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Introduction

At the request of Paul Maxwell, Randy Keller, Kathy Staudt, and Ann Gates organized a meeting of faculty to discuss the infrastructure that they envision would be present in the year 2014 assuming the university has reached Tier 1 status. The meeting was comprised of faculty researchers from all colleges: Sally Blake (Teacher Education), Russell Chianelli (Chemistry), Yi-Chang Chiu (Civil Engineering), John de Castro (Psychology), Ann Gates (Computer Science), Janice Joplin (Marketing and Management), Randy Keller (Geological Sciences), Ana Macias (Teacher Education), William MacKay (Biological Sciences), Arunkumar Pennathur (Mechanical and Industrial Engineering), Kathy Staudt (Political Science), Joseph Tomaka (School of Nursing), and Patricia Witherspoon (Communication). Sergio Cabrera (Electrical and Computer Engineering) sent comments via e-mail.

General Remarks

UTEP’s goal of becoming a Tier I research institution by 2014 requires a bottom-up approach. Indeed, creative and productive faculty members and their students are key to UTEP meeting this goal. As committees are formed to plan new directions and develop strategic plans, it is imperative that faculty at all levels are included to provide a mix of energy, creativity, experiences from within and outside the institution, and institutional history. It is also necessary to include staff and faculty who are involved in outreach, recruitment of students to undergraduate and graduate programs (in particular in science, engineering, mathematics, and technology areas where there is a national need to broaden participation), and retention and development of students.

This report presents the results of a three-hour discussion and as such presents high-level ideas and thoughts. This report should be viewed as a starting point for further discussion and action.

Results

Prior to the meeting, the attendees were given two documents: Draft 10 of the Organizational Culture and Processes report from the Centennial Research Task Force and the UTMB October 2004 report on organizational assessment of institutional research support activities and business processes at UTEP. The faculty who attended the meeting were asked to look at the year 2014 and, assuming that UTEP is a Tier 1 research institution, state UTEP’s values with respect to research, the organizational culture and processes for research, the research incentive policies, and the organizational structures for research that should be in place. The subsections below report the results for each category.
UTEP’s Research Values

- UTEP values research based on strategic planning, while also recognizing that research activities of the faculty cannot be programmed or limited to any region.
- UTEP recognizes that ultimately our research success should be built on a strong program of recruitment, retention, and advancement of students from our region.
- UTEP places value on people who bring different qualities to the university (with respect to pure research, applied research, teaching, outreach, retention, among others).
- UTEP places high value on staff and administrators who serve faculty and student interests and enable world-class research.
- UTEP values student involvement in research at all levels, and internal resources are provided to facilitate this major effort.
- UTEP’s administration seeks and values the opinions of faculty at all levels in regard to research-related matters.
- UTEP values research cooperation and collaboration on and off campus, and there is a sense among the faculty on campus of being a community of researchers who share ideas and resources.
- UTEP is highly valued as a resource to the nation, state, border region and local community.
- Research is broadly defined and all research successes are celebrated across campus.

Organizational Culture and Processes

- Administrators regularly demonstrate deep knowledge of faculty research accomplishments and of all the demands that are made on the time of faculty members that can detract from their core mission of research and teaching.
- Vehicles for disseminating research activities of faculty are in place, reducing the need for self-promotion and supporting informed opinions.
- A culture is in place in which the opinions of faculty are respected and valued.
- In order to stay in touch with the needs of faculty and students directly, there are administrators who remain 1/2-time faculty that teach and are involved in research.
- The university has funds and other resources that are distributed through an open, competitive process. Panels consisting of research faculty make recommendations at the college and university level. Evaluation is based on established review criteria. Funds and resources are distributed for:
  - Funding to support tenure-track faculty who are establishing a research program.
  - Funding of “incubator” research and spontaneous interdisciplinary research
  - Funding for established research programs that are transitioning between grants.
- Multiple models are in place to facilitate collaboration across colleges and departments. Faculty members are encouraged to establish international connections and exposure.
- Performance evaluation mechanisms are in place to encourage faculty research productivity and effectiveness.


- A high performance environment for facilitating and supporting research is in place (ORSP, accounting, human resources, purchasing, seed and transition funding, etc.).
- A competitive salary structure is in place that helps retain research support staff of all types (ORSP, technical support, accounting, etc.).
- Work policies are efficient and effective, and new policies are not decided until an impact analysis is done that includes faculty input.

**Research Incentive Policies**

- Policies are in place to assure that collaborations with faculty on and off campus are rewarded appropriately through the merit evaluation and promotion and tenure processes.
- There is a policy in place ensuring that all investigators on a grant receive credit in proportion to their contribution to the project, including overhead return. In particular, the administrative need for a project director in collaborative projects does not translate into the director receiving more credit than is appropriate.
- All policies that govern the distribution of indirect cost return are transparent.
- The sharing of return of overhead by co-investigators is governed by a model such as 50% goes to the department(s), which in turn transfers most of the money to the investigator’s research area.
- Funds derived from faculty buy-outs stay in the department to facilitate their support for instructional and research staff.
- Faculty members receive released time to write proposals.
- Counter controls are in place that allow evaluation of administrators and research staff so that there is accountability of performance. This would include a faculty oversight committee consisting of recognized researchers that evaluate the research support structure of the university.

**Organizational Structures**

- Chairs and deans seek opportunities for multi-disciplinary research, facilitate the formation of research teams, and support forums for faculty to discuss research opportunities and directions.
- Infrastructure is in place at the department level to support business administration, information technology, and basic research facility maintenance.
- Infrastructure is in place to facilitate the recruitment and development of students in research.
- Highly qualified research staff and post-docs are employed across campus.
- When a new grant requires establishing infrastructure, there is funding available to support the period between award announcement and the start date. Similarly, there are funds in place to help researchers maintain their research operation during short gaps in funding.
- The administrative and research structure is nimble enough to encourage creative research activities and responses to new research directions.
• Vehicles for disseminating research activities of faculty internally and externally are in place. Announcements provide complete and accurate coverage and celebrate truly significant events.

• An electronic system is in place that aids faculty in discovering common research interests and that supports virtual collaborations (e.g., proposal preparation and refinement by a technical writer).

• Doctoral programs are present in almost all disciplines.