited to have children until after my doctorate, but now I am constrained by my tenure clock in terms of growing my family. If given the choice, I will choose more children over my tenure track position. However, I do enjoy my job and my workplace, and if there were options for multiple tenure modifications for having more than one child during 5 years, especially because I am less than 30 years old, I would see myself staying here for many years.

The University does not seem to adequately appreciate that many competitive faculty hires have academic spouses and that for many of these couples Tuscaloosa is a one stop shop. If the University does not make it possible for dual career couples to both have academic careers at UA, it will lose these hires.

"This is a big one. Tuscaloosa is a great place, but we are not booming with industry, so as the primary employer in the region, we need to be really proactive in helping great faculty transition with their spouses.

I don't think we should lower the bar for spousal hires, but pulling a line forward by a year or streamlining the application process seems to make a lot of sense."

This is an important one. Circumstances have radically changed since the days when one spouse (usually husband) could be the superstar at work, while the other (usually wife) took care of kids and home, often with nearby family supports. Nowadays, we are often both working (trying to be superstars), far from family supports, and dealing with other issues (e.g., aging parents). Strains on the couple/family system impact all areas of life quality and satisfaction, including work productivity.

Increasingly common challenges entail finding jobs in the same area, well-screened reliable babysitters, housekeepers, home/yard maintenance, senior care & housing, supports for healthy lifestyle (e.g., access to fitness and rec centers and activities, healthy foods, safe high-quality schools/neighborhoods), as well as colleagues and administrators who provide practical and socio-emotional support (e.g., empathy, mentoring, appreciation of diversity, helpful advice and resources). These considerations are just as important as are factors like salary and infrastructure for success on the job (research, teaching, service), and couples are often willing or feel compelled to move until they find a place that meets their needs. So, ensuring supports in those domains can have a huge impact on satisfaction, productivity, and health, which impact both recruitment and retention.

Why isn't there a faculty/staff only rec center? There are enough of us...
Q24: Weight the importance of the following criteria to identify faculty excellence in research and creative activity

Q24-HUM-T
ROI is not an effective tool for scholarship, not even in the College of Business. UA should be investing in the future, not looking for X results from Y dollars. Scholarship is speculative by nature. We are relying too much on metrics lately.

Q24-HUM-TT
"Academic analytics is not a reliable source of data to rank departments or faculty in the Humanities. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/12/11/rutgers-professors-object-contract-academic-analytics"
Field dependent.
Make sure that the assessment is fair.

Q24-HUM-NTT
Do not try to run the University like a business
The problem here is the implementation of some of these options. For example, quantitative assessment of creative outputs produced would reward faculty who publish a LOT, and some faculty might be driven to publish in predatory journals to be competitive.
This varies by disciplines. Give departments and individuals the discretion to determine what merits faculty excellence in these areas.

Q24-NS-T
All very important
For Q24, I rated graduate degree production at zero. We do not need to become a puppy mill trying to churn out unneeded PhDs. We need a limited number of high-quality PhDs to serve the limited industry and academic needs, but the real world probably needs more MS graduates who can plug into needs for jobs in social work, engineering, chemistry, etc.
Graduate degree production is a natural product of the others. Easy to produce mediocre students that do not support long-term enhancement of faculty, programs, and reputation. Accountability of start up funds (on receiving faculty member and granting college) needs to be more consistent and rigorous.
In terms of graduate degrees, I do not think we should encourage the acceptance of MS students into our graduate school. Further, MS degree production should not count for very much in terms of "faculty excellence". If we want to climb in our rankings as a graduate school, it is the production of PhDs that will assist with this.
"Quality NOT quantity.
Graduate degree production must be couple with an assessment of the quality of the product produced."
Quality of graduates is equally essential. For example some students graduate with no publications vs. some graduate with 10, that is a huge variation. There should be a requirement of at least 4 papers in peer reviewed journals to graduate.
Return on investment may be useful in assessing younger faculty. However, we should be cautious that relying on this aspect too much will favor research that provides a quick return on investment, i.e. applied research. However, for a University as a whole to succeed other areas of research also need to be supported.
Some folks have become too concerned with numbers of pubs rather than whether the faculty member has made an outstanding contribution in a specialized area within their field....in other words.....are they the expert in their field and seen as an expert by grant funders? Or is the person working the system to produce a specific number of manuscripts?
The external funding metric may not be relevant to disciplines where external funding is not common or typically a significant expectation.
The quality of the research/scholarship/creative activity is more important than quantity. Assessment of quality must come from external recognition through awards, journal impact factors, citations, h-index,
etc. Quality is very difficult to assess, even for faculty within the same department but working in
different disciplines. Expectations of return of _x startup funding from grant revenue is easy, but
simplistic. Assessment of return on investment should also include use of equipment/instruments
obtained from startup funding to train students and benefits to UA faculty and students who do not
have to travel to other institutions to perform analytical work or pay higher costs charged by
commercial analytical labs.

This is a tricky one. For morale purposes, I caution the university from placing too much emphasis on
grants. They are important, but as mentioned earlier, we should find funding to support our science, not
perform science to get money. If grants are overemphasized, it may create a culture of hyper-
competitiveness, score keeping, and resentment between the haves and have nots. All funded science is
not inherently better science. Some topics are simply more relevant than others to funding agencies, but
that does not inherently grant-funded projects a higher caliber. It will be important for the university to
keep this in mind moving forward.

Trying to come up with something like this is like comparing apples and oranges. All research is not the
same, so there is no way to make accurate judgements like this. Taking this kind of approach would b
disastrous for faculty morale.

Graduate degree produced mainly reflects the number of TA's the department is able to afford.
If the University would like to see an increase in research funding, productivity and ranking then they
will need to provide additional resources to current faculty, postdocs and graduate students as well as
increase the number of faculty, staff, postdocs and students.
The idea of time-bounded ROI of start-up funds is silly and restrictive. Research always requires
investment. Often, there needs to be patient, long-term investments to see any lasting benefits to the
university, including increased external funding and increased reputation.

Assessing the quality of a creative output will likely not be feasible in a reasonable way and could create
wrong incentive (for example publishing in high-cost journals that may not target the right audience for
a paper, just because that journal has a higher impact factor). Return on investment for startup is also a
poor measure as some research simply requires expensive equipment but the typical support requested
in grants is to pay for students.
Research is the gold standard. Return on investment seems nice, but a successful researcher that has a
higher initial cost but can get external funding over their whole career may ultimately be a better choice
than a faculty member with a lower initial cost that will never be able to obtain external funding. We
should take a long-term outlook on faculty instead of only thinking about the next two years.
All of these are important, but I think the perceived contribution the faculty member is making to their
internal and external research community should be strongly considered as well.

Academic Analytics as a tool to do quantitative assessments is worthless.
Graduate degree production may only apply in departments where relevant. There are many
contributors to graduate degree production in addition to the primary adviser.
How about citations of work relative to the discipline - you know, an OBJECTIVE measurement added in.
For some colleges, that do not have munificent external funding opportunities, it would be silly to use
this as a measurement.
I am concerned about a trend towards simple grant dollar and publication counting. We all know that
this does not accurately reflect scholarship. These are important components, but they are not the only
components. I would like to see more emphasis on the quality of research.
I believe in qualitative assessment - but one must read and assess the work. Merely publishing in a
prestigious place does not ensure quality and publishing in a less prestigious place does not mean that
the work is not excellent. Again, this survey is predicated upon some faulty premises - appears to be
designed by someone who merely wants to count widgets. That is not the university - it's a business model of some sort which probably ill-serves most businesses that use it.

I'm very concerned that people who can't publish but can network their way into funded grants are securing tenure. It's sending a message that as long as you can get a buddy to tag you onto a grant, you don't have to publish to get a lifetime of job security here.

No comment

Not everyone conduct research that produces external funding. If funding is used as a criteria for faculty excellence across the board, you automatically label faculty in many disciplines in the university as unproductive and lacking in excellence. All methods/disciplines/schools of thought should be welcomed by a true university because we all contribute to knowledge. STEM is not the end all and be all of knowledge.

Quantifying scholarship and research is an easy management evaluation, but if this institution wants to further its efforts and reputation in academe, administrators must evaluate faculty members as professionals, not as annual reports in spreadsheets.

There are no longer any external grants for my area of research. Every study I have done (including 3 scholarly books) has been self-funded except for a little travel money from the department. I even paid for most of the travel myself.

While there is a lot of talk these days on campus related to "impact factor", etc., when you do a literature search on a research topic, you get hits irrespective of whether the journal is high or low-impact. The important thing is for the journal to be indexed. After that, except for the predator journals, as long as the journal is peer-reviewed, most published research is fine to quote unless there are problems with methodologies.

Q24-SS-TT

(1) quantity of publications is a crazy measure: it is impossible to compare a chemist or astronomer's publication #s, which include many that they have only had a minor part in producing, to some in history or anthropology or Gender and Race studies, where the articles are longer and reflect the intense work of 1-2 people. (2) ROI for research start-up can be looked at, but sometimes it isn't easy to measure in terms of specific $$$. Start up funds could have helped a faculty member get to know a new area or research or people in a new field to develop connections that will later pay off, not even necessarily financially. Also it is really hard to get grants and even if someone has done an amazing pilot study, they might not get funded. That doesn't mean that funding the pilot was a bad idea.

Look at how Research 1 institutions judge this and take cues from them.

Surely this depends on field. Sciences have big grants and ROIs, which is where prestige lies. Humanities make their influence in more 'soft-power' ways: important publications, changing the national debate, documentaries, culture, etc. The latter isn't less important--we pick up ears with op-eds, with testimony before the legislature, with new museums (think of faculty support of EJI and all the press that got, e.g.). An unanswerable question for the faculty writ large.

The relative weighting of publications and research funding should reflect college/department-specific opportunities and priorities. Quantity and quality (of both publications and funding) should both be considered.

The university is not a business. Every time I hear "return on investment," it sounds like we are turning into a private sector company at the cost of education and research.

Who is qualified to evaluate people who are excellent in their fields? People from outside those fields? Do we want a culture of hamsters on wheels or quality in research? Both is probably the answer, but we need to be able to recognize and value both.

Q24-SS-NTT

All criteria listed should be used to identify faculty excellent in research and creative activity.

This really needs to be customized at each college or department. I realize that in other colleges grant funding is paramount, but in our college, it is truly irrelevant when it comes to market value. If we want
to award external funding, then the university will have to OVER-REWARD for grant applications and grant wins, because our external market places almost zero value on it. While grants can facilitate research and are often worth pursuing, as Scott Lilienfeld and other renowned scholars like him have observed, grants are a means to an end, not an index themselves of actual scholarship. The notion of "return-on-investment" of research startup funds or relying on mere counts of publications or grant dollars as an index of "excellence" is both silly and offensive, even to those of us who bring in far more than our startups or salaries cover. It's true that one must actually produce over time to be productive, that external incentives can help inspire if they aren't excessive and distracting, and that it's reasonable to expect *some* evidence of routine output. But mere counts of an individual's annual products (of publications, grant dollars, etc.) suffer significant flaws. Scholarly productivity is often non-linear with peaks and troughs for a multitude of reasons (e.g., making a series of mistakes that get one closer to a solution), the best work often takes more time to bear fruit, many of the most impactful studies to date have required brilliant minds but minimal funding, and we no longer work in isolated vacuums where individual productivity is as valuable as collective contributions to and of (often interdisciplinary) teams to tackle the big challenges. Thus, it's the *cumulative and collective quality* of scholarship and contributions to society (including lifting up others, such as producing graduate degrees, but also finding ways to understand and uplift the underrepresented, the underserved, the local and global environment, etc.) -- these are the things that not only ultimately bring us prestige and funding, but actually advance us as a university, nation, and people.
Q28: Please identify any actions the University can take to reduce bureaucratic hurdles you might have experienced in pursuing research, scholarship, and/or creative activities

Q28-HUM-T

"1. Use a July-June or Jan-Dec fiscal year.
2. Make it easier for departments to move end-of-year funds into research accounts for the subsequent fiscal year. My department frequently wastes money in September because we are given only a couple of weeks to spend it, and that money would be much better spent on travel and research expenses in the coming academic year."

Compliance requirements, additional advising duties, training sessions, etc. are becoming burdensome to the point of interfering with time allotment for research and creative activities. Every year there seems to be another requirement added to our already full plate!

Cool it on the harassment and other online trainings. Faculty cannot pursue research if there are too many departmental needs. We NEED more teachers and advisors to cover courses and departmental needs first and foremost. This would be the most impactful on the research of our faculty as a whole - more people to share the load of the student and department needs.

Fewer surveys. This one was way too long. Also, there should always be a "not applicable" option, which did not seem to be present here (if there is one, I couldn't find it). Whoever designs these surveys needs to think harder about it from the perspective of those taking them.

I am disappointed that the recent grant from the US government dealing with Cuba will now prevent faculty from participating in the Dean's groundbreaking Cuba Initiative.

I like access to digital copies of books, however, when access is limited to 24 hours, it is ridiculous. I would like the possibility for longer ILL loans (3 weeks is not enough). I wish the IRB process was simplified, I should not have to justify the study necessity or background. My research is sometimes exploratory, I deal with human subjects yes but I do not poke them or test them, I simply ask how they felt about learning activity they engaged in and what they learned. Nothing experimental, I don't think I should have to go through training about hazardous material. Ethical training yes, but not the rest of the training I am subjected to.

I need a separate research computer. Currently I am allotted only one computer which I use for research. I had to buy a separate computer from my own income to have a dedicated computer in my office for teaching, desktop computing and advising.

I stopped answering the survey, as you've noticed if anyone is actually reading these results closely, because it so problematically complies, instead of challenging, the instrumentalization of the modern university--I'm not naive as to the conditions in which we work in the early 21st C, but, come on Faculty Senate, be bold, think big, understand the intimate relationship between teaching and research, convey a sense of the directionless manner in which new knowledge is often created (often by accident), inspire the senior administration to understand that knowledge is created by faculty doing work that animates them as opposed to following initiatives set by administrators. Even if we're pragmatic as to how a university is run today, show some spine and push back a little.

"My field requires intensive training/mentoring of individual students, and a substantial service presence externally. These elements eat into research time.
Priorities: raise GTA stipends, humanities salaries, work travel support."

One key that I'm not hearing discussed much at present is research diversification. UA cannot afford to be good at everything; conversely, being extremely good in one or two areas will not suffice to raise our profile. UA can afford to be good at a few high-expense areas, some medium-expense areas, and a number of low-expense areas. It will be as important, reputation-wise, for UA to invest smaller amounts of money to support research in areas where a little money can have a high impact, as it is for UA to invest larger amounts of money into expensive research avenues. Indirect costs alone cannot be a stable funding source for this institution, and if it tries to make a single high-stakes bet it will risk losing the whole pot. Diversification and investment is the best route forward.
Pay is the biggest—being able to use summer time to research rather than have to work. Pay staff decently so we get good people who don't leave. Pay more attention to research in the arts and humanities; policies on research should at least address issues in these areas rather than ignoring them. Streamline hiring process by OK'ing positions WELL AHEAD of time so that there is a chance to recruit good people. Allow sabbatical replacements. Remove/limit burdensome administrative demands. Cut unnecessary deans and administrative positions. Insure that the libraries are well-funded and run as research tools rather than playgrounds for undergrads. Leave assessment of research quality to the faculty who actually know something about their discipline. In general, a more collaborative approach to running the university with the faculty rather than dictating to them. This is one of the greatest frustrations of my job here (that I haven't experienced elsewhere at good universities). It's the reason I will probably leave when I can.

Put value on the exposure the Arts brings to the university and provide funding and support accordingly compared to initiating research institutes that are "hopeful" to bringing funding and exposure to the university.

Release time for research
Sabbaticals should be year-long. Eradication of bias against the arts. Greater support of graduate students, especially those who teach the most.

"Simply reducing the bureaucratic hurdles experienced in pursuing teaching and service would already free time for research. Faculty should be asked to do only what they are good at doing: research and teaching in their fields of expertise, service only in areas were their expertise is strictly needed. Good universities never ask faculty to spend (the scarce) time (they should devote to research) demonstrating that they are actually doing their job. For instance, the burden of outcomes assessments and other absurd metrics, program reviews, etc. should be on bureaucrats, who, as a general mater, should serve and attend to the needs of the ones who are producing values a university is about: research, teaching. A revolution of the minds is thus required to put this University on the international map.

Is it the purpose of this survey? Or will it be just another administrative Band-Aid put on the tip of the little finger while an open arteria keeps bleeding?"

The "volunteer" basis on which I direct dissertations and theses is inexcusable; that work supposedly fits into my teaching load, but it never leads to a reduction in how many courses I teach, and it should. Many of the questions above are unrelated to my area and not of interest to me (Q26 for example -- I give them all "zero"). Core needs for me are increased salary, increased library budget, increased graduate student support (salary and teaching load for GTA's), greater availability of research grants (such as for summer research, travel to archives, etc).

The university could consider alternate success models to a growth model, and consider the importance of small, quiet, reflective events to our community. The university could recognize and value the contributions made by faculty working with students at the individual level. The university could recognize and value the cultural significance and quality that the fine and performing arts bring to our community.

There is a definite need to increase research support for all faculty members, especially increasing time to engage in research. There is a need to increase grant support if administrators want us to bring in more money to the university, including the process of finding funding, writing grants, and managing grant funding.

This is so totally skewed to "traditional" research and grant seeking that the bare bones mention of creative activity makes it more obvious of the low regard by some members of the academic community than if CA had been left out entirely. See question 26 above for a good example.

This survey was written by scientists for scientists. UA and the Faculty Senate Research and Service Committee should work harder to more fully embrace and recognize the talents and contributions of the entire faculty including the types of support needed by faculty who are expected to produce in areas that are inherently less quantifiable than the sciences.
We aren't taking the library and its holdings seriously. Why aren't we pursuing rare books or manuscripts in subjects other than the South and the Civil War? People on the outside need to know that this library holds a collection on something important. At some point we have to choose between swimming pools for students and real research materials in our libraries. When you think of Yale, don't you think of the Beinecke? Also, we are in the Bible Belt, so it makes sense that we would have strong holdings in religion and theology, but we do not, nor do we have a librarian with an expertise to build that collection.

We have a committee for everything because we have a dean for everything. Please stop creating positions which lead to committees which talk about nonsense that we all know will lead to nothing productive. Please just let us do our work. Also, the accreditation process is more or less worthless. I am sure I am missing something else that is wasting my time, but let me stop here so I can get back to research (by the way, thanks for asking).

**Q28-HUM-TT**

A large part of my research hinges upon participant compensation. However, it does not need to be an excessive amount of money each year. Currently there is not "small" level source of funding for such things (<$1000/year). It would be nice to have a budget for this within my department or college. Currently if I wanted to do that I would have to take away from my conference funding, which is already extremely limited in my department (around $1000/year). If I can't pay participants, I can't conduct my research, so currently the only options are to pay out of pocket or to not present at conferences. All costs related to presenting at a conference should be fully funded. If presenting at a regional/national conference is recommended for getting tenure, then it is necessarily a condition of continued employment. I should not have to pay out of pocket for things that my employer requires me to do to keep my job.

I think that the requirement for librarians to publish and be treated like professors, when we just have masters degrees is too high for most people.

More travel money, easy to use system for reimbursement (Concur is not easy use), summer travel support, and research leave time.

Per the survey itself: Please consider that you have library faculty taking these kinds of surveys, and a question like Q25 doesn't cover all my job responsibilities. (For example, to add up to 100, I had to assign my librarianship duties to "teaching." ) Also, it is impossible for those of us who are not science folk to answer Q26 usefully. None of those things are a problem for me as a humanities researcher. Q27 does not include field work/site (archival/library) research. This is the humanities' equivalent of equipment or staff costs for other fields.

Recognize that research takes many forms-- not all of it quantitative or driven by external funding. Any great university needs to foster and champion *all* forms of research success.

"The RGC process is far too confusing and difficult to navigate and it has been for years.

I am in support of designating "'research'" faculty who are clearly productive, and lessening teaching load to advance research.

This survey was very confusing and difficult to answer.

University support for research is a very important issue and I commend the senate committee's efforts on this."

This survey is too focused on STEM issues and under appreciates humanities research. Also to turn the entire research agenda to a focus on the four research centers is a terrible idea.

Travel funding for faculty research/scholarship/creative activities is low, as is funding for graduate students. It is difficulty to recruit quality graduate students without scholarship funding.

**Q28-HUM-NTT**

As a clinical faculty member, research is not represented in my duties. The University should look at options for bridging from clinical to tenure track if we want to stop the constant turnover in these clinical positions. I would be happy to undertake research if it were an option.
As a full time instructor whose primary responsibility is teaching, my research and travel funds are limited to pedagogy-related presentations. I would like more freedom and compensation to pursue other areas of research interest, which benefit my students, department, and the university more broadly.

I would like have more encouragement to hire student assistants for limited projects. It also should be easier and more appreciated that I lead, participate in and attend study abroad trips, scholarly conferences and seminars, especially in terms of the financial organization. Approval and reimbursement are often very time intensive.

People completing this questionnaire should be told about how long it would take to complete it. I ran out of time a long time ago. Question 28 should have been the first question. Suffice it to say that if UA were a corporation it would have gone bankrupt long ago because there is no real management here (or probably any university). I recommend that the university recruit a group of executives for a "Grace Commission" (look it up). Unless something is done to determine goals and align resources with those goals, we will continue to remain what we are—which is not terrible but will never achieve excellence. Serious consideration about incentivizing the hiring of new faculty should include that industries in Alabama generally compensate lower than elsewhere in the country. Salary packages have to be ready to supplement and so should availability of child care and other practical considerations that will impact travel-based research or intensive projects.

The University can make research and travel funding more easily accessible for all faculty.

"Personally, I have only experienced two issues.
There are disincentives to spend money across departmental lines.
The administration in my area only seems to be concerned with money and is stifling a lot of potentially great work."

PI's should be able to show that they are doing the work for the amount they are getting paid.
Stop letting African American students go through entire PhD programs like Social and Cultural studies then tell them at the end “they don’t know how to Write”! Then, forcing them to take a lesser degree they did not earn in order to save face.

Q28-NS-T
1. Get rid of CONCUR. 2. Establish an oversight mechanism to limit the number of required procedures which encroach on faculty research time put in place by non-academic units of the University. 3. Require the service units of the University, e.g. ODS, to fulfill all of the needs of their clients rather downloading part of their responsibility to the faculty. 4. Establish a Board of Visitors composed of 4 or 5 prominent alumni to help facilitate the acquisition of external research and infrastructure funding, the placement of UA faculty and administrators on national review/advisement panels, and faculty & student recruitment.
"1) Pay administrative staff competitive salaries to reduce turnover and retain trained and effective individuals

2) The upper administration needs to clarify mixed messages about whether increasing UA's research standing is a genuine priority for the future. For example, a past announcement about large planned increases in faculty has not been borne out (quite the opposite)."

Although difficulties with Purchasing have decreased, further improvement is needed. CONCUR reconciliation work has been foisted off onto the faculty in most departments. This is an unnecessary time sink that takes faculty away from research, teaching and student supervision. The University Counsel office, and most recently a senior buyer in Purchasing, have essentially shut-down research by faculty and students who had to wait months for donated software academic license approval due to scrutiny of the contracts. Environmental Health & Safety is understaffed and still does not have a director. As a result, UA is noncompliant in terms of several Federal laws. It can take days to get delivery of a chemical on the COI list; most of the time we just go over and pick it up ourselves (more wasted time). It is impossible to look at Contract & Grant Budget Statements and determine available
grant funds in real time. My department's administrative secretary keeps track of indirect return for each PI because C&GA can't/won't. OPS does not upload grant proposal submission and grant award data frequently enough to be helpful in Tenure, promotion and retention reviews. The candidates therefore have to enter the record by hand; when the data is finally uploaded by OSP, duplicate records result and often do not agree. Insufficient funds exist to support Faculty travel to present their research at professional conferences. No funds exist to support publication of papers in open access journals. We have stopped asking junior faculty to present at 2 professional conferences per year because the out-of-pocket cost to them is literally thousands of dollars per year. Publication in open-access journals is the best way to increase article citations and author h-index values, but the costs are prohibitive. Research and office space limitations and the lack of funds needed for renovation of lab space has cost our junior faculty 12 to 18 months of productivity in their critical first years. Lack of analytical instrumentation and college rules against using startup funding to support travel to other institutions to perform analytical work is another obstacle faced by some of our junior faculty. Decreased productivity results. Our ADR actually discouraged a junior faculty member from seeking internal seed funding, telling him it was a waste of time and 'looks bad' in retention reviews. This demonstrated the ADR's complete lack of understanding of the nature of this faculty member's research and primary funding agency, which requires proof of concept/hypothesis to have any chance of funding. At the unit level the departments are not staffed properly to help with expeditious handling of a researcher's need. We lack core facilities. We are spending our time tracking one thing or another instead of doing research. Reduce the bureaucratic burden, trainings, and help foster a culture of research.

For the second year in a row, I have been awarded a new NSF grant as PI (about $400K each grant). Each of these 2 years, I have published several peer-reviewed manuscripts, supervised 5-7 graduate students plus 2 undergraduate researchers, had teaching evaluations at or above the departmental average, and had far above average performance in service to the department, university, and the profession. For these efforts, I received approximately a 2% raise each year. I could have done no research whatsoever and still have received at least a 1% raise. UA does not reward productive researchers with salary increases. It is not clear that UA upper administration places any priority on research. "Have administrative staff do administrative work instead of faculty. Take Concour for example - in some departments, administrative staff will handle most of this, however, some departments have faculty fill all of this out. There should be an administrative guideline instructing department chairs to have their staff handle this across campus. Any new (and existing) form that faculty need to fill out should be evaluated for a) is it possible for administrative staff to fill (parts of) the form out b) ease of use and c) do we really need this? While I have hopes that these surveys will help change things for the better the results of these surveys should always be made available to participants. It would also be nice to learn what actions will be taken as a result of this."

Highly Effective Associate Deans of research with Proactive and well funded staff

Hire more qualified and more communicative research compliance staff.

I have already listed many. The most important part is that the faculty continue to fill out papers, send emails, call UA offices, fill out online forms over and over again and all of this time we spend doing this work cuts into the research time. *Support staff* in all departments aren't really supporting but asking the faculty to do the work so they can push the enter button. Get quality people into these positions and pay them more so they actually help the faculty. We can not do everything. "IT support is very bad;

faculty voice cannot be heard beside department chair

The school put high priority to build a teaching school." Lack of a functioning research foundation is an obstacle. Lack of facilities for research requiring security clearance is an obstacle. Too much of a focus on the 4 UA research priorities. Lack of transparency
regarding how these research priorities were determined. Little support for promising new research areas.

"Missing from this survey is any sense that scholarly activity is also part of our teaching mission at both graduate and undergraduate levels; there are no questions that seem to address graduate students having access to supplies, travel expenses and training. The unconscious assumption seems to be that external funding will provide what students need to do their research. Science Technology Engineering research is not cheap, and the extent of federal support for these areas, other than NIH, has been slowly shrinking and will continue to do so. Sources of internal support have not kept up with inflation. My biggest concern then is about discussions of "return on investment" where the ROI is calculated largely on $s brought, if other components of UA's return on investment, such as publications, patents, students trained, etc. are not explicitly and routinely cited as part of this discussion then it will continue to send the message we have been hearing: "only dollars matter"." "OSP needs to be better staffed and the grant process streamlined. Deans and provost need to stop micro-managing the hiring process and respect the needs that departments identify." Our start-up is quite low compared to peer institutions.

Please give serious consideration to assisting post-tenured faculty that have proven they can publish, obtain extensive intramural support, and exhibit strengths graduate student mentorship beyond superficial means. The University is wasting what they have already grown and invested in, as such faculty will be around for another 15-20 years at substantial salaries. This would involve three things: 1) earmarking GTA lines/support for such faculty; 2) providing upgrades to equipment that may have been purchased using star-up funds that are over 10 years old for such research-active faculty; 3) unequivocally offer at least one year of bridge funding, with options to appeal for 2 years, if still overtly trying to get funded.

Provide clarity regarding the relationships between departments, centers, colleges, and institutes (organizational chart?) including "reporting lines / chain of command(?)," distribution of credit / return of F&A costs. There is quite a bit of reluctance from some colleges to encourage faculty to "align" with Institutes and share information about ongoing and upcoming activities. This is limiting the potential for growth and increased profile of UA's research enterprise.

Provide more services within colleges. Buy a new IRB protocol system immediately. Increase stipends for graduate students. Create a statistics center and provide x number of hours of stats consultation to each researcher and graduate student. Get rid of the water, land, life, whatever institutes. Hire people for each college who can help.

Purchasing cost-effective and appropriate computer equipment is excessively difficult due to the contractual relationships that the university has committed to and the cumbersome and confrontational way that off-contract purchases are handled.

Push to remove BoT overreach. Simplify purchasing rules. Render grant accounting less opaque. Recognize where consistent problems arise and address those personnel or management issues in a timely fashion. Change the culture to be more research friendly rather than antagonistic, with help in identifying funding opportunities and organizing specific research teams for specific projects (not just having large center membership).

"Reduce IRB burden

Annual evaluations (FAR or Digital Measures) requires too much manual effort

Restructure Office of Compliance personnel so that their efforts serve to facilitate research rather than construct hurdles and roadblocks to research. As research faculty, we are having to devote much more time and effort now to handling our purchases (e.g., daily on-line approving of various steps of the purchase process) and to training (e.g., every year having to retake the same on-line training for a variety of different lab safety requirements).
Rethink the institutes and get them functioning properly and productively as quickly as possible. Substantial real and opportunity costs amassing that can have long-term, seriously detrimental impacts. "Scrap all existing ideas/structures and emulate universities who are successful both in athletics and research...
Also, make Tuscaloosa a more attractive place to live!"
See previous comments on OSP. We (faculty) are also not given consistent feedback on how important teaching versus research are to UA and to our own advancement. The "focus areas" that the administration has chosen to support don't align with actual research contributions from across the university.
"Subcontract generation process after award must be faster.
Change staff culture so they understand that their job is to help faculty work around hurdles to get the job done, not just point out hurdles or worse yet raise hurdles that don't need to be there."
Take a good look at the Office for Research Compliance. Either get them to change their philosophy from policing faculty to supporting faculty or fire a few people (e.g. Tanta, Glenda).
"The compliance office is a disaster and has no interest in helping faculty. The burden of filling out the financial COI forms is very large when most of it could be automated and the data filled in by OR. The same is true of the FAR for very research active faculty. Much of this could be automated also. High performance computing resources are not adequate nor are data management resources adequate."
The functionality of OSP has to be improved considerably, as well of that accounting related to research needs. Also, there cannot be differences among research productive faculty (teaching loads, startup packages, institutional support, salaries, etc) just because they are in different departments within the same College or across Colleges in a similar area of research/teaching (for example, Natural Sciences and Engineering)
The grant budgeting and purchasing processes must be more streamlined. In some cases, it is too confusing and too difficult to make purchases from a grant. Too much burden is placed on faculty to oversee these aspects of a grant. Let faculty focus on the science rather than the administrative components. The IRB process must get faster. Space needs must be sorted out in a timely fashion and long term decisions should be made on the front end of construction projects. For instance, it is unreasonable to expect faculty to move laboratories multiple times in a 5-10 year period b/c construction folks don't have their plans/funding in order. This stifles productivity! Research/laboratory space should be allocated based on need, common sense, and efficiency. Right now there are space decisions that have been made that do not seem based on these principles.
The primary suggestion I would give is to build research infrastructure and build upon existing research activities from "ground-up" rather than "top-down." It is imperative that all facets of the university administration (from the President down to deans and the department heads) listen to faculty ideas and priorities in research before fixing overall university research directions. This is especially important in hiring new tenure-track faculty members because the rest of the existing faculty members need be on board in hiring their new colleagues. Increasingly, the "authority" to recruit new faculty members has moved away (or has at least been perceived to be so) from individual departments/department heads/faculty to the colleges/deans/associate deans. This is not a healthy development for both the administration and the faculty. If UA has to improve to an elite level in research, teaching, and service, the administration should actively seek and achieve "faculty buy-in" at all levels of strategic planning and execution. This survey is a good first step in that direction.
"The University has active and vigorous researchers. Invest in them. The University has identified four emphasis areas for research. Invest in them. For those emphasis areas, ensure the leaders are investing in active and vigorous researchers and their graduate students. For those emphasis areas, ensure the leaders are enabling growth in new areas and meaningful national and international collaborations. For those research areas, ensure the leaders are active in growing the University research interest and not their own.
Once the University has demonstrably solidified this foundation, build upon it by the addition of properly vetted senior faculty research group hires in the four areas of emphasis over time.

Bureaucratic Hurdles:

1. Reduce the faculty/undergraduate teaching ratio. Courses sizes have tripled and research dollars have decreased per faculty. THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP.
2. Reduce the trend of faculty offices from the same department being spread all over campus. Commute times to seminars, proposal defenses, dissertation defenses, faculty meetings, student presentations all are sunk times that cannot be recovered.
3. Junior faculty isolated from their in-department colleagues is unproductive, lacks leadership and is dangerous in terms on tenure and retention.
4. Graduate School requirement that all UA committee members be physically present for a defense is out of touch with current technology. This can delay graduation, research travel, writing time, etcetera. Just a bureaucracy that is outdated.
5. Create digital forms that accept digital signatures for all Graduate Forms requiring committee approval. A flurry of emails with PDFs that have been printed, signed, rescanned, re-emailed is another bureaucracy that is outdated.
6. Copy the PI on all invoices to a sponsor from CG&A. The sponsor often calls with questions that the PI cannot answer because we have not seen the invoice.
7. Allow the PI to designate "Viewers/Approvers" across organizational codes much like what is done in Concur. A Financial Assistant for co-PIs in other departments, centers, or institutes cannot see needed financial information to properly spend down grants.
8. Reduce the time needed to get a fund number once a sponsor has awarded a grant. This slows research expenditures, creates issues for funded graduate students, and impacts research outputs.
9. UA’s research enterprise is not THAT large. Why not talk to those researchers every few months instead of a survey once a year where the results are never published, presented, or disseminated? I have done my parted. I have provided thoughtful, thorough answers to the survey. Tell us when the results are going to be disseminated. Tell us how the results are going to be disseminated. Tell us the timetable for evaluating the results. What is the plan for the survey? Or, is this just another survey?"

The university upper administration must start engaging directly with research faculty to develop strategies and identify areas for improvement (i.e., the poor attitude of the leaders of Research Compliance). There is a serious disconnect in the lines of communication as information is filtered both ways by mid-level administrators who lack the experience or leadership to address the research needs of this university. There are a lot of administrators and staff members who have been at the university for a long time, and who have no experience to lead the university to the next level. Too much effort is exerted by them at maintaining status quo. The upper administration needs to stimulate a culture change. What is the point of going out and hiring research faculty to only impede their productivity with outdated and unneeded policies.

There is not enough staff support within departments. It seems that the upper administration has grown. However, while departments have ballooned, the local administrative support has been a bottleneck. Even though I consistently bring in A LOT of funding into Engineering, I spend a large fraction of my time doing secretarial work.

This survey is too expansive. As we aspire to be a stronger research institution, 2-3 key issues should be the focus of the administration. The new VP of research should schedule interviews with several faculty researchers at all levels and visit individual departments in the first few weeks to assess the current climate, identify the assets, and formulate a plan.

"Transparency in dealings, provide equal opportunity based on merit. Provide an environment which will promote research culture and improve work-life balance. Pay attention to large class sizes. The number of students has doubled in the last 10 years, so have the class sizes. It is time to break classes into multiple sections, so that faculty are not teaching twice the load (even if it is lumped as one class with 120 students)."
Focus resources and energy towards quality graduate student recruitment with the same enthusiasm as has been done at UG level."
Tuscaloosa needs a better high school.
University accounting and budget is not up to basic standards!
University has a great opportunity to elevate its research enterprise. Use UG recruitment principles: scholarships and promotion, to recruit excellent graduate students. Strive for higher rankings and not necessarily Research I university status. Give uniform message, research is important or it is not important!! Avoid top down approach to research. Recognize existing faculty, don’t ignore them.
Provide incentives for competent faculty but not being very productive. External recruiting should focus on high-achieving mid-career faculty, this group is better than senior professors. Promote faculty for awards. Change to service driven research support.
The Digital Measures system needs streamlining based on the experiences of people who have recently been forced to use it.
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As an engineering assistant professor, I am struggling having more graduate students since the department does not have enough TA’s. I think this situation is completely different for some other colleges. On the other hand, results from grad students are critical for publications and, more importantly, testing research ideas and submitting good proposals.
"As mentioned previously, I spend far too much time acting as an accountant. We need better tracking of our grants. I want a monthly update (similar to a bank statement) of the breakdown of all of my grants.
Further, I would like more information on when and if I can buy out of teaching time. Also, if it is possible to teach in the interim, but not have to teach in the fall or spring.
Also, the university or college should supply support for simple maintenance such as pipette calibration, balance calibration, etc. and support if equipment fails and a PI is between grants.
There is very little oversight in building maintenance. Currently, the building I am housed in is without a building manager. I have a leak coming from the room and one of my sinks is leaking. I don’t know who to contact and it seems as though there should be someone doing routine maintenance. Where is my overhead going?"
Faculty with sole PI labs should be able to directly control keycard access to their lab without needing three different reviews and signatures. Several of my projects have been delayed due to it taking over 4 weeks for my students to get keycard access to my lab.
"Help PIs with all of the research compliance (BUA, IRB, IACUC, etc.).
Have research supplies delivered to the lab building, not a centralized college office.
Improve family-friendly initiatives- add at least one more tenure-clock extension for a second child born (currently you only get one for the first).
Assist PIs/departments bring in prospective grad students for an on-campus visit/recruitment trip.
Provide assistance with publication charges."
I think ultimately the best thing would be to hire people who have experience with research, that way they understand it and don’t waste everyone’s time.
"Increase OSP staff during peak loads.
Provide proposal writing support, including reviewing."
More help in preparing proposals from concept to formulation (not just writing) and how to engage program officers specifically, not just generic seminars...
"My overall experience at UA has been pleasant and I have received support from my colleagues, dept. and the College. There are certain things that could have helped me a lot at the start though including:
- Postdoc support which was lacking when I first joined.
- Rigid interpretations of new faculty start-up conditions.
Also, more administrative support in our department is needed. Work that was normally done by admin is being transferred onto faculty because the admin staff is overworked and underpaid. Multiple admin
tasks are being reassigned to faculty because there isn't staff support. For example, (a) hand delivering and picking up scantrons which is a 40 minute walk round trip (b) ODS transferring some responsibility to faculty in terms of setting up notetakers and folder sharing etc (c) no dept. staff support for travel reimbursements with Concur. There are many other small things which individually may be minor inconveniences but they add up over time.

Quality middle/high school for the faculty/staff families. It is a major issue for many faculty families. It is critical to faculty retention.

Sometimes I get the sense that the University doesn't care about our research, but only the money we bring in. Also, I feel that teaching and service duties are going up for me, and yet I am supposed to produce more research. However, research takes time and the less time I have for it, the less I can do. Sometimes I feel the University's plan for increasing research is mostly just to tell us to do more research, all the while expecting us to do more of other duties too.

Streamlining of purchasing process can greatly increase creativity, research and scholarship output. The amount of time spent on getting purchases made for projects is enormous.

"Thank you for this survey--glad that the University is asking these questions.

Probably the single biggest need to reduce bureaucratic hurdles would be to provide more administrative staff. It is not effect for departments with more than one dozen faculty to have two administrative assistants. Some departments have more than two dozen faculty and still only have two administrative assistants. Major research schools have a much lower faculty to staff ratio."

The IRB at UA really doesn't seem to understand field research and partnering with community partners is absurdly difficult (even if they are generally technically competent).

"The purchasing system is the most regular frustration I have in pursing my research activities. This is not a complaint of the actual person doing the buying, but with the overall system. I don't have the expertise to suggest ways to improve it, but it can surely be done.

Obviously significant effort is needed in managing awards, but without the successful submission no award will be won. Ensuring the highest achievers in the OSP office feel valued and rewarded for the excellent work they do should not be overlooked."

"University can reduce the amount of meaningless work that a faculty need to do.

For example, in college of engineering,

1. To get access to a research lab in SERC/NERC or for that matter any room in any building for undergraduate and graduate students who is doing research, we need to fill a paper copy of access form, which need to be signed by research professor, department head, lab in-charge (if any) and then Dean. The faculty/student need to walk that that paper to department office. This need to be done for every semester/year for undergraduate students. I don't understand in 21st century, why one can't develop a simple online application form submission, which requires Mybama credentials.

I also don't get the fact that why some of the graduate students access to the labs need to be keep renovated every year (even though that student is going to be staying at UA for 4 to 5 yrs for their PhD)

2. filling the being away from university form. Again why can't we have this online (linked to mybama) where people can fill in online (web page), instead of filling paper/pdf copy and sending a email to appropriate people. They won't find in large-list of emails when needed."

User facility equipment purchases are decided unilaterally. Grant writers and organizers to push grants are desperately needed if we are going to improve.

We hope the University can give a guideline of graduate students course load. Our graduate students are taking too many courses, limiting their research productivity.

"We need childcare on campus that is accessible to faculty. This is a big issue for women in STEM and all areas of academia, as the years of tenure track are when women have children. Further, there's no infrastructure to support pregnancy on campus. Consider a few stork parking spaces for those that are physically challenged by walking across campus to teach when students fill up the lots.

We need better support from OSP for grant preparation. Dedicated OSP staff for each department, housed in those departments, is the norm at other institutions that are research tier 1."
The purchasing department puts unnecessary hurdles in the way of well intentioned, overworked faculty. Sending back expenses over 5 times with “solutions” that are not possible in Concur are huge time sinks. This should be the job of support staff, not faculty.

We need to improve alumni relationships and advertise the work we are doing to promote alumni donor support.

"We need the support system for research that is already in place to do its job, especially within the expenses/ purchasing department and OSP, which serve critical roles but lately have been very disfunctional. This distracts from our technical work and prevents us from securing research funding. When the support staff operate efficiently, we can too.

We also need childcare on campus that matches the demand of our growing faculty."
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"-- Significantly reduce course credit requirements for PhD/MS. Also, do not put higher course credit requirement for candidates who are joining PhD directly after BS. This discourages promising students. Finally, remove pre-requisite courses needed for PhD/MS. Advisor(s) and committee can make these assessments.

-- Remove bureaucratic hurdles with travel and purchase. There should be no need to contact Dept. Head for these. Rules should be relayed to secretaries so that they can take care of this. A two step process causes unnecessary delays.

-- There should be no need for filling "absence from campus form". Even good private companies are not doing this now! Faculty should be empowered and given flexibility. Otherwise, they will be scared away. Just track the performance and adjudicate it.

-- Faculty working with a larger budget should be issued p-cards.

-- Invest in support staffs/secretaries. They are overloaded, and are running behind schedule in everything they have to do. This is causing unnecessary delays in procuring instruments, securing travel etc."

Do more advertisement of our graduate program oversea, such as China and India.

"Each academic division is different and have different areas of expertise and research agenda. Leadership at the University level, and the departmental level are too bureaucratic, and communication is extremely poor.

There are also non-tenure track faculty who have interest in research or have the ability to contribute towards research, however, this is not appreciated by administration. Perhaps identifying opportunities for partnerships between those with research interest, regardless of tenure status to work on research together."

Faculty PI's that bring in grants and have requested set amounts that he/she would like to pay research technicians/managers need to be able to pay said technician/manager the amount that was requested without HR restricting this amount. Other research institutions (i.e. UAB within the University of Alabama's system) pay their technicians significantly higher than at UA at Tuscaloosa.

"Funds should be readily available to each department such that if they need a new equipment, they do not have to wait for a long time to get things in process.

Involve industry oriented research so that once students graduate they have some hand-on experience on their resume."

highly qualified administrative personnel

I am a non-tenured instructor doing NSF research as an extra component not required of my job description. I have produced more funding then tenured professors in my department. I would like a way to be promoted relational to my accomplishments.

I believe that the IRB review process can be streamlined to help improve the timeline of faculty research. At other institutions that I am familiar with, studies undergoing expedited reviews only take ~5 business days to reach approval from the day of submission.
I have no complaints. I would just ask that regarding compliance we continue to look for ways to make things easier and reduce the administrative burden on faculty that are really just trying to get back to doing their research.

If research is a university focus, shouldn’t all faculty levels be able to participate in research? Instructor positions don't offer the opportunity as they are 80/20 teaching/service - why not allow some research at this level to broaden UA's research potential. Until there is a broader offering, UA will remain behind.

Provide resources so labs floors can be mopped and cleaned in SEC. Offices are vacuumed 2 times a year. It is embarrassing to have visitors in research labs with dirty floors and windows in building that have never been cleaned since move in (inside or out). UA worries about how grounds look but then butchers every tree into a pine cone shape no matter what type tree it is. The entry to Bryce from Campus drive with pointed trees looks horrible. Charging departments to paint 10 year old student buildings results in run down interiors.

The number of students I am teaching in my courses is excessive. College and departmental administration should do a better job to limit some class sizes. Some faculty are limited to 45 per class while others are limited at 250.
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"(1) It takes too long to have an IRB application approved. Maybe the number of IRB members can be increased, or professional IRB members can be hired, so that the full board can meet two times/month.
(2) The process of securing petty cash/gift cards for participant incentives is confusing and a hassle. But I think this is improving.
(3) We need the chance to get a lab computer upgrade from time to time, even those who don’t have a grant. Repurposed computers that are still under service contract would be extremely welcome (i.e., they don’t have to be new).
(4) We need lower teaching loads, or at least more opportunities for release time, or at least teaching schedules that allow larger portions of time for research. To do this....
(5) ....we need more faculty to teach all the students."

1. Eliminate Concur. 2. CITI certificates to last 5 years (end UA as gold standard IRB), 3. create separate tracks for hard science and soft science, and quit applying hard science model to social scientists (IRB, IDC splits etc). One size does NOT fit all.

"Again, my major headaches as a grant-funded researcher are dealing with CG&A and budget issues, particularly (a) the university's LOUSY accounting software and system and (b) the attitude of Accounting staff. The Office of Research Compliance is doing much better these days (though I doubt faculty will ever be 100% happy with their process).

In discussing these kinds of issues with other faculty, I find that the greatest general obstacle to research productivity is demoralization. Administration from deans (at least in my area) up to the president’s office send an unspoken message that the faculty who are already here aren't valued."

Arts infrastructure on this campus is well below the standard of any comparable institution, and it is, in fact, stuck in the 19th century. Even with the forthcoming Performing Arts Academic Center (Dept. of Theatre & Dance) building coming online in the near future, the visual arts studios, music performance spaces, gallery spaces, etc. are all massively sub-par by contemporary standards. Both UGA and LSU -- and even UAB -- have significantly better arts research infrastructure environments.

As a senior faculty member hired with tenure, my college's current system is not set up for (1) sabbaticals for those of us who didn't start our careers here and (2) for changing the workload requirements of research facility. As a research facility, my load should be (at minimum) 60/30/10 research/teaching/service. Right now, it is 40/40/20. That's an extremely high service load percentage (said my someone who came from a teaching school with high service requirements) and doesn't take into account the extra work related to research.

Failure of new UA administration to recognize carefully developed state funding stream (over 20 years) as faculty generated research funds and diverting the funds to administrative use.

Fire all 'full-time' administrators. Rotate administration among faculty members every two years.
Functional IRB
Get rid of the the new strategy of focusing on graduate research. We are an undergraduate institution that could very usefully focus on economic development and partnering with local/regional institutions to better the lives of people across the state. Our current strategy is driving colleagues away. I can see why you may have had a poor response rate.
I have not encountered anything that I would call a hurdle.
I mentioned most in the survey items where specific. But, in more than a decade at UA, it has become apparent that we have too much administration interference with many things, as well as basically changing the FTE norms. A class was 12.5% FTE when I came to UA, now it's 10%. So, that's great with grant buy outs, cost less. But, at the same time, asking faculty to have a load of doctoral students well over the number of 3 which is the traditional max for R1 Big 10 or Pac 12 schools in my field, there have been no accommodations to course releases for being chair of nearly 10 committees at one time. Merit pay HAS done NOTHING to field that overload. It is also extremely disconcerting that a very advanced associate professor closing towards full professor, that their salary is not adjusted when hiring a first year associate with tenure from another school, no time at UA, and their salary is $5-10k more. No equity adjustment this year? Why should I work 60 hour weeks to accomplish things that lead to full when the time and overloads are not being compensated. There are some serious issues going on and if they are not addressed, this multiple million dollar grant recipient is going to start looking elsewhere for being compensated appropriately for the same or greater work for faculty at the same rank in the same department.
I think we spend too much time being critical of what we are not doing and not enough time making sure that all research faculty, irrespective of rank, have support and opportunities to write grant proposals and submit them. We bog senior faculty down too much with service responsibilities and mentoring of junior faculty and committee work to protect the new hires. This is a terrible waste of "senior" research faculty who could instead be writing their own grant proposal or manuscripts. Our system is backwards, but that is all over the US. In other countries, senior faculty are supported and junior faculty carry the load. That makes sense because senior faculty have the years of experience to do research more efficiently and effectively.
Improve IRB procedures
IRB and it's expansion over the years along with the Skillsoft training modules all require us to divert time to these tasks. Clearly we need some independent review of what we ask of faculty and whether we can start to buy back this lost time.
IRB is a nightmare. The protocol submission system is time consuming and not very intuitive. There have been a number of potential scholarly activities that I have passed on simply because I didn't want to have to deal with IRB. I understand and agree with the fundamental premise of IRB, but the process doesn't have to be so incredibly difficult and lengthy.
"Lack of support from the College Research Development office for ongoing grant maintenance. Lack of support from the OSP office for ongoing grant maintenance.
""Complexity"" and ""frequency"" of compliance, IRB,, financial, etc.reports (over and beyond the funding agency requirements). With multiple grants these reports are now greater than 20 per year. This now adds up to a significant per cent (20%) of my research time." Maintain the university's historical commitment to the liberal arts, support efforts to be relevant within the broader Alabama community, and beyond.
Make the IRB process transparent and responsive. I had a project that didn't quite fit in the preset boxes and was unable after numerous attempts to get advice. I have been discouraged ever since in undertaking human subject research.
Make the workload that is on paper a reality instead of a sham. As we have expanded students the work of education has expanded without a reality check. You have to have time to do research.
Mostly, I would like to have readily available statistical support -- someone who knows stats better than I do (unfortunately this has been hard to find on campus, and I am not a statistician) and is available to help when I need it and not necessarily when I have funding to support that person. On my most recent internal grant, I had trouble navigating the biological use authorization process. Standardized forms and sample documents online could help that process. It would also be helpful if faculty could have easy access to budget info (how much have I spent on my budget?) without having to wait for the office associate to get that information for you. Finally, having a person dedicated to helping individual faculty members find grant support and writing grant proposals would be immensely helpful. My primary challenges with research support since arriving last year have been with receiving financial support for research activities, including data purchase and travel. It's also been very difficult to find funding for my PhD students to support their research activities.

N/a

Please see my comment about the IRB. We need a stronger presence of active, residential PhD students. Q25 We can assign a percentage to those areas, but let's be honest. Very few people can nicely complete those boxes. I spend 100% of my time on research, service, and 75% on teaching and administrative duties. Yes this adds up to 350% but to ask me to put it into 100% is not a realistic illustration of my workload.

Ran out of time on this survey -- it's important stuff, but lengthy and time-consuming (from the viewpoint of faculty who know this is one drop in the bucket). Thanks for the opportunity, but hope you'll consider shortening these in the future.

reassignment from teaching to increase research productivity (sabbaticals, research terms, research chairs). Time is finite.

I recommend that University Administration have a serious discussion about equity with Deans. I am mindful of allowing deans to lead and have some leeway in running their perspective colleges, however, equity is important. Their appear to be a lack of appreciation and at times marginalization of experienced faculty. Some of the inequitable behaviors witnessed and discussed among faculty is an injustice and appear to be in direct opposition to what is being communicated from top university officials, about diversity, equity, value of all faculty, male and female. Please use the data generated to address these important issues. I look forward to the positive changes in our UA research culture and infrastructure that will support the expected increase our research productivity, funding, outcomes and overall impact, which will lead to an increase in research ranking. Thank you.

Review and improve HR policies as they relate to the research enterprise. Ensure that PIs receive a portion of the indirects.

"Stop creating Vice-Presidents; and Associate Deans; and Directors. Stop buying complex and tedious software programs designed to make things oh-so-easy for administration, but in the end increase the workload burdens for departmental-level staff and faculty." Submitting reimbursements for attending conferences is a giant pain. Did you get the cheapest flight? Did you really need a rental car? Did you get the cheapest rental car? When the conference hotel was sold out did you commute for thirty-minutes to get to conference to get a cheaper hotel? When you flight was delayed overnight, why did you get a hotel room? You submitted mileage from your house, but you can only submit mileage from the school. When arrived a day early because you panel started at 8:00 a.m., we can't reimburse you for the extra day. It is such a nightmare, that I don't ever want to travel unless an external source is paying for the trip. Having worked at other universities, I can assure you that the 100,000 hoops is not the norm. (Most schools only have about 1,000 hoops.)

The biggest barrier to enhancing my productivity is the teaching load of my department coupled with my current administrative duties. In addition to hiring center faculty, the university could help to reward productive departmental faculty with reduced teaching loads so that they can further enhance their productivity. As I mentioned earlier, we have faculty in our department who are more productive than center faculty. A center appointment does not ensure productivity.
"The IRB office requirements are often excessive and, at times, inappropriate, as in the case of a required module on working with prisoners, a very narrow field of important, important but pursued by a small group of faculty members in my field. As long as our dean curtails support for travel for faculty members and graduate students, we will remain severely hampered in our efforts to disseminate our research. Registration fees, travel, food and lodging are expensive at national conferences."

The unwillingness to deal with entrenched and often subtle biases that keep UA from hiring, developing and promoting the best people is hurting the University in ways that are obvious and not so obvious. World class scholars of all races are put off by the lack of diversity in administration, faculty and professional staff, particularly at higher levels. Some refuse to apply and others decide not to pursue positions after visiting. Then you have the interim and promotion system that works against diversity and inclusion, advantaging those who will maintain the status quo, not those who are most competent and willing to move things forward. Therefore, the same bureaucratic hurdles and tendencies remain, and grow. Deal with hiring and promotion, especially of administrators, upper level professional staff and upper level faculty such that you stop the same patterns, and you will help progress across lots of these issues.

Travel budget seems to have been drastically reduced.... University-wide standards for conference travel. Our department receives only $500 dollars per faculty member from the college/university for conference support. We are a Ph.D.-granting department and this is wholly inadequate. Our operating budget cannot make up for this amount. We had to take away faculty phone service to be able to guarantee $1000 per faculty member, and this still rarely covers the cost of even one major conference.
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"1. OSP needs to be more efficient. 2. Strategic communications needs to be effective. 3. Administrators need to decide if this is a research university or not and then act accordingly. 4. Overall, it is an issue of organizational culture. It seems like many of the units on campus prefer to move slow and do the bare minimum to get by. They don't push for excellence in themselves and others. We don't work to recruit and retain top talent at the faculty level. And we don't seem that invested in improving it at the graduate level either."

A better funding search mechanism than Pivot.

A University-wide teaching load and buy-out policy that incentives faculty to seek out external funding should be considered. Service should not be reduced in lieu of reducing teaching load for tenure track faculty who do bring in external funding, especially when there are effort requirements associated with those grants (ie K awards). Any funding obtained by a faculty member should go towards summer salary or additional course buy out, as opposed to paying their salary for the amount of research time already allocated to a tenure track faculty workload. These issues otherwise reduce faculty incentive to apply for external funding. OSP could receive additional training in federal awards mechanisms and/or hiring of additional staff with significant experience in various federal agencies/mechanisms, especially NIH. Alumni have potential to support our research, would be helpful to have a person responsible for alumni relations full time in our department.

An IRB process that is smoother, and quicker. I've been at a research 1 institution where an IRB can be approved in days if not two weeks. I have found OSP to be a barrier to my ability to do extramural funding. Either more staff is needed or better communication expectations.

At the college level funded research is supported but at the department level during the tenure process it is not seen as valuable in some areas. It leaves some people needing to drop pursuit of funded research so they can write papers that will get into specific journals.

"Established research groups on campus should be more active and organized. There is the misconception that older faculty are too old to contribute to research."

First, the Deans should be educated how to negotiate with faculty from a place of investment not coercion. Second, support staff on campus should be trained to facilitate problem-solving instead of
contribute opposition. Third, investment needs to be made in a "culture" of research, which includes investment in faculty time dedicated to research and the building of faculty labs, i.e., funding to graduate assistants and research incentives.

Get rid of journal lists that interfere with interdisciplinary faculty getting tenure.

Having a pre-tenure research sabbatical would be great, but is not available to faculty in my college. "I'd just like to say that university resources are a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you cut off funding/de-prioritize a department, that department will sink through the rankings, and it will seem even less important to you. Be aware of this when making choices, and if you de-prioritize, don't blame a department for being worse five years down the line--in other words, don't punish them for your own decisions. We all know there are finite resources, and anyone not annoyingly self-centered or desperately naive supports the university's decision to grow their research profile. But I do worry about the university becoming a two-tier institution. If you look at the truly great state schools--Michigan, Berkeley, UVA, Texas, etc.--they *don't* do this. They are known as much for their thinkers as their labs, and that's important. Don't become Wisconsin, which is increasingly treated with sadness rather than pride.

The questions on this survey have revealed your intentions quite clearly. Understand that this will cause anxiety. (I have grants, even if they don't involve any hazardous chemicals, so I'm not worried, but I know others will be.)

I would also encourage the University to consider staying open to faculty innovation, rather than having this be the one generative moment. Smaller research pots for other institutes or nodes of interest would be welcome (perhaps funded on a more temporary basis? So, say, a five-year thing with a couple grad students/post docs and/or research funding and/or course reduction?)

If I have enough funding then I don't have to worry about travel etc. Important to be able to get good doc students. Many questions were very difficult to answer.

Improve the IRB. Recognize research productivity that reflects well on the University and provide realistic merit raises and course buy outs accordingly.

Increase infrastructure to support pre-award and post award support to faculty. Develop an interprofessional center to assist social scientists and members from the hard sciences to collaborate across campus.

IRB needs to be improved in terms of speed and what they monitor.

Mandatory teaching assignments in the summer at College of Nursing graduate program. Work release time rescinded due to faculty shortage. Workload formula in place that no one understands despite numerous requests to explain. Expectation to do research with full teaching load.

None I can think of.

"Once a grant or award is won, it is really difficult to actually get the money to where it needs to go. The process is opaque and I never knew exactly who to talk to.

It would also be helpful to have the staff support we have provide support. My experience thus far is that they pursued their own priorities before helping me put together a proposal - even when they committed to doing so."

Overhaul the IRB review process! It took me and a UA faculty collaborator 3 tries and 4 mos. to get a protocol approved. Also, I need access to a larger participant pool—my dept just started one and I've been unable to recruit a sufficient number of human subjects for my studies (it's been over 2 weeks and only 6 participants have completed my study).

People on tenure track teach too many courses and its difficult too balance that with research and scholarship.

Please help us achieve consistency across the staff at the IRB. For instance, proposals are returned to us for wording changes that were copied directly from previously submitted, successfully approved proposals. It seems small but it's very frustrating. I'm sure it's frustrating for the IRB staff as well.

Remove limits on using funds to pay participants.
See my earlier answer regarding (lack of) childcare access. (Also note that this is an issue that, while not solely affecting female faculty, definitely disproportionately affects female faculty.)

Simply paying participants has been a hassle because the budget office would not let me disperse cash. The solution was to disperse checks, but participants are complaining about how long it is taking to receive checks. I just heard that VISA cards are now recommended, but I have not tried those out. IRB can be very slow and they focus on the wrong issues (i.e., the scientific hypotheses, statistical analyses) rather than the respect, benefits, safety, etc. to participants.

Teaching schedule has interfered with scholarly productivity. Heavy teaching loads make it difficult to balance all areas of academia: research, teaching, and service. The focus of SOI being sole indicator of teaching ability has diluted the academic rigor and causes additional labor on faculty to accommodate extra requests (such as extra office hours or extra review sessions). Although this extra time is not required by administration, the faculty know that SOIs are too important not to implement these extra accommodations. Also greater class sizes put a greater burden on faculty. Time that faculty could be productive in their research is monopolized by logistics and planning of large class sizes. How can we truly teach and touch someone to further excel and progress the profession or research of interest if we pack them in by the hundreds to hear endless monotone with numerous PowerPoint slides? Ideally, smaller class sizes can increase faculty productivity and affords opportunities to involve students in their research at a more intimate level. Also support personnel is needed terribly. I am unable to be productive in research without help financially, administratively, and professionally.

"The entire research architecture at UA needs to be thoroughly evaluated. Compliance personnel are not appropriately trained, OSP legal presents constant barriers rather than assistance solving obstacles, and the assistance with authoring grant applications is seemingly nonexistent with the exception of final grant submissions.

UA is also missing significant opportunities to increase research expenditures by allowing PIs more flexibility in paying research staff. PIs are tasked with authoring grants, making sure all necessary resources are acquired, execution of the grant tasks, and all other aspects of a grant. They should be allowed to pay staff on those grants salaries that fit within the boundaries of the budgets of the grants. This would significantly benefit UA by increasing expenditures and enable researchers to acquire and retain staff more easily."

The expectations for research productivity far exceed the effort we are allocated. My evaluation and my ranking is based in large part on my research productivity, yet it is equal to my effort in teaching. This makes it very difficult to accomplish my goals.

The hurdles you have to jump through with contracts is crazy. I have been working on purchasing a program with grant money for three months and our contracts department cannot seem to approve things to get the program purchased. It is a grant that I received to purchase this product. Why is it this complicated?

The IRB is very slow as compared to other peer and aspirational universities.

"The main concern I have had so far has been the time imposed on my department/college by forces outside of the university. For example, I'm in a teacher education program, which has many additional requirements by the Alabama State Department of Education. While there are many staff members who contribute to processes such as accreditation, faculty still perform the majority of this work. Additional responsibilities are included in supervision of students in the field and licensure requirements by the state. Each of these activities take away from research time, but are not counted toward either teaching or service, but are considered part of the normal work requirements. However, other tenure-track and tenured faculty across campus do not have these additional requirements.

My suggestions would be:
1) to increase the faculty in teacher education programs to lessen these workloads, so faculty can perform more research activities
2) to have the university work with the state department to streamline the requirements to privilege research
(3) include these requirements in the teaching and/or service load to reduce the other requirements on faculty
Those without laboratories should not have to deduct overhead from grants.

Q28-SS-NTT
Any hurdles take time away from research productivity even if the hurdles are not research related. I am new to UA, but there are many inefficiencies and many details are handled by faculty that take up time and are not what faculty have been primarily hired to do/are evaluated on. Systems are inefficient in terms of trainings and IRB and the university seems to still function as a smaller teaching-focused institution in a number of ways that I think will continue to impede the research productivity and retention of research productive faculty.
I am a FTTI and I would love the chance for my position to be respected by the wider UA faculty community.
I struggle with finding the time to write grants. Also, I frequently get emails from within my college and the university with information about small grants that I'm interested in applying for but all of them are due within weeks of the email being sent and I can't get the writing done in time to facilitate that with my teaching schedule. Also, in terms of teaching load, it is mainly clinicals that take up most of my time during the week (16 hours on the hospital floor with students).
Improve oversight/management of IRB. Teaching/service grant & contracts with evaluation requirements do not rise to level of being research. a funder-required evaluation of some sort of program or activity should be exempt per federal guidelines.
"IRB....IRB...IRB...IRB...IRB
I never thought I would say this, but I would gladly donate 10 hours a week of my time to serve on a executive board of the IRB to help the current office adopt a customer service culture, better adhere to the Common Rule, and be more consistent.
I am a chaired professor and when I met with the assistant professors in my department when I was hired and I asked what I could do to help them be successful, 100% of my colleagues said "fix IRB."
I know these responses make me sound like a crazy person, but our IRB is so broken that we are already delaying the progress of great researchers, but we will start losing people (including me) if we can't get it under control. I used to lead research integrity training at my old University, so I take IRB obligations seriously and we must abide by the Common Rule, but we simply delay reviews here due to a combination of poor attitudes, poor training, no oversight, and possibly under-funded with respect to initial reviewers."
More support staff assistance
"Most of my concerns were addressed in the questions of the survey and my responses. The following request is admittedly narrow, but still pertinent to research productivity: Please get faculty access to Google G Suite! I swear, no conflicts of interest here, simply have used G Suite previously at an R1 institution, and it's so much better than the current UA/Outlook exchange email and calendar system, which is clunky and limited (e.g., much harder to track down that email from a colleague on a grant, limited storage capacity, fewer options for calendar reminders, no easy doc-sharing function, etc.). G Suite offers Gmail, Calendar, Docs, Drive, etc. and is far more flexible than the current exchange system. On the flip side, having unlimited Box access is fabulous. Make collaboration far easier, and is the envy of my peers at some R1 institutions who don't yet have it."
Offer a work environment that is empowering, inclusive, and supportive. Pay community members fairly. Let's have some women in leadership positions. Since Bell and Whitaker arrived the number of top level female administrators has plummeted.
Place more value on community engagement & participatory research that can facilitate progress in the state through policy and legislation.
Reduce the number of administrative positions at UA. Make the office of financial affairs more transparent.
Standing Data Safety Management Board for interventional research in the Health Colleges
The IRB needs to update its policies and procedures regarding exemptions to align with CITI and the policies of R1 Universities. Currently, there are roadblocks and unnecessary steps required to gain access to existing, low-risk, de-identified, secondary data sets. This a barrier to faculty research productivity. Secondary data from de-identified, completed studies should be considered exempt in most cases and should not require submission of a protocol for approval (which is not the current policy). Revision of these procedures will not only help researchers, but will also aid protection of human subjects by allowing the IRB to focus its resources on studies that pose a higher risk to human subjects.

Assisting our PhD graduate students with qualified chairs to assist in dissertation writing, topic selection, and critical feedback. I have come across a couple graduate students who I have had the pleasure of not only teaching but sitting in their dissertation committees and neither student felt supported by their chair nor did they feel that they received helpful guidance. This has deterred one from potentially earning a PhD.

None