KU RESEARCH ENGAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT

Submitted March 24, 2010 by

Steve Warren, Chair,

Kristin Bowman-James, Co-Chair, and

the KU Research Engagement Task Force.

Executive Summary

Faculty members in all disciplines are expected to engage in research and creative activities. In fall 2009, Chancellor Gray-Little appointed 19 faculty members to serve on the Research Engagement Task Force. The charges to the task force were 1) to identify appropriate measures of research engagement and 2) to suggest specific approaches to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize all types of research engagement by the faculty.

After careful deliberation and input from KU researchers, staff and administrators, the task force makes the following three recommendations to address the two charges:

- To create a comprehensive, university-wide system for measuring research engagement by KU faculty that takes into account discipline-specific metrics;

- To implement actions at the school or college level that promote, increase, sustain, and recognize research engagement, including identifying and eliminating barriers and increasing incentives; and

- To enhance and utilize university resources to achieve and sustain high levels of research engagement, including but not limited to providing pilot research funds, improved infrastructure, graduate and undergraduate research fellowships, and additional university wide research awards.

Charge to the Task Force

Research engagement is an inclusive concept that encompasses scholarly and creative activities. Measures of research engagement include indicators of the outcomes of these activities, such as the number, quality, and impact of publications and performances, as well as inputs that support research engagement, including sponsored research funding. Faculty members in all disciplines are expected to engage in research and creative activities, not only in the production of the various outcomes of research and creativity but also in seeking the inputs that make research and creative activities possible.

The goals of the task force are twofold:

1) To identify appropriate measures of research engagement; and

2) To suggest specific approaches to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize all types of research engagement by the faculty.

Task Force Activities

Chancellor Gray-Little appointed 19 faculty members to serve on the Research Engagement Task Force (see Appendix A for a list of members). Steve Warren, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, served as chair and Kristin Bowman-James, University Distinguished Professor of Chemistry, served as co-chair. The task force met together on November 10, December 12, January 23, and March 6. Part of the January 23 meeting was devoted to a discussion of draft recommendations with KU-L deans. A similar meeting was held with KUMC deans on March 4. The task force's draft recommendations and report were posted on the Research and Graduate Studies web site on February 15. Faculty members were encouraged to provide written comments in response to the report and/or to attend one of the open forums at KU-L and KUMC. On February 22 an open forum was held on the Lawrence campus to discuss this report, followed by an open forum at KUMC on February 23. Written comments on the draft report were also accepted through March 5. Minutes of task force meetings, summaries of comments expressed at the open forums, and all written comments on the draft document submitted by faculty members are appended to this report.

Task Force Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the Chancellor charge the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies (KU-L) and the Vice Chancellor for Research (KUMC) with the creation of a comprehensive system for measuring research engagement by KU faculty. The specific parameters measured for each college and school shall be determined in consultation with their respective deans and with the approval of the Provost or the KUMC Executive Vice Chancellor. The resulting measurement system should provide discipline-appropriate profiles along with their impact on research engagement at all levels: individual faculty member, department, and school or

college. Parameters chosen for research engagement must be quantifiable so that the impact of the metrics can be evaluated over time. Measures of research engagement for graduate and undergraduate students and postdoctoral associates are to be identified and assessed as appropriate. An annual KU Research Engagement Report shall be submitted to the Chancellor by the offices of the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies (KU-L) and the Vice Chancellor for Research (KUMC) beginning June 1, 2011 and annually thereafter.

2. It is recommended that the Chancellor charge the dean of each college or school with the implementation of specific actions to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize research engagement by their faculty and students. The specific approaches may vary from department to department and school to school depending on the discipline and other factors. These school-specific efforts should focus, in part, on the identification and reduction of barriers to research engagement. It is strongly urged that future resource allocations be linked in part to the evaluation of departmental/unit efforts to promote research engagement. Departments with strong records of research engagement and/or effectively promoting research engagement should be rewarded. Deans will be required to submit a brief but specific Annual Research Engagement Support Plan to the Provost (KU-L) or Executive Vice Chancellor at KUMC, effective August 1, 2010.

3. It is recommended that the Chancellor, working with deans and other senior administrators, partner with faculty to enhance resources available to achieve and sustain high levels of research engagement. Such resources might include funds to support pilot research, additional research awards in recognition of exemplary research at all levels, enhancement of research infrastructure and support cores, graduate and undergraduate research fellowships, and the availability of special opportunity funds, such as travel awards, among others. Such funds will be collected from a variety of sources, including private donors and external grants and contracts generated by faculty. It is further recommended that the Chancellor, working with deans and other senior administrators, identify ways to remove the barriers and increase the incentives for grant seeking and the pursuit of other such research awards.

Discussion

Recommendation 1: Create a comprehensive system for measuring research engagement.

There is no single hallmark measure of research engagement. Rather, research engagement can be assessed using multiple indicators. Examples include peer and non-peer reviewed publications; the impact of these publications in terms of citation counts and other indices; external grants or attempts to obtain external funding, including foundation support and donations; books published; patents; invited presentations

nationally and internationally; editorships of scholarly journals; the development of original artworks; and the creation and/or production of musical compositions, plays, etc. Measurement especially needs to account for scholarship in emerging areas of science, technology, and the arts and humanities in ways that encourage risk-taking and/or multi-disciplinary efforts, and collaboration with other scholars or colleagues in disciplines where such collaborations leverage creativity.

For KU to support and enhance research engagement, it is necessary to measure it systematically, thoroughly, and regularly. This must be done in the most efficient, flexible, cost-effective, user-friendly, and least redundant form possible. Furthermore, the data that is collected must be relevant to individual disciplines and must relate closely to expectations for scholarly activity or research engagement in a particular discipline. At present the university has no centralized way to measure research engagement and thus, with the exception of grant funding (for which the university is required to keep data), has no way to assess research engagement by any broad set of either discipline-specific or multidisciplinary measures. There is a clear need for a broader mechanism for measuring research engagement, since the availability of external research support varies greatly by disciplines and in any case represents only a single narrow measure. To this end, a centralized, carefully designed, web-based system should be created and maintained. Such a system should allow analyses at the level of individual faculty, departments, schools/colleges, and the university overall. It should also support comparisons to appropriate units *at peer universities* to facilitate creation of valid metrics relative to the standards of various disciplines. The design and development of this system should begin as soon as possible after the acceptance of this report. Although data should be collected annually, analytic tools should allow for multi-year data comparisons, as appropriate, to achieve the most meaningful measures of individual faculty engagement, since timelines for definable and measurable scholarly output vary across disciplines. Finally, it is strongly recommended that, to reduce redundancy and faculty time wasted completing multiple reports, this system should be designed so that necessary information required for annual faculty activity reports, tenure and promotion materials, and other routine faculty reports can also be collected and managed through this system.

The implementation of Recommendation 1 will allow departments and schools to measure research engagement over long periods of time (e.g., 5 to 10 years and longer) and to assess the impact of various policies and procedures on engagement. The accumulating database will also facilitate the comparison of individual units, both within the university and with similar units at peer institutions, which will ultimately allow for a measurable assessment of the growth of research engagement at KU.

Recommendation 2: Employ specific efforts to support and enhance research engagement.

There are many potential ways to enhance research engagement by individual faculty members. One obvious way is to reduce existing barriers. Many of these barriers are the result of excessive time spent in other activities, either by necessity (i.e., heavy

administrative, teaching, or clinical loads), by inefficient organization (i.e., excessive and unnecessary meetings, or redundant reporting requirements), or by lack of infrastructure (i.e., poor IT, inadequate space or facilities).

Deans should work with department chairs and faculty in general to support and enhance department cultures that expect, support, sustain, and reward research engagement by all faculty members. Many KU departments across all areas of the university already have time-tested, well-developed, and supportive cultures that create clear expectations and reward systems for appropriately high levels of research engagement. These departments serve as empirical proof that high levels of research engagement can thrive at KU. Leaders of these departments represent valuable sources of expertise on how to develop and support such cultures in other departments.

A key indicator of research engagement is national and international recognition through awards. It is vital that recognition of successful research endeavors also takes place within one's home institution. Not only do institutional awards for research reward the recipient with recognition (and financially in some cases), but they also present an opportunity to highlight the research strengths of KU to the public. There is a need for additional university-wide recognition of research accomplishments at KU, as cited in the *Initiative 2015: Shaping KU's Future* report http://www.chancellor.ku.edu/2015/docs/full_report.pdf. In particular, more research awards for exemplary research at all levels (assistant through full professor, including non-tenure- line faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral associates) should be instituted and publicized. Furthermore, awards for research accomplishment provide another means for research enhancement.

Another mechanism for research enhancement lies within research centers, which, by definition, exist to support research engagement. Virtually all of these centers strongly support multidisciplinary collaboration. Faculty should be encouraged to affiliate with appropriate centers to further enhance their research efforts. It may be timely to develop new centers or expand existing centers to spur emerging disciplines. Faculty should be supported and rewarded for engaging in multidisciplinary scholarship. At the same time, productive faculty in disciplines that maintain the single-investigator norm should be rewarded for discipline-specific engagements and their outcomes. Finally, faculty in all disciplines should be encouraged to take advantage of the university's open access policy, as this may further enhance the national and international visibility of their research and scholarship.

While all faculty members are expected to engage in research and scholarly activity, some faculty members no longer maintain an active research program. Nevertheless, these individuals can play vital roles in the university by utilizing the opportunity for differential allocations of teaching, research, and service efforts. An explicit, affirmative, university-wide policy endorsing such differential workload assignments would be valuable to deans and department chairs endeavoring to enhance research engagement with limited resources. This can, in turn, allow faculty who are research-engaged to devote greater efforts to scholarly activities.

Recommendation 3: Enhance the resources available to support and sustain high levels of research engagement.

The sustenance of high-level research engagement and research-oriented graduate programs requires external funding in many fields. Rather than a means to the end of resource generation, grant proposals and awards are essential intellectual endeavors. They commonly require an extremely competitive peer-review process, often at the discipline's highest level, as in the case of NEH, NSF, NIH, IES and other agencies and foundations. The amount of funding varies widely by discipline, and the size of a grant can rarely be directly equated with the intellectual or scientific merit of the project or activity. In fields in which outside funding is appropriate, KU faculty, especially tenured and senior faculty, should be able to support their own research and to support graduate students and postdoctoral associates in their research efforts. In fields in which outside funding is rare and targeted only to assist single-investigators to complete their projects, KU faculty, especially tenured and senior faculty, should be encouraged to seek that funding as often as appropriate because the writing and review of grant proposals is fundamental to the conception of projects. Across all disciplines, senior faculty members should provide research leadership models for junior faculty and doctoral students. KU's ability to provide proposal support, core labs and other infrastructure, and pilot and travel funds depends on all faculty members contributing broadly to our research enterprise.

The university should make every effort to support faculty members who are willing to secure the resources to make research and graduate education possible. In addition, every effort should be made to ensure that each faculty member is competitive for future grants renewals when such opportunities exist. Toward that end, central resources, whether at the department, school, or university level, should enhance and supplement the efforts of those faculty members who make concerted efforts to bring in those resources through grants and other mechanisms. Time to work on proposals or manage larger funded projects is an essential resource (perhaps *the* essential resource). One way to encourage grant development on the Lawrence campus, for example, may be through the provision of course releases when faculty members receive sufficient salary through external funding. This is especially important in disciplines that carry a 2-2 teaching load or extensive clinical commitments.

University resources should also be used to help assistant professors establish strong programs of research and to help new associate professors move their programs of research to the next level. The existence of many "career associate professors" at KU is a sign that our expectations of and support for the research engagement of this group may have been inadequate in the past. This situation is perhaps more prevalent in certain disciplines, such as those that provide key required courses or for which responsibilities include very heavy clinical loads. These situations should be carefully assessed and appropriate steps taken to alleviate them. Possible mechanisms are post-tenure mentoring, efforts to discourage associate professors from taking on extensive service

duties (especially the role of department chair), allocating a defined percentage of time for research for clinicians, and others. The university also needs to make extraordinary efforts to retain faculty members who have sustained portfolios of externally funded research or achieved significant national and international renown for their scholarship. These scholars are essential to sustaining a first-class research enterprise, and are often attractive to other universities competing for the same resources and discipline-specific reputations for smart, innovative thinking and nationally and internationally recognized scholarly achievement.

Implementation

Upon acceptance of this report, the Task Force recommends two immediate actions. First, the Vice Provost for Research at KU-L and the Vice Chancellor for Research at KUMC should be charged with the development of a comprehensive system for measuring research engagement by KU faculty. Second, the Provost and the KUMC Executive Vice Chancellor should meet with their respective deans and begin the implementation of specific actions in support of enhanced and sustained research engagement throughout the university.

Appendix A: Research Engagement Task Force Members

Steve Warren, Chair
Vice Provost/Professor
Research and Graduate Studies/Applied Behavioral Science

Kristin Bowman-James, Co-chair
Director/Distinguished Professor
EPSCoR/Chemistry

Craig Adams
Chair and Distinguished Professor
Civil/Environmental/Architectural Engineering

Jim Calvet
Professor
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, KUMC

John Colombo
Director/ Professor
Life Span Institute/Psychology

Derrick Darby
Associate Professor
Philosophy

Don Deshler
Director/ Professor
Center for Research on Learning/Special Education

Adam Duerfeldt
Doctoral Student
Medicinal Chemistry

Bob Goldstein
Distinguished Professor
Geology

Susan Harris
Distinguished Professor
English

Leslie Heckert
Professor
Molecular and Integrative Physiology, KUMC

Mary Lee Hummert
Vice Provost/Professor
Faculty Development/Communication Studies

Steven Maynard-Moody
Director/Professor
Institute for Policy and Social Research/Public Administration

Sara Rosen
Associate Vice Provost and Dean/Professor
Research and Graduate Studies/Linguistics

Christian Schoeneich
Chair and Professor
Pharmaceutical Chemistry

Ariel Tazkargy
Undergraduate Student
English/Global and International Studies

Paul Terranova
Vice Chancellor for Research and Senior Associate Dean/Professor
Molecular and Integrative Physiology, KUMC

Joy Ward
Associate Professor
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Susan Williams
Associate Professor
Chemical and Petroleum Engineering

Bob Collins, Staff/Director
Planning Information and Analysis
Research and Graduate Studies

John Schott, Staff
Assistant Director
Institutional Research and Planning

Terry Turner, Staff
Director
Planning and Analysis, KUMC

Appendix B: Minutes of Task Force Meetings

Chancellor's Task Force on Research Engagement
December 12, 2009

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Warren at 8:30 AM. Steve distributed the meeting agenda and briefly described the Task Force charge, noting that it was relatively narrow in scope and would require a brief report to the Chancellor.

The focus of the charge is two-fold: 1) To identify various measures of research engagement, and 2) To suggest specific approaches to promote, increase, and recognize all types of research engagement of the faculty.

Steve's plan is for him and Co-Chair Kristin Bowman-James to draft a preliminary task force report for review and discussion by the next task force meeting in January, and to hold open meetings in February to receive input from the university community at large on the draft report and on research engagement in general. He also mentioned the idea of vetting the ideas developed and presented in the report to a representative group of Deans and Chairs. The task force would complete its work in March, when the group would deliver its report to the Chancellor.

The group discussion began with considering measurement metrics and the question of how does this group identify such metrics for areas like the Humanities? Using this construct, discussion ranged over questions such as standards, measurements, and systems to measure performance. Providing measurement tools to departments was noted as particularly important, as was the use of normalized data for inter-institutional and inter-departmental comparisons. The reporting, use, and comparison of faculty publications as research engagement were discussed, as was the teaching, research, and service expectations of faculty. It was noted that the second task force focus was not as proscriptive as the first, and that the implementation of specific research engagement approaches at the department level was a role and responsibility of the Deans.

At this point, the task force turned to a case study presentation, which focused on many aspects of research grant funding, including federally sponsored research expenditures, demographics of tenured/tenure track faculty, levels of faculty participation in research, N of projects and PIs, and GTA/GRA profiles. While task force discussion covered a wide array of research engagement-related topics, a major point of the case study was to demonstrate that the various measures shown in the 20-some slides describe various aspects of collective research engagement behavior, and that there is no one single perfect measure of research engagement.

The task force then turned to discussion of other measurable indicators of research engagement. Suggestions included:

- Actual time spent on research (percent of effort)
- Publications
- Books

There was some discussion of how to measure research engagement in emerging fields. General consensus was that departments should identify such emerging areas and should help develop methodologies and criteria for evaluating research engagement in those areas. In all fields, whatever measures/metrics are used, collected and normalized data will help to establish a baseline, which then can be used in inter-institutional comparisons.

- Scholarship (top- level, peer-reviewed journals)
- Doing research proposals (to enhance future grant success)
- Performance/Juried Events
- Publications/Citations
- Collaboration/Presentations (on research items/at professional meetings)
- Professional Associations (participation/involvement)
- Externships
- Applying for small grants (success at a lower level leads to success at a higher level)
- Focused Research Training

The task force next turned to identifying barriers to research engagement. Among the barriers identified and discussed at length were:

- Teaching loads (need to adjust teaching/service parameters)
- Multiple authors on an article (better to be a single author)
- Administrative support (time factor in meeting the requirements of the "compliance Industry" - departments need to "push back" as much as possible)
- Administrative service requirements for Associate Professors
- Peer pressure to teach (take on greater teaching loads)
- Systemic reviews
- Physicians (pressure to engage in research)
- Specific "cores" in Life Sciences, e.g., instrumentation core (improper cores are an impediment; faculty will use cores if they are good – poor cores can kill a research area)
- Putting resources into new people ("First" awards)
- Lack of proper research space
- Lack of recognition of research effort (use U-Tube video on research?)
- Lack of visible research awards (no research award like the Kemper Teaching Award)
- Interview research "nonproducers" to get their story/how to get them productive
- Associate Professors (those not promoted to full – how to get them productive – training?)
- Differential teaching loads (send more of the teaching load to dedicated teachers)
- Lack of research mentors (mentorships could keep the stars here, help "the middle")

The task force concluded its meeting with the decision to meet again in January. The first half of the meeting will be to review the document which Steve and Kristin will draft. Following that, a group of invited Deans will review and discuss the ideas, proposals and recommendations contained in that draft document with the task force. It was suggested that at least one Dean from the Humanities/Arts be included in that group.

The task force will convene on Saturday, January 23, at 8:30 AM to review the draft document. Location of the meeting is to be determined.

Chancellor's Task Force on Research Engagement
January 23, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Warren at 8:30 AM. Steve distributed the meeting agenda and briefly reviewed the Task Force charge. The focus of the charge is two-fold: 1) To identify various measures of research engagement, and 2) To suggest specific approaches to promote, increase, and recognize all types of research engagement of the faculty.

The plan for the meeting was threefold – to receive a research engagement report from KUMC, to review the draft Task Force report prepared by Steve and Task Force Co-Chair Kristin Bowman-James, and to meet with the Deans or their representatives to get the Dean's perspective and input on the direction and scope of the draft report. Approximately one hour was to be dedicated to each of the three tasks.

The KUMC research engagement presentation closely paralleled the KU-Lawrence research engagement presentation at the December 12 Task Force meeting. Data on a number of research engagement metrics, including total research volume, research growth, funding sources, faculty size and number of researchers, number of projects, centers and multidisciplinary research, and graduate research assistantships, were presented. The subsequent task force discussion covered a wide range of research engagement-related topics. Like the KU-Lawrence presentation, a major point of the case study was to demonstrate that the various measures shown in the research engagement graphs display various aspects of collective research engagement behavior, and that there is no one single perfect measure of research engagement. Both the KU-Lawrence and the KUMC research engagement presentations focused on dollars and people, two elements which are easily countable and necessary for a complete picture of research engagement, but are only two of many such elements required for a comprehensive perspective of such engagement.

One item of task force interest was the KUMC research score card, which tracks the research grants, awards, publications, and presentations of individual KUMC faculty members. Task force discussion about this unit record approach to developing faculty research profiles touched on the utility of such a document, as well as on items which could be added to the profile, such as research consulting, participation in professional societies, and program development.

Also briefly discussed was the potential for using data from Academic Analytics, a private LLC which gathers data on faculty, including research and award data, to enhance faculty research profiles. Steve noted that this company will provide actual data on KU faculty, as well as data on faculty nationwide, which KU can use for various comparative and evaluative measures. He again emphasized that there is no single gold standard for research engagement.

Following this discussion, the task force turned to the draft report, which Steve indicated the Chancellor had seen and was pleased with the direction the report was taking. Steve requested that the task members send to him any comments or suggestions concerning the draft, and he further noted that the appendix of the report will include the various comments, points, and counter-points raised by the members.

Task force discussion focused on time frame considerations for research engagement evaluation and the need for a variety of quantitative and qualitative research engagement measures. One time frame-related example was the researching, preparing, writing, and publishing of books. Since book publication is the result of several years of effort, interim "markers", such as articles and presentations relative to the book research, could be used as a research engagement indicator.

Discussion also focused on the collection of faculty research engagement data and the accountability chain. The task force felt that, while it is important to collect these data, all data collection should be coordinated so that the data are collected once, thus eliminating the multiple reporting of the same data. To make research engagement a more useful tool, research engagement and productivity measurements need to go further than the department chair – they need to go to the Deans and possibly the Provost. Some task force members indicated that this movement of research engagement-related data up the chain has already begun. Among the specified items needed to support and enhance faculty research engagement were administrative support,

enhanced endowment support, support for graduate students, more focus on graduate education, and the option to "buy-out" teaching assignments. The task force recognized that teaching loads directly impact research engagement and productivity.

During the last hour, the task force heard from the Deans of Education, Journalism, and Engineering, the Interim Dean of the College, and the Associate Dean of the Law School, about their views on the recommendations in the draft task force report.

Generally, the Deans and Associate Dean were very supportive of the direction and the recommendations contained in the draft report. Their specific questions related to how the measures would be used, which measures would be used, the research engagement comparison base, and the frequency of data collection. The group discussion indicated that the measures of research engagement and productivity would be used to compare KU schools with peer schools across the country, and not other KU schools. Measures would be school-appropriate, and thus each school would likely have a unique set of research engagement measures. Data collection probably would be on an annual basis, which would allow flexibility in reporting outcomes and would allow the data to serve as a more effective, time-sensitive management tool.

Three additional areas of discussion were the growing interdisciplinary nature of the research enterprise, the need to coordinate and expedite research activity data collection, and the cultural change necessary in some schools to advance and reinforce research engagement.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Steve noted that he and Kristin would produce a second draft report and distribute it to the task force prior to the February 22 KU-Lawrence open forum on research engagement, to be held at Alderson Auditorium in the Kansas Union. On March 4, a similar open forum will be held at KUMC.

The next task force meeting will be Saturday, March 6, starting at 8:30 AM, in the Pine Room in the Kansas Union.

<div align="center">

Chancellor's Task Force on Research Engagement
March 6, 2010

</div>

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Warren at 8:30 AM. He referenced his email of February 27, which included the written comments that had been submitted to the Task Force through RGS, the draft notes from the open forums at Lawrence (February 22) and KUMC (February 23), and the current draft version of the Task Force report. He noted that the principal task of this meeting was to review and discuss the feedback received as a means to help guide him and Co-Chair Kristin Bowman-James as they draft the final task force report. That draft will be distributed to the task force for final review and comment in about two weeks. Steve also indicated that the report appendix would contain the written comments received via RGS, the task force meetings minutes, and the notes from the open forum. Once the task force approves the draft, the final report will be submitted to the Chancellor.

The first item of business was a brief report from Kristin about the meeting she attended Thursday evening at the Medical Center, and at which she gave a brief presentation on the task force activities. She felt that the group provided positive feedback about the task force goals and direction, particularly about the possibility of developing a centralized faculty data base system. During discussion, it was noted that librarians at KUMC are already pulling data together as a "first step" towards establishing a functional faculty data base. One concern raised was about the difficulty in establishing comparison groups for certain departments/activities, e.g., surgeons.

Overall, the group was quite supportive of the task force direction, and was anxious to know what the next steps would be after submission of the report to the Chancellor.

Following Kristin's report, the task force began reviewing and discussing the written comments submitted through RGS. The first item of discussion centered on the appropriate metrics to use in measuring research engagement. There was extensive task force discussion about the predominant role of grant funding in supporting an active and engaged research function at KU, and how the grant funding/faculty support model does not work for faculty in the Humanities and the Arts. Concern was expressed that the grant metric was too money-focused, and that politics played a significant role in determining grant awards. The task force ultimately determined that the draft report should be revised, as appropriate, to place more emphasis and focus on faculty "scholarly output" and less emphasis on grant dollars and awards as metrics, especially for faculty in the Humanities and the Arts.

In the balance of the written comments, among the more important points/themes raised were:

- OIRP should develop and maintain the centralized data base for faculty publications and performances, and should make those data available on-line.

- Barriers and disincentives to collaborative research must be removed, and collaborative research needs to be actively promoted, recognized, and rewarded – the perception that multiple-author research may be of lower value or held in lower esteem must be challenged and changed.

- Assigning differential faculty workloads based on individual research engagement and productivity requires an explicit, affirmative university policy endorsing and promoting such differential workload assignments.

- The importance of undergraduate and graduate student research needs to be recognized as an important factor in both the education of the student and the future of a given discipline.

- There is a need to have great research at KU recognized like KU currently recognizes great teaching -- with specific awards and honors. There was discussion of establishing a Research Summit on the order of magnitude as the current Teaching Summit.

Following the task force review of all written comments was a general discussion of the task force report. While some members voiced concern that this document should not make faculty uneasy or uncomfortable, others felt that the report should, in fact, make faculty comfortable, inasmuch as this effort at stimulating research engagement represents change, and people need to feel some degree of unease in order to effect change.

The question of continuity was briefly discussed, with general task force agreement that some members of this task force should be members of any subsequent task force or committee charged with the actual implementation of the task force recommendations.

Steve and Kristin will rewrite the task force report to reflect the task force discussion, and will distribute the draft to all members, along with a short draft executive summary of the report, hopefully within the next two weeks. While today's meeting is the last face-to-face task force meeting, Steve indicated that he and Kristin may be contacting several members of the task force to help them frame and focus the draft report.

Steve and Kristin thanked the task force members for their committed participation on this important task force, and the group thanked Steve and Kristin for their task force leadership.

Appendix C: Summaries of the Open Forums

<div align="center">

Research Engagement Open Forum
Woodruff Auditorium, Lawrence Campus
February 22, 2010

</div>

Research Engagement Task Force Chairman Steve Warren, along with KU Chancellor Bernadette Gray-Little, opened the Forum with the presentation of the KU Research Achievement Award to Don Huggins, Kansas Biological Survey.

Following the presentation, Task Force Co-Chair Kristin Bowman-James gave a summary background presentation on task force activities to date, including the Task Force charge and membership, the operating definition of "research engagement", and the three current draft Task Force recommendations. Kristin gave a more detailed review of each of the three draft recommendations - Measurement, Enhancing Efforts, and Enhancing Resources. The presentation slides are available at the RGS website.

Following this background review, Steve opened the forum to the audience.

The first participant, Task Force member Susan Harris, stated that she had materials from Kathy Porsch, Hall Center for the Humanities, strongly endorsing the development of a centralized faculty research data base. Susan will send those materials to the Task Force at rgs@ku.edu.

The Dean of the School of Education raised several systemic issues related to the Task Force recommendations:

- Research collaboration, particularly in the Social Sciences and Humanities, can be a negative factor in tenure and promotion consideration. He suggested reviewing tenure and promotion policies in light of the Task Force recommendation encouraging such collaboration.

- Comparing KU departmental and school research engagement and productivity with other institutions is appropriate as long as the comparison department and schools are truly comparable entities.

- Engaging research centers in collaborative research can lead to fewer dollars going to the Deans to support departmental research activities.

- The University needs to develop and issue a strong statement supporting differential teaching loads to give departments the opportunity to set faculty teaching loads relative to research engagement.

- If the Task Force recommends discouraging Associate Professors from assuming administrative positions within a department, who will assume that responsibility?

    All these suggestions will be forwarded to the Task Force.

Additional statements from the audience reflected the following:

- It is important to recognize all levels of research and scholarship. A related issue, recognizing the expanding length of productive faculty careers, was the need for KU to sustain faculty research engagement over time.

- High profile rewards and recognition currently provided for outstanding teaching also need to be provided for outstanding research achievement. This would serve as a stimulant for research activity.

- Establishing a faculty "common room" to enable open discussion and sharing of interests could be a valuable enhancer of increased collaborative research.

- The important functional connection between instruction and research needs to be emphasized.

- Great graduate programs have, at their core, great graduate students. KU needs to actively recruit outstanding graduate students to its graduate programs.

In response to a question on how allocation of resources to departments based on research engagement would be accomplished, Steve indicated that any allocation methodology would be based on input from Deans on how to best support research engagement activities.

Steve encouraged all those attending to submit comments by February 26 to RGS@ku.edu.

Steve then thanked all those attending for their input and feedback and closed the forum.

Research Engagement Open Forum
School of Nursing Auditorium, KUMC Campus
February 23, 2010

Research Engagement Task Force Chairman Steve Warren opened the forum with some introductory remarks, and was followed by Task Force Co-Chair Kristin Bowman-James, who gave a summary background presentation on task force activities to date, including the Task Force charge and membership, the operating definition of "research engagement", and the three current draft Task Force recommendations. Kristin then gave a more detailed review of each of the three draft recommendations - Measurement, Enhancing Efforts, and Enhancing Resources. The presentation slides are available at the RGS website.

Following this background review, Steve opened the forum to the audience.

- The first question focused on the lack of robust clinical wet labs at KUMC, and that this lack of lab space constituted a significant impediment to garnering research grants. While the recommendations of the Task Force will not specifically indicate which research resources should be expanded, Steve encouraged the individual to send information on such specific issues to RGS.

- In response to a question on how the recommendations would be reflected in the tenure process, Steve and Kristin responded that by collecting and reporting data relative to an individual's research activity, research engagement will both measure and impact the research component of tenure decisions.

- A related question focused on how the teaching aspect of those KUMC research track faculty who also teach would be impacted by the Task Force recommendations. Steve indicated that teaching is not specifically addressed in this document – research engagement is the sole focus of the Task Force.

- A question was raised about what specific assessment tool(s) would be used and if KU had the resources to manage the data collected. The tools and data would remain in the

research and graduate studies "domain." Envisioned is a dynamic system (which has not yet been designed) that allows each faculty member to add his/her data as appropriate. Steve noted that data collection, or "harvesting," is being done now by outside agencies, such as Academic Analytics. Information from such agencies can help KU firm up its own faculty data. A dynamic system would allow customization of data to meet the varying needs of individual departments and units. The critical feature of such data gathering is that it provides a baseline for departments, units, and schools to see change in research engagement over time.

- Data collection for research engagement will replace most existing data collection efforts, and will collect essentially the same information in the same general timeframe.

- The pre- and post-tenure mentoring of faculty will be implemented at each school and department and will be based on the specific needs of the school/department. It is a variable, flexible process, and will not be a top-down, pre-defined model.

- A question was raised about the accuracy of self-reported /self-entered data and its impact on the assessment tool, and a related question focused on what we would do with all that data. Steve and Kristin noted that there is a large N of departments on both campuses that currently are highly active in research. Using research engagement measures would allow KU to measure the current state of research engagement and how it varies across the university.

- One attendee raised the point that support for graduate students and for graduate student researchers was critical to research engagement, and was suffering in this financial slump. Support for graduate students is included in the Research Engagement Task force report.

- A question was raised about data base accessibility on both campuses. Although the data base itself has not yet been designed, Steve indicated that it is intended to be widely used at both campuses.

- A question was raised concerning the ability of the data base output to identify weaknesses in core facilities. Steve explained that the output could suggest where core facilities might need to be strengthened, and any enhancement of core facilities would be the result of discussions between the dean and the chair.

- In response to a question about the utility of grant data, Steve and Kristin noted that research engagement output data could help focus on the research activity of departments, including the "evenness" of such research – essentially who is doing the research. They also noted that departmental "culture" can play a positive (and sometimes negative) role in research engagement.

- An attendee raised a question about dealing with tenured faculty who are primarily focused on teaching and not research. This question led to a related question on department culture in clinical departments. Steve and Kristin noted that faculty primarily involved with teaching and not research can help free up time for those faculty who are focused on research. They further noted that the task force report supports the opportunistic use of differential teaching loads when and where appropriate.

- In response to a question on publishing in non-peer reviewed journals, Steve and Kristin stated that the most important factor in publishing articles was not the N of articles but the impact of such articles on a discipline.

- An attendee observed that there was not a lot of "new" data being gathered, and that this was an effort to standardize the approach to research data gathering and to make it more transparent.

- One attendee suggested that KU should collect data from the past five years and use the first of those years as the base point for the research enhancement data base, noting that this approach was more effective than starting with current data.

Steve encouraged all those attending to submit comments by February 26 to RGS@ku.edu.

Steve and Kristin thanked all those attending for their input and feedback and closed the forum.

Appendix D: Written Comments Submitted in Response to the Draft Report

Comments were received February 12-26 at rgs@ku.edu and are listed chronologically.

I am unable to attend the open forum on Research Engagement, but have read the report carefully. Although there is acknowledgement of differences in disciplines, I am still concerned at applying a model appropriate for the sciences and social sciences to the humanities. In particular, I am troubled by the statement on Page 4, lines 19-22: "Nonetheless, KU faculty, especially tenured and senior faculty, should be able to support their own research and, in certain disciplines, to support graduate students and postdoctoral associates in their research efforts."

In my six years as chair of the English Department, only 2-3 out of 40 faculty members were able to obtain any outside funding, despite many many applications and the invaluable help of the Hall Center. It is simply not a reasonable expectation for faculty in our field to be able to support their own research through outside funding. Our research expenses are not normally very large -- it is mostly time and some travel that we need. In fact, it often seems a waste of valuable research time to do the extensive work required for grant applications that are so very competitive that there is a minuscule chance of receiving funding. In my own case, for instance, I could have completed and submitted an article to a refereed journal last semester in the time it took me to fill out and endlessly revise grant applications for the only grants available for my project, which were not successful. Very fortunately, I was awarded internal support (a Hall Center Research Fellowship); such internal support is crucial and should be expanded for humanities scholars. Especially in these difficult economic times, available funding for the humanities is extremely limited and scholars should not be expected to "support their own research through outside funding" as a measure of their research productivity.

Dorice Williams Elliott
Associate Professor
Department of English

I am unable to attend the forum scheduled for Feb. 22nd, so I thought I would e-mail you with a suggestion. In an era of budget cuts, the number of part- and full-time lecturers at KU is increasing. Many of these faculty have the same academic qualifications as their tenure-track colleagues and research programs in progress. Some may argue that the fact that tenure decreases portability of grants and contracts, yet many lecturers' commitment to KU is just as firm. As a courtesy professor, I have been excluded from certain research funding opportunities (e.g., Big Twelve Fellowship, Hall Center) because these are reserved for tenure-track and tenured faculty. I have no doubt that this issue is on your agenda; I just wanted to put in my two cents in absentia. Thanks!

Terese Thonus, Ph.D.
Director, KU Writing Center

Dear Susan [Harris]: I am noticed you are among the members of the KU Research Engagement Task Force, and so I am directing my thoughts regarding the draft report specifically to you. I suggest that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning <http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/profiles.shtml> track the number, quality, and impact of publications and performances, and make that information available online, as it now does other university data.

I most heartily agree that KU needs a centralized tracking method to consistently record this type of information, as well as the inputs that support research engagement. A major frustration for me is the lack of a university-wide tracking system to consistently track research out-puts and then make that information easily available for use in grant development. I am glad this committee has recognized that need, but I think there is a conflict between the recommendation that the University implement a comprehensive system and the recommendation that the measurement and tracking not only be left up to the colleges and schools and the individual departments within them to conduct, but also that it be left to them to define their specific approaches, e.g., "The specific approaches may vary from department to department and school to school depending on the discipline and other factors." How, then can we have a consistent, measurable, comprehensive data collection and retrieval system? We will end up exactly where we are now, with collection of publication information being inconsistent and sporadic at best and non existent at worst.

I have thought for several years that the logical entity at KU that should be charged with collecting this data and making it available is the Office of Institutional Research and Planning http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/profiles.shtml.

This is the first stop for anyone I know who is developing a major institutional grant application and needs consistent longitudinal data on the University. OIRP is already set up to do exactly this kind of data collection, tracking, and publication via online database. To me it makes more sense to dedicate some of the resources the study mentions will be needed to additional staff and whatever additional hardware/software might be necessary to expand the excellent work of that group and take advantage of the expertise already in place to take on the task of tracking publications and their impact, performances and their impact, and so on. The publications at the least would benefit the entire university. Performances are a bit more narrow and possibly more difficult to track, but are important measures of intellectual and creative output as well.

Many federal and other grants now require some sort of data regarding publications and the best I can do is to use what the Hall Center gathers for its book awards (that method relies on self-reporting). I made that fly for the NEH Challenge grant the last time, even though it wanted university-wide publications and intellectual impact as evidenced by citations of those publications. Thankfully, it just wants humanities faculty this time, so I won't have to struggle quite as much. Still, our information is spotty and, as you know, the Hall Center simply does not have the staff to take on formal data collection, analysis, and posting for its constituent faculty in the manner that is envisioned here.

As far as the research inputs go, I think Bob Collins at KUCR does a fine job of tracking the institutional expenditures resulting from grant funding.

Tracking the individual fellowship expenditures is a little problematic, but if fellowship winners request supplemental salary funding, their fellowships also become part of Bob's tracking system; and I am tasked with tracking such information for the Hall Center's constituent faculty. Most other faculty do not engage so heavily in applications for individual fellowships, but whichever center they typically work with can be similarly tasked to track such information. However, if

tracking research inputs also includes tracking all internal funding that goes to support research endeavors (e.g., the Hall Center Humanities and Creative Fellowships and travel grants, the College's travel fund, the Office of International Programs travel fund, the GRF and NFGRF), then perhaps OIRP could also track that type of information.

If this information would better be tracked by KUCR, however, I suggest that adequate funding be provided by the University to sufficiently fund that endeavor, as well.

While I am on this topic, another data set that we sometimes need, and most definitely for the Title VI applications, is placement information on our graduates (both UG and G). There is nothing in place to track this. The individual National Resource/FLAS Centers try to track the students associated in some way with their programs, but it's quite hit or miss and heavily dependent on responses to emails. The Alumni Association is little help in this regard. In recent years it has declined to share what information it has due to confidentiality concerns, but even when it did share the information, it wasn't particularly quantifiable.

In sum, I suggest that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning be tasked with tracking the number, quality, and impact of publications and performances, and making that information available and that sufficient resources be dedicated to this effort, and that the committee subsequently work with the departments and schools and the OIRP staff to ensure that the collection strategies are sufficient to adequately track these particular measures of KU's research productivity and thereby provide solid, measurable data.

I'll try to attend the meeting next week, but I'm sending these thoughts because I am juggling Title VI and other grant proposals at this point and so may not be able to attend. Thanks for giving me the chance to share my thoughts on this. -Kathy

Kathy Porsch
Grant Development Officer, Hall Center
Humanities Grant Development Office, 900 Sunnyside Avenue

There are a large number of postdoctoral research fellows here at KU, all of whom are keenly interested in research at the most basic levels. Please consider including this group in your strategy.

Ruth Entwistle

[Ruth is a research associate in the Higuchi Biosciences Center.]

The best way to enhance research engagement is not to introduce yet another redundant reporting mechanism which penalizes those who have something to report by stealing their time, and has no burden on those who have little or nothing to say.

Departments are already charged with evaluating research as part of annual evaluations.

The best way to proceed is to support research. One can begin by not putting impediments in its way (see above). For another (recent) example, by not cutting off Adjunct Professors who are active

collaborators, because a report was not received -- which was never requested. This in turn cuts off their library access until this is corrected.

Adrian L. Melott
Department of Physics and Astronomy

I'm sorry but I'll be on my way to the University of Pittsburgh that day and will have to miss the forum. I'll be sure to read through the report and provide some comments if I have any, though.

Jeff Aubé
Medicinal Chemistry

Please share with the committee members what good work I think this draft represents. You hit on many of the key issues that must be addressed. At the open forum today some matters like graduate student support and helping aging faculty members phase into the late stages of their careers are good ideas to build in. Regarding research, I anticipate a very thorough conversation in the School of Education, especially given Boyer's notion in *Scholarship Revisited* of multiple ways to engage in meaningful scholarly activities. For us in a professional field like education that likely will mean appreciating work that ties closely to practice.

 I think the recommendations raise a number of systemic issues that must be considered in order for their implementation to be successful. I'll mention these and hope they support your work:

- Recommendation 1 talks about the importance of collaboration in research activities. I agree. However, our departmental, School/College and university tenure and promotion guidelines need to reflect this appreciation for collaborative work if we are serious about supporting it. I hear all the time from P&T committees about concerns with candidates due to multiple authorships or the lack of single authored papers. This past year the issue came up that a scholar had worked too closely with a mentor who happens to be the leading scholar in his particular field. Shoot, had I trained with Freud I would have been honored to work with him! If collaboration is to be pursued as a goal, it must be appreciated in the most significant reward system we have – promotion and tenure.

- Similarly, Recommendation 1 talks about having peer institution data for comparisons. But if every School/College develops their own set of research engagement guidelines, and other universities don't have this, how will comparisons be valid? My point is that we are part of a larger system of universities and if we want meaningful comparisons we can't be too idiosyncratic.

- Recommendation 2 talks about faculty engaging with research centers – a great idea and we support that in the SOE. However, the report later talks about Schools/Colleges supporting faculty research engagement and development. Please understand that if faculty tie to research centers, given the current split of indirect cost recovery funds, Deans will get less money to support the very activities you ask us to promote for junior faculty members and others to pursue their research.

- Recommendation 2 also talks about differentiated workloads for those who carry greater research activity, perhaps more teaching for those who do not. Great idea, I think most of us try to do this already. I just want to highlight that promoting differentiated workloads would be easier for department chairs if there was more explicit university policy to back us up. We passed a School policy to support this, but chairs still complain about the difficulty to get faculty to buy in. Some sort of explicit statement that puts the power to set faculty workload in the hands of the chairs (or Deans/Directors in smaller units) would go a long way here to help achieve this end.

- Recommendation 3 promotes course releases for faculty heavily engaged in research. A great idea. However, we Deans have been discussing the fact that about 50% of KU's courses are currently taught by non-tenure track faculty members or GTAs. While I definitely support the idea the committee suggested, just know that doing this has effects elsewhere in the university and would likely place strong researchers in fewer classes. Does this fit with the notion to graduate more students in four years?

- Has the idea of figuring out a better way for faculty to get overload pay for grants been pursued? I realize that the feds have pretty strict regs on this matter, and know we have set some policies in place. I just wonder if we could do more to incentivize faculty getting grants.

- Finally, the issue of not having Associate Profs serve as chairs to get them moving towards Full Professor is a good idea. That said, if the Associate profs aren't to do the heavy service and administrative loads, and if the Full professors are to be released to do more research and grant work, who will do the hard work of making the university run?? The thought is a great one – the reality muffles it a bit and needs some careful thought as to how best to propose what you want to accomplish without undercutting the operation of departments.

Hope these ramblings help. You are on to some very good ideas here.

Rick Ginsberg
Dean, School of Education

Additional Feedback for Leslie Heckert

With respect to #s 2 & 3, I think it would be more effective if those charged with enhancing, promoting .etc... research were required to first specify what actions were to be taken and how success will be measured - followed, of course, with outcomes. This will provide useful efficacy measures, guide improvements, and target changes/termination for ineffective strategies that ultimately waste time and money. I think that the database could be constructed to hold measurements of implemented plans. For example, core usage. It would be incredibly valuable to have information on how many times an individual uses a particular core within the same database, as discussed in the meeting. Then, if you want to see how much use and how engaged individuals are with respect to a particular core or other program parameter, usage can be determined. This gives both a measure of research engagement for the individual and a measure of how much the core is used. Then, if you tie this into productivity measures (i.e. new grants, publications _ for KUMC, anyway), then you get a more comprehensive view of how the core enhances research.

Lastly, I know this is not in our charge (at least I don't think it was), but it would be nice to have an indication as to what might be done should there be a deficit in research engagement. I am thinking, in particular, of the clinical departments. There is such a high demand on clinical service that it prevents most from engaging in any meaningful research. Ideally, the research engagement information would be used to help free up time for clinician's to engage in research. However, that has been a long ongoing battle with little progress and I don't see it changing. My fear is that the concepts we have put down will be misconstrued in order for deficient departments to meet some designated research engagement requirement, ultimately defeating the reason for doing this in the first place.

I am writing to comment on the research Engagement Task Force recommendations.

I like the document very much. It points out the expectations of faculty at a research university as opposed to a liberal arts college, that they actively engage in research and strive for research excellence.

I like these things about the document in particular:

1) The document acknowledges that some faculty become disengaged from research and have no practical chance of restarting a high-level research enterprise. The suggestion that these faculty contribute through increased teaching and service responsibilities is an excellent solution. This would help research-active faculty spend more time on research, would give research-inactive faculty a vital role in the department and university, and would utilize the talents of all faculty.

2) The idea that all faculty, regardless of department, discipline, or school, are expected to engage in active research and pursue external funding is key to a top-notch research university.

3) I am pleased that the committee acknowledged that the pursuit and winning of external funding is more than a "facilitative" activity. It is often said that some disciplines (e.g. sciences) require more money to do research than others, and therefore grant getting simply facilitates their work. While true in a limited sense, many scientists would be able to do research with a bit of supply money (GRFs) and graduate teaching assistants. However, in order to pursue high level, cutting edge, excellence in research, external funding is indeed required. This is likely true outside of the sciences as well. External funding is the ultimate peer review by your colleagues, and as a peer-reviewed creative act is unparalleled. External funding allows students to be GRAs instead of GTAs, allows one to pursue cutting edge equipment and technologies, and allows one to mentor post-doctoral scholars. It also allows professors to be paid for working during the summer, allows them to take research intensive breaks from teaching (e.g. fellowships), and facilitates year-long sabbaticals. Therefore, external funding is more than simply facilitative. It represents striving for excellence in research, whether in the sciences, social sciences, or humanities. As faculty at a research university, all faculty, regardless of discipline, should pursue excellence in their research and not "settle" for what is easy and readily available. The latter is a recipe for mediocrity.

Thanks again for putting this document together. I like it very much.

Erik A. Lundquist, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Molecular Biosciences

I appreciate the work that must have gone into the draft report. Recommendation #2 is fine. Recommendation #3 does not appear to acknowledge that most disciplines on campus have little or no access to external grants. I view recommendation #1 as undesirable. The implementation of a centralized reporting system will place a paperwork burden on faculty members in departments, schools, and the college that will not be offset by commensurate benefits to those faculty members. It is difficult for me to imagine how (or why) anyone in central administration would attempt to compare the productivity of KU professors of music versus physics. Measures of research engagement should be identified, and records kept, at the department level, and consolidated at the school or college levels. Copies of those records could be supplied annually to the central administration.

Michael Ettredge
School of Business

After attending the KUMC 9 a.m. session I have a few comments. First, let me state that I am open to and positive about the task force recommendations and believe the trick is always in the implementation.

With respect to gathering research data on an annual basis:

It seems difficult to evaluate anyone's level of "research engagement" without looking at the full picture of their teaching and university/national service. Certainly the annual department assessments take these into account. So again, there either needs to be substantial duplication of what the departments are currently doing or we will still need multiple annual assessments. One minor point: I would also like to note that invited talks at conferences and invitations to present seminars consumes a considerable amount of research faculty time, and should be part of the data gathered on an annual basis. The task force is correct that there are many forms of research productivity. Some of it not as obvious - such as trying to gain a national reputation, establish an identify to a potential manuscript or grant reviewer, or meet someone to forge a new research collaboration.

With respect to identifying barriers to research engagement:

The relationship between gathering the annual data and the goals of identifying research hurdles/barriers is difficult for me to see. I have grants and publications - but they don't reflect my goals for future research, nor collaborations that are in an early stage. As pointed out in the questioning, the metrics also will not reflect what each of us, as PIs, has implemented to overcome barriers. For example, I have a full time systems analyst and my own data server (with over 20 terabytes of image data) and can not expect any substantial level of help from university IT. They would be overwhelmed with my data management needs. These costs are only possible because of funding from a private research foundation that basically "subsidizes" my NIH funded work. There is no way to know this type of barrier by looking at data. My fear is that someone will be looking over my data and then come to me with a plan of action to help my research program. Perhaps there are opportunities I am missing - I'm open to learning. However, I would much rather be asked at this point in time, and not 5 years from now, what my barriers are. I can tell you immediately. Perhaps it should be made clear if these 2 recommendations (gathering annual data and identifying barriers) are closely or loosely linked, and what other mechanisms will be in place to identify barriers. Also, the administration should recognize that there are significant barriers to

research that exist that are currently leading to low morale - many related to space. The ongoing problems that accompany trying to perform research adjacent or near construction zones is a large barrier. Lack of transparency in renovations plans/time frames is another. Information technology, bandwidth, and animal care resources are several others.

With respect to the role of the department:

I agree with the comments that the departments have already compiled a vast array of data that could be retroactively used to begin to identify problems. As one person pointed out - there is a widespread feeling that clinical researchers do not have enough time to engage in research. The perception is they are too valuable (at bringing in dollars) in the clinics. We have lost a number of good clinical researchers over the past years. We are not starting from "zero" in that existing perceptions and culture are at play. In addition, a lack of transparency in implementing recent research-related policies have lead, in m opinion, to some disenfranchisement of the basic science chairs. I hope there remains a role for the chairs in developing assessment tools that are actually useful at the department level. I think the role of the chairs in this plan needs to be specifically stated.

With respect to promoting interdisciplinary work:

I am part of a group of PIs that currently performs multidisciplinary work. We have identified other collaborators at other institutions that could likely lead to joint grant submissions. I credit the task force for identifying this as a goal - and again, would like to point out that the PIs in many cases already have multidisciplinary strategies in place and just need financial support to obtain enough preliminary data to submit grant proposals. We can't use existing grant funds in some cases to perform experiments for a NEW proposal. How will information be gathered from PIs to help others help them perform multidisciplinary research?

I appreciate the time and efforts of the task force members and in no way am I negative about improving research engagement. Good luck with your efforts!

Brenda J. Rongish, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, University of Kansas Medical Center

---

I very much enjoyed your report. I look forward to seeing how some of this might get implemented. I did however notice that there were several references to Creative Activity in the document. At the same time, I noticed that there are not a single person on the task force who even works with someone who engages in creativity activity and not traditional research on the panel. As I saw how creative activity was acknowledged, it became clear that the people on this committee, while well-meaning, have no idea what people who engage in creative activity actually do, or how to ever quantify that behavior. I gently suggest that in the very least, you include some traditional academics who work with people who do creative activity, if not some actual artists (musical, visual, or dance) in this conversation.

Christopher M. Johnson
Professor, Music Education & Music Therapy, Director, Music Research Institute

Thank you very much for your wonderful talk this morning related to Chancellor's Research Engagement Task Force. I was very delighted to know about emphasis on research engagement activities within the campus and fully support all endeavors.

I joined KUMC   a year ago to establish, build and strengthen outcome research within the Department of Internal Medicine. Working at the University of Pittsburgh, as a physician and administrator, I gained lot of experience in clinical outcome research and establishing mentoring programs for faculty. Seeing University of Pittsburgh grow in research and mentorship, I used the similar strategies to develop Center for Outcome Research and Education (CORE) with the help of wonderful department team and support of Department Chair, Dr Steven Stites. We established CORE from scratch when nothing really existed in outcome research. Similarly, we also built and strengthened mentoring environment, and still working on it. Making several investments in outcome research, within 10 months, we have put together wonderful training and mentoring programs for our young budding clinician-scientists. The details about mentoring programs, K-12 program, seed awards and "incubator" are provided on our website.
http://www2.kumc.edu/internalmedicine/core/

Incubator is a unique concept of "train the trainers" by providing them exceptional mentorship, research resources that also includes community resources. We have put together a health-disparity community advisory board (CAB) last year in order to partner with our ethnic minority communities and help them towards reducing health disparities. The board consist of more than 8 ethnic groups (African Americans, Jewish, Hindus, Muslims, Hispanics, Vietnamese etc), executives from major regional organizations, health department and many more . We are currently performing more than 5 research projects with the communities that involve training of our faculty, fellows and residents.

All these efforts have been made to accomplish research missions of our institutions.

These research efforts may not serve as role models, however I think these research engagements certainly are step forward towards bringing a culture here and improving health through, training, partnership and collaboration. I believe these goals are also in line with your task force objectives.

Please let me know if I can be of any help to you to provide information on approaches to promote, increase, sustain, and recognize all types of research engagement by the faculty."

Dr. Sunita Dodani MD, MSc, PhD, FAHA
Director, Center for Outcome Research and Education (CORE)
Division Director, Outcome Research, Quality Care and Education &
Associate Professor of Internal Medicine, Preventive Medicine and Health Policy and
Management, School of Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center

---

I agree with previous comments that this is a clear, well-written report and I agree with nearly all of its recommendations. The creation of a system to track research productivity would be especially helpful.

One minor point for your consideration. Under recommendation 1, examples of research engagement include "external grants or attempts to obtain external funding." Some time ago we developed a point system that scores research accomplishments. While it initially included credit

for all grant proposals, whether successful or not, we eventually eliminated credit for unsuccessful attempts. While it might have been important at one time to encourage people to submit, over time it became clear that what we wanted to reward was success, and not simply effort.

This change is one our scientists now support fairly strongly.

Thanks for the opportunity to review and comment, and for all your work on this.

Rex Buchanan

[Acting Director, Kansas Geological Survey]

[Sent to Sara Rosen and forwarded to rgs@ku.edu]

Todd Little provided the following comment concerning the task force recommendations on research engagement. One barrier to research engagement and research productivity is the historical lack of support on this campus for quantitative data analysis. He wanted you to know that the Center for Research Methodology and Data Analysis is designed explicitly to help remove that barrier to research in providing support for data analysis and data presentation to researchers, faculty and graduate students. The establishment of the CRMDA is a good example of the type of initiative that KU can put in place to help remove disincentives to research productivity.

1.Revise the reward system to faculty

Tuition increase is necessary to push KU toward top 25 among public universities.

But some departments have some lazy professors sitting on tenure and do no research.

Squeezing money out of Kansas families and allocating portion of increased revenue for those idlers' pay raises are extremely unfair to all Kansas families, current students and hard-working professors.

KU should revise the reward system or even eliminate tenure to re-emphasize research, not only maintain the pressure for publication but require faculty to subordinate their teaching to the quest for external funding.

2.Raise graduate school admission standards

-Require GRE to all departments

-Set min. GRE/GMATT/LSAT scores for admission.

I just wonder what's going on at Business school. The average GMAT score has dropped dramatically from 620 to 570.

Hiroyuki Kato

[Mr. Kato's e-mail address is jayhawker@hotmail.co.jp. According to the KU Alumni Directory, he is a 1996 graduate with an M.A. degree in economics. As of last December, he was living in Yokohama and working in Tokyo for the Takeda-Kirin Foods Corporation.]

I wanted to send in a quick question/comment about the Research Engagement Task Forces' report. The report doesn't appear to articulate yet a connection (whether in current thinking or future intention) between the identification of measures and "approaches to promote, increase, sustain and recognize all types of research engagement by the faculty" and how that might impact or be impacted by departmental/school (and disciplinary) P& T expectations and criteria. Would these future rubrics will be tied to P&T expectations or would P&T expectations be tied to research engagement measurements? No need to send me a response—I wanted the TF to know that faculty might be wondering this and in future plans or documents that question might be addressed.

L. Ada Emmett
Associate Librarian for Scholarly Communication, University of Kansas Libraries
Center for Digital Scholarship

On February 23, 2010, members of the KU Research Engagement Task Force presented their draft report to the faculty of KUMC. Their three recommendations are exciting and we do hope the chancellor accepts these recommendations. As researchers, we are very happy to have top administrators supporting our research endeavors and feel this will only serve to further strengthen our university.

Regarding the concept of measuring research engagement, we encourage the chancellor to look at research engagement uniquely for each department. We are members of a clinical department and have few faculty who are NIH funded or are involved in typical measures of research engagement on a regular basis. In clinical departments, we would submit that clinically productive faculty members further the research mission by allowing other faculty release time so they can focus on research matters and strengthen research engagement.

We are also concerned about the concept of "evenness" that was presented by Dr. Warren. If we understood correctly, what Dr. Warren proposes is that departments in which, for example, 11 faculty engage in small amounts of research would be seen more favorably than departments in which 2 faculty engage in large amounts of research. From the perspective of a clinical department, we typically have vast amounts of primarily clinical faculty, some faculty who are both clinical and research, and perhaps a few who are primarily research. We believe this is a fundamental feature of clinical departments that cannot be altered if we are to continue to meet both our research and our clinical mission. Therefore, we would like to urge caution when implementing a concept like "evenness" in a medical center, especially in clinical departments.

Finally, as the chancellor moves forward in the next steps of implementing a research engagement plan, we encourage her to continue to have strong representation from researchers in clinical departments as we feel we bring a unique perspective to the table. Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to increased attention to research engagement in our university.

Ann McGrath Davis, PhD, MPH, ABPP
Associate Professor, Pediatrics, KUMC

Michael A. Rapoff, PhD
Ralph L. Smith Professor of Pediatrics, KUMC

I write on behalf of my colleagues at the Spencer Museum of Art. First, we would like to thank you for your thoughtful work investigating best practices for measuring scholarly and creative activities at KU and for sharing the draft report with the KU community. We appreciate the opportunity to contribute comments. KU's support for all types of research engagement is critical to the Spencer Museum's position as a multidisciplinary research center that values a range of scholarly and creative collaborations. The Spencer Museum of Art not only generates creative and scholarly output (for example in the form of exhibitions, publications, international artist residencies), but also important inputs (including a rich and growing collection of art and works of diverse cultural significance that support and inspire research, teaching, and artistic creations across media and disciplines; a variety of external grant funding; graduate student internships; the support and presentation of new research).

We see the following as important for the Spencer Museum to achieve its goals to develop and support risk-taking, scholarly and creative initiatives across disciplines:

-Scholarly recognition for collaborative research and creative projects within the arts and humanities (e.g. support for collaboratively taught classes by faculty from different departments; for multi/interdisciplinary collaborative research; projects/publications that cross disciplinary boundaries from the arts and humanities to the social, physical and biological sciences) - Recognition for artistic production and research-driven exhibitions as forms of high-level (high-impact) scholarship; -Support for faculty research - and teaching - collaborations with Museum staff; for scholarly research and projects with the collections; -Develop methods to value and assess creative forms of thinking and scholarly production across disciplines.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Celka Straughn
Andrew W. Mellon Director of Academic Programs, Spencer Museum of Art