

**Response to the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness
Office of Research Services Task Force Report**

**Lawrence A. Dreyfus, Ph.D., Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development
Summer 2017**

Summary reply to Task Force Report. The Office of Research Services leadership wishes to thank the ORS Task Force (TF) for their thorough efforts in assessing the effectiveness of the Office as it relates to our mission and service role to the campus. Overall, the Task Force report captures many of the challenges that face our operation and presents several useful recommendations aimed at improving operations. The TF lists 7 main findings and recommendations and makes a number of other recommendations throughout the report that will be addressed below. Overall, we believe the report findings and recommendations to be reasonable and helpful and several of them have already been addressed as noted below. Finally, we look forward to implementing additional recommended actions to expand and improve the services provided by the ORS and its affiliated functions.

Response to Main Findings/Recommendations.

1. *The ORS-TF suggests the need for the VCR and Assistant VCR to develop a new Strategic Plan with a clear vision and defined goals to strengthen the UMKC research mission. The TF recommends:*
 - (i) *Defining a clear mission and vision as well as short and long term deliverable goals for the ORS with input from a reorganized and revitalized UMKC Research Advisory Council.*
 - (ii) *Communicating this mission and vision to the UMKC faculty and campus wide.*
 - (iii) *The role and responsibility of the Assistant VCR within the ORS should be clarified.*

Given the budgetary challenges that face UMKC and the UM System over the next several years, we also believe that the time is right to develop a new strategic plan for research. As the Research Advisory Council is reconfigured early in Fall of 2017, the VCR and Assistant VCR (AVCR) will be looking to that group for input. We will also seek guidance from the Research Deans and faculty focus groups from various research sectors of the university.

The position of AVCR was created in 2014 as a “special opportunity position” that taps the unquestionably unique talents of Dr. Anthony Caruso in research areas and expertise that are highly sought after by funding entities within the Department of Defense. In creating this part-time role (a 35% appointment) for Dr. Caruso, UMKC leverages Dr. Caruso’s research talent, his connections to the Naval Research Laboratory, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and selected Federal Congressional staff personnel to advance new opportunities for UMKC researchers. In addition, Dr. Caruso maintains excellent professional connections with local research entities such as Honeywell and MRI_Global that help to open doors for other UMKC faculty members. Dr. Caruso was instrumental in helping to draft, develop and execute an MOA with Honeywell that will serve as a research faculty exchange program as well as a means to help guide curricular development that serves the vast scientific and

engineering workforce needs of Honeywell. Other initiatives are in progress. In addition to his 35% time with ORS, a portion of Dr. Caruso's time (25%) is supported by the School of Computing and Engineering where he serves as the Associate Dean for Research. Much of Dr. Caruso's time with SCE is devoted to mentoring faculty, reviewing proposal white papers, helping junior faculty prepare for NSF career award applications and serving as a liaison between faculty members and DoD program officers. The remainder of Dr. Caruso's time (40%) constitutes his faculty appointment in the College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Physics and Astronomy. It is clear that there has been some confusion on the role that Dr. Caruso plays as far as the UMKC research mission is concerned. Perhaps the confusion is heightened by the title "Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research". Other title options could have been considered but due to Dr. Caruso's activities in Washington, D.C. with individuals on Capitol Hill as well as in the Pentagon, we believe the title is appropriate. I hope this explanation helps to quell any concerns. Dr. Caruso's efforts and successes in his role have not gone unnoticed by former VP for Research, Economic Development and Academic Affairs, Hank Foley, current interim VP for RED&AA, Bob Schwartz and President Choi, all of whom (were) and are enthusiastically supportive of Dr. Caruso's efforts.

2. *The TF has found a lack of institutional support for the ORS. All other comparable institutions that were examined provide institutional support for their research support offices. The TF finds the current model, whereby the ORS at UMKC is supported by indirect funding alone, to be untenable and feels that institutional support for the ORS is a critical factor for continued development of the UMKC research mission. Therefore, the TF recommends:*

- (i) The ORS budget should be funded directly from the state funds general revenue allocation (GRA) to ensure sustainment and future development of research and scholarly activity.*
- (ii) The goal should be for the GRA funds to at least cover the budgeted salaries of the ORS staff members (\$1.5 million).*
- (iii) ORS indirect dollars should not be used to support the UMKC Environmental Health and Safety Office. Instead, this office should be supported by the institution.*

The leadership of the ORS agrees completely with the TF on this point. In order to execute programs and provide the support necessary to promote research excellence (i.e. core facility technical support, support for equipment purchases and maintenance, grant writing workshops, cost-share on grant applications, strategic funding to help retain our top research faculty, etc.), the ORS requires a solid general revenue allocation base to support staff compensation. In 2013, we looked into the funding for research administration offices of approximately 20 universities having significant research operations and not a single

institution funded research services solely from indirect cost recovery (F&A). Thus, UMKC is the only UM System campus that funds research operations in this manner. A rational approach would be to cover staff compensation by GRA (I believe this is what the TF had in mind rather than salaries, since salary is only approximately 74% of personnel costs). In addition, as the TF recommends, 50% of the F&A should come to ORS to be used for operating costs as well as strategic investment funding (i.e. items such as those mentioned above). Environmental Health and Safety should be funded by other means rather than F&A. Annual compensation for ORS staff members is approximately \$2.3 M.

3. *The TF has found a need for improved communication between ORS and researchers. Therefore, the TF recommends:*

- (i) Restructuring the UMKC-Research Advisory Council by appointing or electing a Chair other than the VCR.*
- (ii) Redesigning and simplifying the UMKC-ORS website to make it more user friendly.*
- (iii) Developing a database with information on existing research expertise at UMKC.*
- (iv) Streamlining the Listserv e-mails so that they provide only relevant funding opportunities to the investigators, suited to their specific area of research.*
- (v) The VCR and ORS staff should respond to e-mails in a timely manner.*

We are in agreement that additional means of communication between ORS and the campus are necessary. The TF had much to say about the Research Advisory Council and seemed to conclude, without much supportive evidence, that the RAC has not functioned as it was originally intended. As a bit of background on the RAC, when VCR Dreyfus was appointed to that position in 2013, there was no research-focused committee on campus. The only research-related committee was a regular meeting of the previous VCR (Bonewald) with the Associate Deans for Research from the Life and Health Sciences academic units. Thus, the RAC was formed in the Fall of 2013 to fill the gap in the absence of any person-to-person information flow between the ORS and the campus. The TF suggested that the RAC met irregularly, but the minutes of the RAC, posted online, do not bear this out. The RAC meetings are scheduled for the first Monday of the month for the academic year. As such, there are only 7 months of the academic year that the RAC could meet following this template (September, October, November, December, February, March, April, and May). This schedule was adhered to as much as possible or as much as was necessary (there were times when VCR Dreyfus was traveling on University business, and times when there simply was not sufficient material to cover during a meeting). Though the intent of the RAC was to disseminate information regarding research and to receive feedback on policies and issues that faculty needed addressed or needed help with, the VCR regularly requested agenda items from the RAC membership. Only twice in 4 years was there a request from the RAC membership for a specific agenda item. There is no disagreement that a reconfiguration of the RAC with a stronger faculty focus could yield a positive outcome. To this end, as of May 2017, the RAC was notified that it would be reconfigured with a

faculty Chair. The VCR and other members of the ORS will be available for input and to provide information as requested (See more on this below).

As additional means of information dissemination, the VCR will continue to meet on a regular basis with the Associate Deans for Research. Historically, these have been productive meetings since it often addresses specific issues pertaining to pre- and post-award policies and practices, new federal guidelines that impact grants management, research involving human subjects and experimental animals, new UM System policies and programs, etc. The Research Deans are typically very good at relaying information to their respective faculty members.

We agree that the ORS Web site needs updating. The web site suffers from having been appended time and time again over a number of years and as a result, the site is bulky, illogical in its navigation and, as a result, items are difficult to find. Thus, we will be looking into reconstructing the ORS web page. This project will be part of the reconstruction of the Provost's web page that has already begun.

An inventory of all significant UMKC research assets is nearly complete and will be prominently posted on our new web site. There already exists a Research Facilities site on the web page. Better web site design and organization would help to make this spot more visible. (<http://ors.umkc.edu/research-facilities>)

This spring the ORS launched an electronic newsletter ([Research News](#)) that is distributed to the entire campus via email on what will be a bimonthly schedule. Two editions of the newsletter have already been released. The editions are stored on a blog post for reference. The objective is to provide news on upcoming items of interest, expose the campus to core facility and research resources, spotlight research Centers and Institutes, and to introduce ORS staff members to the campus.

4. *The TF has noted a need for more aggressive efforts for fundraising to support the research mission of UMKC. The TF recommends:*
 - (i) *Inclusion of a research focus in the Capital Campaign drive to support core research facilities (for example neuroimaging, proteomics, confocal imaging, and metabolomics centers), matching funds for student researchers and endowed chair positions.*
 - (ii) *More aggressive efforts to raise philanthropic support for research equipment, endowed chairs, research scholarships, etc.*

The VCR is in complete agreement with these recommendations. Steven Norris, President of the UMKC Foundation is fully aware of the need to include research-related fundraising as part of the UMKC Capital Campaign. Dr. Dreyfus and President Norris have met on a number of occasions to discuss logistics and needs. One of the outcomes

of this was the recent (April, 2017) creation of the UMKC Research Foundation, a 501(c)(3) Missouri nonprofit organization that will serve as the research-related capital funding entity of UMKC Foundation. Dr. Dreyfus and President Norris are both members of the Research Foundation Board.

With the formation of the Research Foundation, Dr. Dreyfus and President Norris will be meeting regularly to discuss and implement new fund raising strategies for research. On July 28, Dr. Dreyfus and Maureen Hannoun, Director of Sponsored Programs met with the Development Office Staff at their Summer meeting to introduce the Development Office personnel to the operations and function of the ORS as well as a presentation on the annual summary of sponsored programs and intellectual property activity.

Some recent discussions with the Foundation on research fundraising have centered on the identification of thematic areas for investment requests as well as the preparation of high quality “visual” materials to support local and regional awareness of UMKC research activity (i.e. materials such as *Explore* magazine tailored to specific research activity areas).

5. *The TF suggests a stronger faculty recruitment and retention plan. The TF recommends:*

- (i) *Development of a pool of funds for faculty retention.*
- (ii) *Clustered recruitment across different academic units targeted to research themes in areas of existing excellence or areas where UMKC can be internationally recognized.*

The ORS completely agrees with this objective. Recruitment and retention is one of the prominent features of the current Research and Economic Development Strategic plan. As with all items on the Research Strategic Plan, however, partnership with the Deans and direction from the Provost and Chancellor are necessary to accomplish this objective. The VCR and the ORS have no authority for hiring or executing retention strategies outside of collaboration with the Deans and/or Provost. One recommendation would be to build incentives into cluster hiring around research themes. A plan for recruitment and retention is in the ORS Strategic Plan that was provided to the TF as part of the information requested by that group.

6. *The TF has noted a lack of internal administrative support for submission and administration of grants in certain academic units, for example the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty in other units with internal grants support personnel have fewer problems with the ORS, as the applications tend to be better prepared before they go to ORS and grant spending is tracked better. The TF recommends:*

- (i) *Evaluating whether internal administrative support for grants should be instituted in all the academic units or whether this should be an ORS responsibility for certain units (e.g. College of Arts and Sciences).*
- (ii) *If this is the responsibility of ORS, there is a need to enhance communication to faculty about available support services, deadlines, etc. and to ensure that optimal help is available to researchers for grant preparation.*

The ORS/VCR agree that better coordination between the academic units and the ORS on research administrative support is needed (pre-award activities, in particular). Research administrative support within the academic units is varied across the campus and though there is an absolute necessity for staff support with specialized training to conduct a set of (predominantly pre-award) functions within the units, the individuals conducting these tasks have several unit administrative functions many of which are unrelated to research award activity. The College presents an especially difficult situation with 18 departments, not all of which are engaged in sponsored research activity and thus departments are often left to hire their own research administrative personnel to conduct the necessary functions.

We believe a better model (in particular for the College) would be to consolidate the research administrative functions performed on a part-time basis (presently) by two or three individuals into 1-2 FTE that will be housed within the College but trained and coordinated by ORS Staff members. These individuals will essentially be ORS staff functioning within the College. Funding for the position(s) can be split between the College and the ORS. Similar arrangements can be made with other units currently without significant internal support (i.e. SCE, SBS, N&HS, etc.)

7. *The TF considers the UMKC indirect cost return (also known as research incentive funds, RIF), to be an important incentive to promote research efforts by faculty at UMKC. However, recent discussions of a possible change in this mechanism has concerned extramurally funded faculty who see this as a critical incentive. The TF has also noted a discrepancy across schools in how RIF funds are distributed. Therefore, the TF recommends:*
- (i) *That 50% of the indirects should continue to be returned to the School that generated the funding. The other 50% of indirects should continue to be allocated to ORS.*
 - (ii) *For the 50% of total indirects returned to the School that generated the funding, 60% (30% of the total indirects) should be distributed to the principal investigator's RIF account and 40% (20% of the total indirects) should be distributed to the School/Department.*

- (iii) *That RIF account expenses should be formally monitored by ORS to ensure that funds are spent on only research or related scholarly activities in accordance with federal requirements regarding indirect costs.*

The use of indirect cost recovery (Facilities and Administrative cost recovery; F&A) to support and incentivize research is an important funding stream for all institutions. The UMKC policy that returns 50% of the F&A to the academic units is completely unique and though over 25 years old, is still a forward-thinking policy. To function properly however, there must be an institutional agreement on how the returned F&A is invested in support of research operations and over what time period. In addition, this presupposes that Research Administration is already fully funded to conduct all necessary research administration functions, and to support the research effort by way of grant writing support, core facility support, pilot grant project support, bridge funding, etc. At present, this is not the case.

Moreover, the federal government insists that F&A is provided to the institution as a whole and not intended to be associated with any one particular project, but rather issued to universities to provide means to conduct the administrative and facility support aspects of research. Allocating 50% of the F&A to units and then to faculty through whose grant expenditure activity the F&A was generated, though a progressive and highly coveted policy, sends the unintended message to the units and faculty members that the F&A is “theirs”. F&A is intended to support the overall research mission and thus the “greater good” of the institution.

It is the opinion of the VCR that the policy to return 50% of the F&A to the academic units is a powerful incentive that should not be changed. This policy, if managed properly, can serve as a lever to promote additional research activity and external awards. Execution of this policy, however, should not be at the expense of the research administrative services (the ORS). At present, the ORS is underfunded, operating at a deficit on 40% of the total F&A, thus with insufficient funding to deliver the necessary services and support that the campus wants and needs. Under the current funding mechanism this occurs while F&A, in some cases, accumulates in faculty RIF accounts within academic units, remaining unspent sometimes for a number of years.

Regarding the allocation and responsible management of F&A the VCR recommends that:

- The F&A distribution policy be changed to allocate 50% to the academic units and 50% to ORS. Environmental Health and Safety should be funded from the general revenue allocation process.
- Within the academic units receiving F&A, F&A should be split 50/50 between the Dean and the faculty member whose sponsored activity generated the overhead. Thus, the Dean and the faculty member would each be receiving 25% of the total

- F&A (splits among multiple faculty or multiple units would be assigned during the pre-award process as presently done).
- F&A expenditures should be strictly controlled and allowed only for the support or execution of research according to a policy to be developed by the VCR in conjunction with the newly configured Research Advisory Council and the Associate Deans for Research and approved by the Provost and Chancellor.
 - This presupposes that the ORS is fully funded by a mix of F&A and general revenue allocation. Funding for the ORS should include:
 - General Revenue Allocation support for staff compensation (~\$2.5 M/year)
 - 50% of the total F&A
 - Additional cost management allocation strategies should also be considered, such as funding certain ORS functions off the top of the F&A recovery (i.e. a set subsidy for core facility support such as, the Lab Animal Research Center, the Mass Spectrometry Facility, and the Confocal Microscopy Facility; etc.). An off the top allocation of \$500,000 would cover all of these functions while reducing the LARC user fees to their lowest levels ever.
 - F&A allocations into RIF accounts should come with timelines for expenditure. F&A as allocated by the federal government is specifically for research activity that generated the administrative support. Thus, there should be an expectation that the allocation is spent towards elevating or expanding the activity, or moving into related research areas in a timely manner (i.e. no more than 2 years post close of the award that generated the funds).

Other issues raised by the TF

The UMKC-ORS staff strength is fairly comparable to other institutions (data provided by UMKC-ORS), but it appears to be a little on the higher side. For example, University of Missouri Columbia administers more than \$37 million in federal funding but the personnel costs seem to be proportionately lower. The University of Kansas Medical Center research office supports about \$61 million in federal funding with approximately 75 personnel whereas UMKC ORS supports about \$11 million federal funding with 32 personnel.

These types of comparisons are difficult to make due to differences in how various offices are structured and how staff members are reported. Thus, attempts at making comparisons can be misleading. For instance, the 32 FTE referenced by the TF represents every individual listed on the Research and Economic Development organizational chart. This chart lists not only those individuals that manage and support research applications and awards, but also the Directors of the IHD, the Innovation Center, Technology Commercialization and all of the Lab Animal Resource Center staff

(13 FTE). It is doubtful that the MU and KUMC research administration staff numbers include these types of positions. In fact, I am certain that they do not.

Moreover, to *only* consider federal funding awards or expenditures in this *calculation* is also misleading since our total expenditures are approximately \$33M, generated from >230 awards and >400 proposal submissions, annually.

Taking all of this into consideration, we employ 17 FTE that have some measure of responsibility for research awards administration. This number includes, pre-award staff (3 FTE), post-award staff (5 FTE), research compliance staff (5 FTE), fiscal and office management (1 FTE), sponsored programs management (1 FTE), executive staff (1 FTE), VC for R&ED, (1 FTE). Given these numbers, it is doubtful that you will find a research administration office that operates (considerably) more efficiently than the UMKC ORS.

The UMKC RAC was formed in 2013 and charged with an advisory role to the Provost and the Chancellor on matters relating to research and scholarship at UMKC. Membership includes one elected faculty member from each academic unit and representation from sub-disciplines in the College of Arts and Sciences. There is also one member from the UMKC Libraries, Faculty Senate, UMKC Staff Council and UMKC graduate student body. Ex Officio membership includes the Provost, VCR and Associate VCR, Associate VC of Finance and Administration, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Director of Research Compliance, Director of the Office of Technology Commercialization and Director of Sponsored Programs Administration. In addition, Research Deans and Directors from each academic unit are invited to participate in meetings. The committee's role is to develop the mission, vision and goals for research at UMKC, develop strategies for increasing research opportunities and funding at UMKC, review/develop policies and procedures that impact research at UMKC to improve administrative efficiencies, support graduate and undergraduate research activities and provide a reviewer pool for internal grants. The RAC has the potential to be a very effective mechanism for faculty input and a means to provide recommendations to the Provost, Chancellor and VCR from the user perspective and from the perspective of individuals who are knowledgeable about state-of-the-art research in their fields. However, the perception is that this committee is dysfunctional in its current format. Meetings are frequently cancelled (for example there were only 4 meetings in 2015 and 5 meetings in 2016) and members feel that the committee does not achieve much forward progress. The VCR chairs this council and sets the agenda for the meeting and there is no general solicitation before the meetings for agenda items to be added. The perception is that decisions have mostly already been made and are being presented to the council more as an informational exercise rather than seeking active input. Even when the UMKC RAC does provide advice, it is often ignored, causing many members of the UMKC RAC to question its utility. Because of this, attendance at meetings by UMKC RAC members is low. The UMKC RAC mostly focuses discussions on issues related to Life Sciences research and there is a need to be more inclusive of other research (e.g. Arts and Humanities).

Survey and interview responses indicated that a large number of research faculty at UMKC are unaware of the existence of the UMKC RAC and do not know who their representative is. Although

it is stated that the committee includes elected members from each unit, many faculty members are not aware of these elections having taken place.

We are in agreement that the RAC has the potential to be an effective committee to voice recommendations to the VC, the Provost and the Chancellor on all matters pertaining to research. As noted above, prior to the formation of the RAC in 2013 there was no such committee on campus and much of the first 2 years of the existence RAC was spent in dealing with acute matters that had not been considered, i.e., the lack of research funding for faculty (Funding For Excellence), the absence of any format or forum for faculty to showcase research (Annual Research Symposium), the absence of any formal annual reporting of research data (Annual Report), the absence of a quality visual to showcase outstanding research activity by our faculty (*Explore*).

Regarding the number and scheduling of meetings, the RAC meets the first Monday of the month during the academic year. Thus, scheduled meetings are in the months of September, October, November, December, February, March, April, and May. If the result of the standing Outlook calendar invitation is such that a number of members or the VC and Assistant VC are unable to attend, the meeting is cancelled. After 2013, the first year of the RAC, there was not a year when the committee met less than 5 times and aside from that year there was only one additional year that the committee met less than 6 times.

Can the RAC “do” and “be” more? Certainly! But, to characterize the RAC as “*dysfunctional*”, I believe, (and I would argue that a majority of RAC and Associate Research Deans would agree) is a gross misrepresentation of fact. I believe the minutes of the RAC as well as consultation with RAC members and the Associate Deans for Research will support this opinion.

A major concern expressed by several investigators is that the University does not invest in a full-time Veterinarian to oversee the UMKC animal facility. This is not a criticism of the current Veterinarian, but of the lack of institutional support for the facility. Having a full-time Veterinarian would enhance the operations of the facility and the IACUC review process and the Veterinarian could be included as a co-Investigator on grants, which might enhance grant competitiveness.

The overwhelming opinion of the LARC leadership team and the VC is that the current arrangement whereby we share the services of Lon Dixon with the Columbia campus is more than sufficient for the scope and scale of our facility. Since we only house rats and mice in the LARC (we have approved rabbit protocols, but rabbits have not been used for 5 years), it is difficult to justify the financial burden that a full-time veterinarian would carry (approximately \$150,000 total annual compensation). Lon Dixon is available on short notice to travel to KC for IACUC meetings, AAALAC (and other) accreditation visits, etc. In addition, there is nothing that would prevent Lon from serving a co-investigator on a grant to potentially improve the competitiveness of the application.

The lack of a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) approved surgical suite is viewed a major deficiency in our LARC that limits research and may have implications for hiring of top quality research faculty. If their research requires surgical procedures on USDA species and larger animals, they would have to find an alternative location for this research, which may discourage them from coming here.

A USDA-approved surgical suite would be necessary if we were to house USDA-regulated animals, which we currently do not. Thus, the present surgical space is sufficient to conduct surgery on rodents. The concept of expanding and upgrading the current LARC is a potential strategy for faculty recruitment, but like all recruitment strategies, a cost-benefit consideration must be carefully assessed.

There was a consensus that a deficiency at UMKC compared to other institutions is that there is not much support for research Cores (e.g. proteomics, imaging, gene profiling, transgenic/CRISPR). These have tended to be set up by individual investigators willing to invest the time and commitment rather than the Institution making them a priority. The VCR has been generally supportive when these opportunities have been initiated, but with the current financial constraints on the ORS, his ability to support these initiatives has been limited. UMKC has therefore fallen behind other institutions that can offer these core facilities and resources to their investigators. This puts us at a competitive disadvantage for recruitment and retention of faculty as well as competing for extramural grant funds. One of the few things UMKC has that may serve as an incentive for retention and recruitment of investigators is the RIF distribution but there has been talk at ORS of reducing the RIF distribution to investigators. The TF feels that this would be catastrophic and would likely lead to an additional exodus of funded investigators, as UMKC currently offers few advantages over other institutions without these RIF funds coming back to the investigator.

We agree in completely that UMKC must increase our investment in research infrastructure. As the TF mentioned, we are fully supportive of growing additional core facilities, we but we are stretched beyond our financial means to do this. A complete restructuring of the ORS budget including providing GRA for compensation, and a greater portion of F&A (50% versus the current 40%) are good starting measures to allow us to support additional facilities, including those mentioned by the TF (above) in a meaningful manner. The simple budgetary change would provide nearly \$1 M per year to be spent on core facilities and research infrastructure. If we are to improve our research expenditure output, we must invest at least this amount on money on an annual basis to promote and support research. In addition to increasing the output of our current faculty, these steps will help us recruit and retain outstanding research faculty members, the key ingredient to greater research productivity.

Recommendations from the Task Force related to Other Findings

The institution should prioritize support (in the form of dollars) for research and research infrastructure and make it a priority to provide funding support for graduate students.

The ORS agrees with this suggestion. There should be a central source of money to support infrastructure including graduate students. However, a portion of this support should come from the F&A that is returned to the campus, perhaps in an “off the top” support mechanism as recommended above.

The ORS together with the institution should develop initiatives and provide support for the establishment of core facilities comparable to those at other institutions (e.g. proteomics, imaging, gene profiling, transgenic, etc.).

There is no disagreement with this notion (See budget recommendation above).

The institution should hire one or more full time grant writing specialists who could liaise with grant applicants and help improve the quality of grant submissions. These individuals would likely “pay for themselves” if they are able to increase the success rate of grant applications.

The ORS agrees with the suggestion of recruiting at least one or more full-time grant writers. This would be possible under the budget recommendation that we make (above).

Mechanisms need to be instituted campus wide to enable promotion of “rising stars” to faculty level positions, such as Research Assistant Professor, that make them eligible to be PIs on extramural grants. Some Universities have positions such as Instructor, Faculty Associate, that fulfill this. These generally do not cost the University as they are grant supported.

Under current regulation, Research-track NTT faculty **ARE** eligible to serve as PIs on extramural awards. We have faculty in various units already engaged in this practice.

The Institution should better disseminate information to researchers about resources available in the Center for Health Insights.

We have made several attempts to spotlight the CHI via various modes such as a feature story in Explore Volume 2, 2 press releases in the last 2 years including one on the acquisition of the Health Facts Data set from the Cerner Corp., an information piece in one of the recent ORS Newsletters, a UMatters feature story last Fall on the Health Facts Boot Camp that was offered during the Spring of 2017; several emails announcing the Health Facts Boot Camp; and information on the CHI, the Health Facts Data set acquisition, and the pending Health Facts Boot Camp last year during at least 3 RAC meetings.

At present, the position of CHI Director is open following the departure of our founding Director, Mark Hoffman, to Children's Mercy Hospital. This presents a serious challenge and threat to the stability and success of the CHI. The VC will be working closely with the Dean of Medicine and the Chair of the Biomedical and Health Informatics Department to ensure that this position is filled as soon as possible. But, this needs to be an institutional priority not only an ORS-supported and promoted Center.

In addition, there will be a second Health Facts Boot Camp during the coming academic year. Look for announcements during the 2017 Fall Semester.

Recommendations from the Task Force on Specific ORS Offices and Committees.

The TF made a number of thoughtful and positive suggestions on various Office and Committee functions. It is the opinion of the VC that these should be discussed with the TF separately. Many of the recommendations are either currently in practice, planned to be executed or are initiatives we have already considered and rejected for various reasons. In addition, we believe it would be useful to clarify these matters with the TF directly.