UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
UWMILWAUKEE

Graduate School

Strategic Planning for Research
• Final Report of Subcommittees
• Assessments and Recommendations

April 29, 2011

Facilitated by

KOHLS GROUP
Consulting, Inc.

Table of Contents **Page**

Executive Summary

Given that sustaining and growing research at UWM—recognizing our mission as a doctoral and urban institution—and enhancing our reputation require better alignment of our current resources and building capacity across and including all units by

- articulating a specific and ambitious mission and vision of where UWM should be as a research campus in the next 5, 10, and 25 years
- increasing support for staff and faculty to grow research agendas
- increasing graduate student stipends and number of graduate student funded positions
- publicizing UWM's research and scholarly contributions to Milwaukee, the state of Wisconsin, and the national and international communities

the Strategic Planning for Research Committee recommends, generally, that UWM work to develop a culture of research on campus, balancing this charge with a call to student access.

To achieve the goals listed above, in the following pages are specific assessments of campus structures as well as recommendations and explanations of terms and processes for achieving the necessary attention to:

- research culture
- funding
- administrative support
- infrastructure
- marketing and public relations
- interdisciplinary research
- equitable distribution of resources to all units, disciplines, and individuals
- valuing the diverse research that occurs across disciplines
- ethics

We trust that our work sets a clear enough platform for careful action, and that this document will be disseminated widely through the appropriate faculty governance and administrative units for development of an implementation plan.

These recommendations are the work products of eight subcommittees consisting of members of the faculty, deans, support staff and members of the campus administrative team. The subcommittees met from

January to April 2011. Each of the committees was given a separate and specific charge in one of eight questions posed by Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development and Dean of the Graduate School, Colin Scanes. Each question appears in the header of each of the following sets of assessments and recommendations.

(Please note that the various subcommittee assessments and recommendations provided in the following pages address the bulleted list of items listed above but do not line up in one-to-one correspondence with them.)

Top Three Recommendations from Each Subcommittee

Subcommittee #1
How do we recognize diversity of research across the University and promote the strengths and reputation of UWM in research and education?

1.   Create a communication plan for more active promotion of all of the University's research successes and accomplishments.
    a.   Create a system for gathering the appropriate information
    b.   Have a transparent process for choosing stories and the ownership of public relations.
    c.   Identify the tools, media and stakeholders we need to work with.
    d.   Tailor all of our messages concerning the value, diversity and strengths and reputation of UWM in research and education to the multiple audiences we need to reach.

2.   Develop a culture that invests in quality faculty.
    a.   The chancellors, vice chancellors and deans should take more responsibility for promoting, advocating, publicizing and supporting the value of our research.
    b.   Create or obtain a balanced set of measures for research that recognizes not only the dollars that research can generate but also the value of scholarship within each discipline's standards.
    c.   Address and solve the issues of salary compression and inversion that adversely impact recruitment and retention and faculty climate, and the diversity of research across campus.
    d.   Hire and support grant writers.
    e.   Develop initiatives to support programs, activities and events to encourage the creation of a community of scholars across disciplines.

3.   The Graduate School should take the lead in articulating a mission to recognize and promote fundamental and applied research, developing a strategy to support that mission and creating synergy among the different units in the implementation of the strategy.

Subcommittee #2
What are the needs for research space, equipment and other critical support infrastructure?

The following recommendations address three categories; space (S), equipment (E), and critical infrastructure support (C).

1.   (C): Funding for e-journals should be increased. Increasing access to journals may be one of the quickest ways to have a direct and positive impact on research growth. Actively pursue models for shared journal access among institutions throughout the state.

2. (C): Create a single help desk, for example the Office of Sponsored Research, to facilitate and coordinate research related administrative activities and answer questions related to pre and post award issues. This could be modeled on the current IT help desk.

3. (S, E): Funding needs to be allocated to develop, operate, maintain and support new core research facilities and shared equipment. There should also be a process by which there are regular and recurring reviews of the types of shared equipment and core facilities needed on campus.

Subcommittee #3
How do we move UWM's Centers of Excellence to the next level?

1. That UWM's existing Centers—and centers—of Excellence be given the support and recognition appropriate for how they enrich campus life and spark innovative research.

    a. Make the system-recognized Centers of Excellence and all productively functioning centers more visible to the campus community and to potential students, collaborators, and funding agencies.

    b. That a process be developed by which all UWM's Centers and centers be evaluated on a regular basis, and that the evaluation be used in decision-making about ongoing support for — or recommendations for the retirement of centers.

    c. Develop, make public, and apply clear criteria for what counts as a center.

    d. Dedicate the work of one person in the Graduate School to the support of Centers and centers.

2. That processes be developed and implemented for supporting and encouraging groups on campus that have potential for performing research that cannot be accomplished by single individuals.

    a. That a process be developed, paralleling the RGI but in support of collaborative and/or interdisciplinary efforts, to support existing research groups and to encourage the development of new potential research groups.

    b. That acknowledgement of the particular needs of Arts, Humanities, and qualitative Social Sciences faculty researchers be folded into any research support plans.

3. That practices and places be developed that encourage both formal and informal discussion and connection-making across departments and divisions so that strong research groups of all sizes can develop and so that existing centers flourish.

    a. That team-teaching—both within departments as well as across departments and divisions—be encouraged, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

    b. That physical spaces be developed on campus where faculty and academic staff can meet and talk formally and informally.

    c. That a culture of idea sharing around the centers be grown on campus.

Please see full subcommittee report document for more detailed explanations and further tactics for each recommendation.

Subcommittee #4
How do we promote multidisciplinary research?

1. Create the structures and mechanisms for the deans and the Graduate School to promote and facilitate multidisciplinary research. The deans and the Graduate School should facilitate the development of a culture of exchange, reciprocal relationships, or inter-departmental or faculty/administration cooperation and understanding. UWM institutes, centers and other groups and their leaders should serve as key facilitators linking together the administration and faculty.

2. Create a seed and bridge funding mechanism for multidisciplinary research.

3. Develop systematic guidelines for drafting inter and intra institutional agreements that clearly articulate the expectations and responsibilities of the partners and participants. These agreements should be based on best practices and be reviewed and evaluated for their effectiveness.

Subcommittee #5
How do we reengineer administrative processes to the needs of a research university?

1. Create effective and efficient administrative processes aligned with the mission of an urban doctoral university with academic access in order to maximize the time researchers do research and minimize the time spent on administrative duties, while maintaining well reasoned approaches to compliance and making compliance guidelines easier to understand and follow. To accomplish these changes the Provost and the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Research should ensure that administrative processes for research are mapped from beginning to end taking into account and involving the following:
    - All stakeholders
    - The desired and required outcomes
    - The ownership of those outcomes:
        - Do they know the desired/required outcome? (Small Picture / Big Picture)
        - Are they accountable?
        - Are they incentivized?
        - Are they supported?
        - Do they have the appropriate tools?
    - Subject experts
    - The reconciliation of administrative processes related to research with other administrative processes on campus
    - Making the process repeatable

2. Administration and leadership in the UWM and UW system should recognize the importance of investing in a system of research that enhances the research mission of an urban doctoral research university. The following positions should communicate the big picture, be accountable, ensure investment (not just dollars), authorize work and allow for change in a system of research:
    - Chancellor
    - Provost
    - Vice Chancellor of Research
    - All Vice Chancellors
    - Deans (colleges and schools)
    - Functional Group Leaders (i.e. Libraries, Physical Plant, Purchasing, Information Systems, Assurance)

3. The office of Sponsored Programs and the associate deans of the Graduate School should create and properly resource a solutions/action team, whenever needed, to respond to identified administrative obstacles and solve them in a specific time frame.

Subcommittee #6
How do we create and improve partnerships with other institutions, businesses, non-profits and government agencies?

1. Support campus efforts to build UWM 's image as a research university by highlighting partnerships and successful partnerships in campus marketing and public relations efforts. Create a marketing message that articulates the value added by successful partnering with UWM.

2. Re-visit the definition of and reward system for research and the continuities and synergies between research and community engagement.

3. Create a permanent university wide council of faculty and academic staff from across the schools and colleges, appointed by campus administration, to facilitate, strengthen and measure the success of University partnerships.

    a. Create the processes, infrastructural systems, and databases for the development and maintenance of research partnerships. Provide common access across the University to an inventory of current research partnerships and offices that are supporting research partnerships.

    b. Evaluate and explore the best practices that have evolved at UWM and have been employed by other universities in their development and maintenance of research partnerships.

    c. Provide models for establishing agreements with partner institutions and develop strategies for reducing barriers to research partnerships.

    d. Engage in professional training programs around our research programs for PI's and teaching-based research for students at all levels as a means of creating more opportunities for partnerships, including exploring and expanding new and not-traditional models for partnerships such as entrepreneurial start-ups, international collaboration and consulting.

    e. Establish metrics for measuring University success in research partnerships.

    f. Showcase research partnerships internally and externally by providing information on successes and highlights to the University marketing function.

Subcommittee #7
What do we need to do with budgets and incentives to meet our research and educational missions?

1. The Chancellor should find additional sources of funding to make graduate student stipends competitive with those of peer graduate programs.

2. Incentives are needed to attract, reward and retain the best researchers. Compensation and start-up packages must be competitive with peer institutions. There should be a means by which faculty

members receive compensation increases commensurate with their eminence, that goes beyond the current merit pay system.

3.   The University should allocate internal funding and pursue external funding for support staff and structures to pursue, administer and manage grants, with an additional focus on large grants.

Subcommittee #8
How do we ensure a culture of ethics, inclusivity and research integrity?

1.   Instill integrity in the University culture. The Chancellor should be the voice of the University in articulating ethical values and culture in the conduct of research. The deans should be the major transmitters for ethical behavior to ensure the beliefs and values of ethical conduct are internalized.

2.   Pull all of the existing codes, regulations and compliance together in a centralized office of compliance and research integrity. Reinforce and align the drivers of cultural change including orientations, training, incentives, and best practices. Work with the appropriate governance groups to ensure a smooth transition to centralization. Create a confidential process for reporting misconduct.

3.   Pursue equity in the distribution of research opportunities. Recognize and reinforce the value of all people and all disciplines while understanding that different research spheres have different metrics and produce different types of gains.

Assessments and Recommendations
UWM Research Subcommittee Complete Reports

SUBCOMMITTEE #1
How do we recognize diversity of research across the University and promote the strengths and reputation of UWM in research and education?

Assessment:

1. The University has top-notch faculty and staff and quality programs but this message and others reflecting the positive image of the University are not making their way to the public.

2. University public relations efforts have had a narrow focus that reflects an inconsistent vision and image and a lack of a shared belief in who we are and who we want to be by the administration and leadership.

3. Given the University's qualities and assets the University's profile is lower and more modest than it needs to be. The University sells itself short which is frustrating to those within the University community. It appears that the public relations effort is not proactively communicating the diversity, strengths, resources and successes of research at UWM.

4. There is a need to actively engage with the public in a discourse on how research is important. The outcomes and broader impact of our research should be more effectively communicated to the public.

5. The University does not currently present the image of status and prestige that is needed to attract top quality researchers. The University needs to be perceived as successful in order to be more successful. There is a large gap between the actual and the potential.

6. In order to move ahead our focus needs to be that we are not competing with each other but with others outside the University.

7. The administration does not allocate resources for faculty development or strategies to foster or advance scholarship or research in a manner that is consistent with its status as a research extensive university.

8. There are doubts as to whether entrepreneurial models are applicable or beneficial to the University and to research. Peer reviewed research in particular disciplines is not part of the entrepreneurial agenda.

9. It is very difficult to enhance and promote research when compensation is not competitive with peer institutions and faculty face compression and inversion of compensation.

10. A lack of a clear research mission combined with changes in leadership have led to mixed messages with regard to research goals and the role of research in the university community.

11. The University culture and practices have not evolved in concert with our research aspirations.

12. The current support structure is insufficient. State funding focuses on teaching and undergraduate degrees, not research. The extramural emphasis for funding is on grant dollars.

Recommendations:

1. Create a communication plan for more active promotion of all of the University's research successes and accomplishments.
   a. Create a system for gathering the appropriate information.
   b. Have a transparent process for choosing stories and the ownership of public relations.
   c. Identify the tools, media and stakeholders we need to work with.
   d. Tailor all of our messages concerning the value, diversity and strengths and reputation of UWM in research and education to the multiple audiences we need to reach.

2. Develop a culture that invests in quality faculty.
   a. The chancellors, vice chancellors and deans should take more responsibility for promoting, advocating, publicizing and supporting the value of our research.
   b. Create or obtain a balanced set of measures for research that recognizes not only the dollars that research can generate but also the value of scholarship within each discipline's standards.
   c. Address and solve the issues of salary compression and inversion that adversely impact recruitment and retention and faculty climate, and the diversity of research across campus.
   d. Hire and support grant writers.
   e. Develop initiatives to support programs, activities and events to encourage the creation of a community of scholars across disciplines.

3. The Graduate School should take the lead in articulating a mission to recognize and promote fundamental and applied research, developing a strategy to support that mission and creating synergy among the different units in the implementation of the strategy.

SUBCOMMITTEE #2
What are the needs for research space, equipment and other critical support infrastructure?

Assessment:

1. UWM does not have sufficient spaces dedicated to research as opposed to other activities. Adequate space would enable the growth of research and facilitate the recruitment and retention of top-notch researchers and donors.

2. The recent campus master plan indicates that UWM may have one of the highest densities of students in the U.S. This density aggravates issues related to the allocation of space available for research at UWM.

3. The lack of adequate space, critical support infrastructure, core facilities and equipment undermine the University's ability to recruit and retain researchers, technicians, post docs, graduate research assistants, faculty and the acquisition of extramural research funding. Aesthetics and image are also important components of attracting and maintaining quality researchers.

4. "Hoteling" space, in which ownership changes with funding, is not a long-term solution to the need for research space. Existing spaces are not adequate for advanced research and retrofitting existing facilities is not a viable option.

5. The methods by which spaces and facilities are currently allocated and controlled by different departments, schools and colleges (deans) are not clear or transparent at the University level. There needs to be a rational internal review process for the allocation or dedication of new or existing space. A process is also needed for reviewing the types of equipment needed by researchers.

6. The lack of facilities, equipment and infrastructure support poses risks for some research programs, especially those involving anatomical or animal tissue and radiation and chemical protocols. These safety issues place limitations on many research directions, growth, access to funding and pose risks to the reputation of the University.

7. The lack of administrative support results in researchers doing administrative work instead of research. The current "dedicated" staff or "shared staff" models are not working well.

8. The current WISDM system inhibits effective research related and accurate grant accounting.

9. Turnover in support staff inhibits productivity.

10. There are issues related to perceived inequities in the allocation of staff support to new vs. existing programs

11. The current library resources for research are insufficient for the needs of researchers.

12. The University does not have a mechanism for acquiring major shared instrumentation on an ongoing basis.

13. The process for the maintenance and support of shared equipment is not well defined. The existing mechanisms for funding equipment are:
    a. Start-up grants
    b. Internally negotiated funds
    c. Extramural grants

14. Not all equipment can be acquired from competitive extramural grants.

15. Parking and intercampus transportation issues adversely impact research as considerable time and energy are invested or wasted in travel and searching for parking space. The current Master Plan does not adequately address these issues.

16. The University is struggling to institutionalize the processes and policies to support the current level of research and scholarship. In particular pre-award and post award support is essential for shared equipment and facilities.

17. Inventory control of research equipment does not serve to inform or facilitate optimal sharing or purchasing of major equipment on a campus-wide basis. Researchers need a means to be aware of the availability of equipment on campus.

18. Restrictive policies and procedures with regard to computer purchasing and support in different schools and colleges are having an adverse impact on research.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations address three categories; space (S), equipment (E), and critical infrastructure support (C).

1. (C): Funding for e-journals should be increased. Increasing access to journals may be one of the quickest ways to have a direct and positive impact on research growth. Actively pursue models for shared journal access among institutions throughout the state.

2. (C): Create a single help desk, for example the Office of Sponsored Research, to facilitate and coordinate research related administrative activities and answer questions related to pre and post award issues. This could be modeled on the current IT help desk.

3. (S, E): Funding needs to be allocated to develop, operate, maintain and support new core research facilities and shared equipment. There should also be a process by which there are regular and recurring reviews of the types of shared equipment and core facilities needed on campus.

4. Since not all equipment can be acquired from extramural grants the University should have a competitive intramural grants mechanism with is externally peer reviewed for the funding and acquisition of shared equipment.

5. (S): The campus master plan addresses many of the needs for research space. However, it needs to be a living document implemented through work groups that reconcile current and future needs with the plan. The working groups need to develop a process which will originate with the research community, for identifying, reviewing and prioritizing the needs for research space and infrastructure and allows the University to take advantage of opportunities to build or enhance research space and infrastructure as opportunities arise.

6. (C): Develop an occupational health program and strengthen the bio-safety program to meet our growing research needs.

7. (C): Replace WISDM with a system which:
    a. Allows for real time monitoring of and reporting on accounts
    b. Reduces the time spent by researchers in accounting functions
    c. Provides for the correction of errors in a timely manner
    d. Has a clear point(s) of contact for problem resolution

8. (C,E): Increase support staff pay and benefits to a level where they are competitive with those of peer institutions and consider creative ways to provide incentives to attract and retain high quality support staff.

9. (C,S,E): Communicate and inform the university community as to the means and processes by which allocations of support staff are made and ensure that the process is transparent.

10. (S,C): Provide designated parking for research participants, collaborators and partners. Further, every new plan for building should assess and address parking issues.

11. (E): A well-defined mechanism that provides for routine and timely maintenance and support of shared equipment should be developed and funded.

12. (C,E): The efficiency and cost benefits to be gained by internal and external collaborative purchasing, licensing and sharing resources for research without the encumbrance of state contracts and regulation needs to be explored.

13. (C): Invest heavily in support personnel and systems for research and scholarship and, in particular, pre and post award support.

14. (C,E): Support infrastructure must work collaboratively with researchers and re-examine restrictive policies and procedures to advance the research agenda, especially in computer purchasing and IT support in different colleges and schools and in administrative support to different colleges and schools.

Appendix:

The following are examples of infrastructure, core facilities and equipment needed on campus. Please refer to recommendation #4 for our suggestion on how to review and prioritize these needs.

1. **Infrastructure** -- The following are examples of critical support infrastructure needed:
   a. Infrastructure to meet the protocols of biological and tissue culture research.
   b. Technicians
   c. Motor pool (vehicles)
   d. Instrument shops, electronics repair shops and the people to run them.
   e. Storage space
   f. Loading docks
   g. Competitive start-up salary packages for technicians, post docs and graduate research assistants.
   h. Grant writing and grant management personnel and support.
   i. Staffing for core facilities listed below.
   j. Maintenance staff for important equipment
   k. Administrative support staff, staff generalists, accounting, billing i.e. Jet.
   l. Auditorium space

2. **Core Facilities --** The following are examples of core facilities needed:
   a. Clean rooms
   b. Genomics/proteomics core facility
   c. Bio-safety core facility (and occupational health or bio-safety officer)
   d. Computer clusters
   e. Adequate terrestrial and aquatic core facilities
   f. Electron microscopy imaging
   g. Crystal structure
   h. Dedicated bio-materials facility
   i. Research vessel, ($20 million)
   j. Libraries and refrigerated storage for degradable or flammable materials
   k. Dark room(s)
   l. Shared wet laboratories
   m. Shared human performance laboratories
   n. Shared gait laboratories
   o. Digital storage and data management
   p. Campus data network
   q. Visualization imaging technology
   r. Larger email storage capacity.
   s. Instructional kitchen for nutritional science

3. **Equipment --** The following are examples of major equipment needed:
   a. Next Gen sequencing
   b. X-ray diffraction
   c. Micro CT scanners

SUBCOMMITTEE #3
How do we move UWM's Centers of Excellence to the next level?

Recommendations:

1. **That UWM's existing Centers—and centers—of Excellence be given the support and recognition appropriate for how they enrich campus life and spark innovative research.**

   ASSESSMENT:

   If one does a search of UWM's website, it is impossible to find any recognition of the existing, Wisconsin System-recognized Centers of Excellence; instead, one finds a list of seventy-plus "Centers, Institutes, Laboratories and Academic Support Areas" (https://www4.uwm.edu/academics/centers.cfm); the nine existing system Centers of Excellence are folded in amongst all the other centers, many of which link to moribund websites or 404 errors.

   Only slow persistence finds the existing Centers of Excellence on this webpage and uncovers the vibrancy and strengths of these Centers (or that one of the Centers no longer exists). Amid the long list of the other varyingly sized groups, there are many with active, ongoing, productive agendas; few on campus, and probably fewer off campus, know of the work of these smaller centers.

   How might UWM celebrate the energetic Centers—and centers—and capitalize on what they bring to campus? How do we portray these various groups to the outside world, to potential students, collaborators, and funding agencies?

   SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

   1a *Make the system-recognized Centers of Excellence and all productively functioning centers more visible to the campus community and to potential students, collaborators, and funding agencies.* Celebrate the contributions of the various centers to campus life. The UWM website needs to be updated and redesigned into an active, interactive, and current means for communicating about and celebrating these centers.

   1b *That a process be developed by which all UWM's Centers and centers be evaluated on a regular basis, and that the evaluation be used in decision-making about ongoing support for — or recommendations for the retirement of centers.* The work of the APBC in 2006-2008 toward an initial evaluation provides both criteria and a process framework that should be followed. This earlier work of the APBC occurred during a time of increased scrutiny of campus resources, in response to budget cuts; there was a desire to avoid redundancy and increase efficiency and clarity of purpose. Nobody really knew how many campus centers existed and there was no comprehensive list; there are governance guidelines for starting centers, but none for evaluating them or closing them down. There was a perceived lack of overall accountability and organization of centers/institutes and a lack of definition. What does it mean to be a center at UWM? How is each unique and whom is it serving? What is the relationship of centers to faculty governance?

   The questions asked by the APBC in 2006-2008 can still be asked today. The evaluation process developed by the APBC enables addressing those important questions and toward recognizing how much the Centers and centers add to campus life.

1c   *Develop, make public, and apply clear criteria for what counts as a center.* In line with all the above, it is clear that we are unclear about the differences among the various groups listed on the "Centers, Institutes, Laboratories, and Academic Support Areas" website. There are UW System Centers of Excellence, UWM Centers of Excellence, and Centers, among other possible labels for research, academic, and service groups on campus. To achieve clear criteria, we first need clarification of the UW system's requirements: If there are no evaluative criteria and there is no process for review and retirement of the system's Centers of Excellence or for other campus centers, then UWM needs to develop and implement such criteria and processes. In parallel, criteria for other groups need to be developed and made public, and used in the developing evaluation process recommended in step 1b.

1d   *Dedicate the work of one person in the Graduate School to the support of Centers and centers.* Centers and centers need to be given support in developing and keeping current their own websites, publishing news about their work through both online and print venues, and, importantly, centers need to be given support for building collaborative relations with similar centers nationally and internationally. This person would also support Center and center directors in navigating other administrative needs, such as finding more space.

2. **That processes be developed and implemented for supporting and encouraging groups on campus that have potential for performing research that cannot be accomplished by single individuals.**

ASSESSMENT:

The Research Growth Initiative provides support for new research by a small number of investigators primarily in the Sciences, Engineering, and the Professions. The RGI has been successful in providing a competitive mechanism by which limited university resources are allocated to potentially high-reward research on campus. However, there are both established and nascent research centers on campus that do or could pursue fruitful long-term research programs and that would benefit from improved allocation of resources. In addition, some of the exploratory research projects started under the RGI should mature into flourishing programs; there is no system of support for sustaining such successful programs.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

2a   *That a process be developed, paralleling the RGI but in support of collaborative and/or interdisciplinary efforts, to support existing research groups and to encourage the development of new potential research groups.* Recognizing that research requires continued investment by the University to start, sustain, and strengthen such activities, the subcommittee recommends that the Graduate School create a competitive program to support research centers at the University.

The program should provide a stable base of support from which centers can establish or enhance the national and international reputation of their research programs. The program should have the following features: Make awards based on proposals submitted to an annual competition; support research centers built around multiple investigators pursuing a common goal; support research in any academic discipline on campus (single discipline and multi-disciplinary centers should be considered equally); support a range of efforts from nascent centers to well established powerhouses; provide support for 3-5 years, since long term support is critically important because center-based research programs often have long-lead times to establish and mature; require annual reports and mid-term evaluation to assess the progress of the center.

Such a process would be, first, responsive to the differing academic, intellectual, and administrative liaisons that ground new research and, second, alert to the differing research and

support needs (including of graduate students) and differences in external funding among the sciences, the arts, and the humanities.

The groups identified through such a process could become centers, according to the criteria we recommend be developed and clarified in recommendation 1, and would then be subject to the specific evaluation criteria recommended in recommendation 1—but such groups also might cease to exist after the completion of specific research projects.

Note that support of a particular center should not be predicated on monetary return on investment, although the program should strive to achieve a 3:1 return on investment when averaged across all supported centers. Centers in engineering, sciences and other well-funded fields might be expected to show a 4:1 ROI while centers in the humanities might show much less.

The Center for Twenty-first Century Studies' development of the "Transdisciplinary Challenges" in 2010 provides one model for how such a program might be approached. This program should continue because of and be acknowledged for the particular encouragement it provides for creative, cutting edge methods for transdisciplinary research.

2b   *That acknowledgement of the particular needs of Arts, Humanities, a qualitative Social Sciences faculty researchers be folded into any research support plans.* Currently, extramural funding for the Arts, Humanities, and qualitative Social Sciences exists in nothing like the amounts available for the Sciences and Engineering (see, for example, http://uodigschol.wordpress.com/2010/03/04/nhadata-shows-decline-in-funding-for-humanities-researchers/ or the summary of Humanities funding listed at http://www.HumanitiesIndicators.org/content/hrcoIV.aspx)—although Arts and Humanities research projects also rarely require the significant funding levels of projects in the Sciences and Engineering—and there is not much incentive for Arts and Humanities faculty to move outside their normal research zones.

Such acknowledgement could include:
➢ Increased support and incentives for faculty in Arts and Humanities to apply for outside funding. Workshops in developing and writing grants for new faculty in Arts and Humanities would not only encourage cross-disciplinary partnerships but would start to develop a culture of grant-seeking in the Arts and Humanities. Support staff in the Graduate School dedicated to Arts and Humanities grant sources and procedures would help change a perception on campus that UWM's attentions are focused on the Sciences and Engineering, and could also help support the culture of grant-seeking mentioned above.

➢ Support for faculty and academic staff to write proposals for funded opportunities (including opportunities with the relatively limited funding typical in Arts, Humanities, and qualitative Social Sciences) in *collaborative interdisciplinary or intra-disciplinary research.* Support could include:

- Course buyouts or 1/9 summer buyouts to support faculty in pursuing proposals for intra- and inter-disciplinary research projects.
- Travel support to meetings at which one can connect with/establish partnerships with potential research collaborators from other research universities.
- Support for purchases of equipment that enable research engagement not possible without that equipment.
- Underwriting of visits by outside artists and scholars who can engage with UWM faculty in intra-, inter-, or multi-disciplinary research undertaking.
- Grad student stipends for research assistance.

➢ Full support for on-going Arts and Humanities research projects given the dearth of outside support for such projects and given their relative low cost. There should be a steady pool of funds and a competitive process for faculty to apply for such support.

➢ Incentives for departments to encourage faculty to pursue funding opportunities that might secure a semester's or a year's leave to do research when successful at the application stage. Typically, deans replace the faculty with ad hoc instructors and bank the differential saved in salary and benefits. Incentivizing approaches to such situations would divide the funds as now happens with federal grants: Give 10% to the dean, 10% to the department (who could use it if they wished to help hire a proper visiting professor at a decent salary), and 10% to the faculty member (who could use it for summer salary or S&E).

3. **That practices and places be developed that encourage both formal and informal discussion and connection-making across departments and divisions so that strong research groups of all sizes can develop and so that existing centers flourish.**

ASSESSMENT:

Existing campus spaces support only the smallest of conferences and there is a dearth of spaces for formal presentations. Each subcommittee member described disappointing turnouts for presentations sponsored by the person's unit; some described the embarrassment of bringing well-known colleagues to campus only to be able to offer poor presentation spaces. There was also discussion of the difficulties—the divisive campus credit-counting formula that tends to mitigate against schools and colleges sharing courses, students, and, ultimately, tuition—involved in setting up interdisciplinary team teaching, the sort of teaching needed to help our students learn the needed abilities to work across disciplines but that also helps faculty develop working relations.

But subcommittee members also described how a chance, informal encounter with a colleague from outside their discipline sparked new ideas or research growth.

These issues only intensify as UWM's campus becomes more geographically broken apart, given the new School of Public Health, Fresh Water Sciences, and the Innovation Park.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS:

3a *That team-teaching—both within departments as well as across departments and divisions—be encouraged, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.* Team teaching not only provides students with the interdisciplinary approaches they need for contemporary work, it also helps faculty develop the working relations and shared projects that grow into the research projects that form the cores of centers.

3b *That physical spaces be developed on campus where faculty and academic staff can meet and talk formally and informally.* Formal presentations of research projects and informal discussions around such work not only help faculty communicate their research but also help faculty meet potential collaborators and gestate research projects. In addition, *a faculty club* would encourage the relaxed sharing of research ideas that so often results in the most forward-looking shared projects and would demonstrate to faculty that the university values their contributions to the institution.

3c *That a culture of idea sharing around the centers be grown on campus.* The richness of centers depends on the dissemination of their research and scholarship. Not only should there be more support for bringing in external researchers and scholars for colloquia at centers at UWM, but

faculty, students, and staff should be regularly encouraged to attend presentations at centers across all units. We therefore recommend that there be an annual, competitive, application process by which centers apply for monies that will enable them to bring speakers to campus for a regular "Second Friday" series sponsored by the Graduate School; speakers will be chosen based on their abilities to appeal across disciplines and schools.

SUBCOMMITTEE #4
How do we promote multidisciplinary research?

Assessment:

1. Committee members cited several attributes that may define the meaning of "multidisciplinary." They include:
    a. Research on problems and issues that are so complex they are not likely to be solved by one discipline.
    b. Research that involves different disciplines or expertise, departments, centers and institutions working together.
    c. Research in which the combined capabilities of the different participants equal more than the sum of the parts.

2. The history of the University has been one in which resources for research have been allocated to support research by a single discipline, department or college. When resources are distributed along departmental lines it is difficult to determine how to support multidisciplinary research.

3. Recognition for research in general is lacking. Inside UWM, multidisciplinary research dilutes the recognition received by researchers.

4. Support structures, funding and infrastructure are insufficient to the enhancement and sustainability of high quality research or multidisciplinary research.

5. Budget cuts undermine support structures necessary for multidisciplinary research. This makes grant and bridge funding critical.

6. Multidisciplinary research is relatively rare at the University. There is little institutional or departmental encouragement to favor multidisciplinary research.

7. The various disciplines, departments and colleges know very little about the assets capacities and skills of others outside of their disciplines.

8. In some disciplines there are risks involved in encouraging and recruiting academic staff and junior faculty to engage in multidisciplinary research.

9. There are cultural differences between departments and disciplines. Some disciplines don't place a high value on multidisciplinary research. In some cases multidisciplinary research might not make sense.

10. There is no process for maintaining or ensuring equity in sharing people involved in joint appointments.

11.   To be successful, multidisciplinary research teams need to be strong enough   across all
       collaborative areas to address the problems they are researching.

Recommendations:

To create an environment in which multidisciplinary research can flourish across departments, schools and
colleges, researchers have to feel enabled, rewarded and incentivized to do multidisciplinary research and
allow it to develop from the research community itself.

1.   Create the structures and mechanisms for the deans and the Graduate School to promote and facilitate
      multidisciplinary research. The deans and the Graduate School should facilitate the development of a
      culture of exchange, reciprocal relationships, or inter-departmental or faculty/administration
      cooperation and understanding. UWM institutes, centers and other groups and their leaders should
      serve as key facilitators linking together the administration and faculty.

2.   Create a seed and bridge funding mechanism for multidisciplinary research.

3.   Develop systematic guidelines for drafting inter and intra institutional agreements that clearly
      articulate the expectations and responsibilities of the partners and participants. These agreements
      should be based on best practices and be reviewed and evaluated for their effectiveness.

4.   Inform the various disciplines, departments and colleges about the assets capacities and skills of
      others outside of their disciplines.

5.   Do more to recognize and celebrate all multidisciplinary success and all of the partners involved in
      those successes.

6.   Evaluate the level of interest in multidisciplinary research by each department and should review
      policies in light of the differences that exist across disciplines, departments, colleges, types of
      appointments, and stages of careers.

7.   Encourage internally and recruit externally to create a climate in which more people will be
      interested in and enabled to do multidisciplinary research.

8.   Encourage the development of multidisciplinary courses, degree programs, and
      graduate/undergraduate multidisciplinary research opportunities.

SUBCOMMITTEE #5
How do we reengineer administrative processes to the needs of a research university?

This committee interprets its overriding goal as being to maximize the time researchers do research and
minimize the time they spend on administrative duties while maintaining a well reasoned approach to
compliance and making intelligent decisions about risk.

Assessment:

1.   There is a need for administration leadership in the UWM and UW system to commit to investing in
      a system of research that enhances the research mission of an urban doctoral research university.

2. All of the people who touch research need to understand their roles in promoting effective, efficient research. In the absence of a clear research mission, administrators/people have maintained a narrow, bureaucratic definition of accomplishing their job responsibilities.

3. The University does not have a practical and effective process or tools for resolving complex problems involving administrative processes that span across different functions. If they do, it is not well known.

4. The most administrative obstacles are to be found in the processes related to grant accounting, human resources, purchasing, travel, payments to participants and, perhaps, physical plant.

5. The solution to reducing administrative hurdles is not about adding more people; it's about streamlining the process to make it more effective and efficient. In doing so there is a need to look at the research process from beginning to end when applying our recommendations with subject experts and stakeholders from all relevant groups and process mapping facilitation experts.

6. The roles of the Research Policy Committee and the Graduate Faculty Committee are not clear regarding administrative processes.

7. Research active faculty need ongoing advocacy, perhaps within the campus Research Policy Committee, to create and sustain change.

8. The Institutional Review Board for Protection of Human Subjects and the pre-award section of the Office of Sponsored Programs may be a source of best practices.

Recommendations:

1. Create effective and efficient administrative processes aligned with the mission of an urban doctoral university with academic access in order to maximize the time researchers do research and minimize the time spent on administrative duties, while maintaining well reasoned approaches to compliance and making compliance guidelines easier to understand and follow. To accomplish these changes the Provost and the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Research should ensure that administrative processes for research are mapped from beginning to end taking into account and involving the following:
    - All stakeholders
    - The desired and required outcomes
    - The ownership of those outcomes:
        - Do they know the desired/required outcome? (Small Picture / Big Picture)
        - Are they accountable?
        - Are they incentivized?
        - Are they supported?
        - Do they have the appropriate tools?
    - Subject experts
    - The reconciliation of administrative processes related to research with other administrative processes on campus
    - Making the process repeatable

2. Administration and leadership in the UWM and UW system should recognize the importance of investing in a system of research that enhances the research mission of an urban doctoral research university. The following positions should communicate the big picture, be accountable, ensure investment (not just dollars), authorize work and allow for change in a system of research:
    - Chancellor

- Provost
- Vice Chancellor of Research
- All Vice Chancellors
- Deans (colleges and schools)
- Functional Group Leaders (i.e. Libraries, Physical Plant, Purchasing, Information Systems, Assurance)

3. The office of Sponsored Programs and the associate deans of the Graduate School should create and properly resource a solutions/action team, whenever needed, to respond to identified administrative obstacles and solve them in a specific time frame.

4. Grant administration accounting should improve. To eliminate cost overruns and unanticipated spend outs the grant accounting system should facilitate the ongoing management of grant accounts.

5. Review the charges of the Research Policy Committee and the Graduate Faculty Committee to determine their roles, if any, as relates to research administrative processes.

6. There is a need for a process by which there is an ongoing review of the administrative processes to:
- Adapt to changes in research (regulations, grant requirements)
- To eliminate "obstacles" when they first appear in the process.

SUBCOMMITTEE #6
How do we create and improve partnerships with other institutions, businesses, non-profits and government agencies?

Assessment:

1. The question is better stated as "How do we create and improve *research* partnerships with other institutions, businesses, non-profits and government agencies?" Research encompasses investigations in all disciplines and various forms of scholarship and creative activity.

2. Effective partnerships create relationships that are productive, positive and sustainable.

3. There are multiple program level partnership models working in the University that can serve to provide best practices for partnerships.

4. There is a need to create greater awareness of opportunities for new and expanded partnerships and where the opportunities for new and expanded partnerships are.

5. Individuals are creating and maintaining current partnerships. The maintenance of partnerships is labor intensive and can benefit from the support that a coordinating council could provide.

6. The University would benefit from having clear and well-defined contact points for inquiries from potential partners.

7. The University should track the success of its partnerships and maintain a history of lessons learned and maintain a history of lessons learned from successful partnerships.

8. There are continuities and synergies between research and community engagement to be explored. The University would benefit from opening a dialogue on the interrelationships between research and community engagement.

9. The University needs to value, recognize and acknowledge the research partnerships that exist and disseminate knowledge about them.

10. The University's current lack of identity and image as a research institution, coupled with minimal marketing around research has an adverse impact on recruiting both partners and students.

11. The University could do a better job of marketing and promoting partnerships.

12. PI's are encountering challenges to maintaining effective partnerships. There is a need for the vice-chancellor of research to identify and address the practical internal and external challenges that impact the efficacy of partnerships at UWM. These obstacles include, as examples, IRB, parking, Facility and Administration agreements, writing and facilitating agreements, merit and promotion procedures, and enhancing the relationships between PI's and partners.

Recommendations:

In order to enhance the creating and improvement of partnerships with other institutions, businesses, non-profits and government agencies, the University should proactively address the issues cited above by implementing the following recommendations:

1. Support campus efforts to build UWM's image as a research university by highlighting partnerships and successful partnerships in campus marketing and public relations efforts. Create a marketing message that articulates the value added by successful partnering with UWM.

2. Re-visit the definition of and reward system for research and the continuities and synergies between research and community engagement.

3. Create a permanent university wide council of faculty and academic staff from across the schools and colleges, appointed by campus administration, to facilitate, strengthen and measure the success of University partnerships.

    a. Create the processes, infrastructural systems, and databases for the development and maintenance of research partnerships. Provide common access across the University to an inventory of current research partnerships and offices that are supporting research partnerships.

    b. Evaluate and explore the best practices that have evolved at UWM and have been employed by other universities in their development and maintenance of research partnerships.

    c. Provide models for establishing agreements with partner institutions and develop strategies for reducing barriers to research partnerships.

    d. Engage in professional training programs around our research programs for PI's and teaching-based research for students at all levels as a means of creating more opportunities for partnerships, including exploring and expanding new and not-traditional models for partnerships such as entrepreneurial start-ups, international collaboration and consulting.

      e.   Establish metrics for measuring University success in research partnerships.

      f.   Showcase research partnerships internally and externally by providing information on successes and highlights to the University marketing function.

4.   Create an advisory group where the particular needs of PI's can be addressed.

SUBCOMMITTEE #7
What do we need to with budgeting and incentives to meet our
research and educational missions?

This committee's focus is to align budget and incentives with the creation of opportunities across research on a campus wide basis and not to make recommendations on funding specific types of research.

Assessments:

1.   There is no clearly defined mission statement, vision, or goals for the Graduate School from which to work with regard to meeting our research needs. Budgets and incentives must be aligned with the University's mission and vision as a doctoral research university.

2.   Maintaining an access mission and a research mission puts significant strain on the University's incentives, budget and the alignment of both.

3.   We trail our peers in budgets. Incentives and compensation for faculty research and the infrastructure and facilities to keep and retain outstanding people is lacking.

4.   There is very little money for rewarding the best faculty, particularly in mid-career.

5.   There is no budget to actively recruit graduate students. The current support for graduate students in many disciplines is not competitive.

6.   Chancellors and school fellowships serve to supplement stipends to underpaid graduate assistants, however, these fellowships remain inadequate.

7.   Deans and Chairs understand the needs of their faculty and therefore are best equipped to allocate budgets and incentives in conjunction with centralized mechanisms that allow for competition and collaboration.

8.   Overall, the RGI process works for those disciplines where there are higher levels of external funding available, and should continue to evolve.

9.   There are other programs such as The Faculty Arts & Humanities Research Travel Awards, The Graduate Faculty Committee Research Committee Awards, and the Visit to Sponsors Travel Awards, (VISTA) which should also continue to evolve with enhanced budgets and support and a review of their funding distribution channels.

10.   The definition of research expenditures is limited ("dash 4") in the University's administrative and accounting systems. This is more than an accounting issue; reporting does not accurately reflect our

progress toward our research goals and can create an inaccurate picture of our research productivity, which can, in turn, have an adverse impact on our standing as a research university.

11. UWM does not have an extensive record of winning grant proposals to support large grant (as defined by funding agencies) funding for collaborative work, nor does the University have the budget for the infrastructure and support structures to support large grants. UWM has an improving track record with regard to single PI grant awards.

Recommendations:

1. The Chancellor should find additional sources of funding to make graduate student stipends competitive with those of peer graduate programs.

2. Incentives are needed to attract, reward and retain the best researchers. Compensation and start-up packages must be competitive with peer institutions. There should be a means by which faculty members receive compensation increases commensurate with their eminence that goes beyond the current merit pay system.

3. The University should allocate internal funding and pursue external funding for support staff and structures to pursue, administer and manage grants, with an additional focus on large grants.

4. The Graduate School needs to create a mission, vision and strategic plan for research in a doctoral research university that has, as a primary focus, the alignment of budgets and incentives with the strategic goals.

5. There should be a system and budget allocation for re-invigorating the research of mid-career faculty. The University should look to the models used by foundations, funders and peer institutions for best practices essential to maintaining the involvement and motivation of mid-to-late career researchers.

6. There should be more funding allocated toward actively recruiting and interviewing graduate students.

7. Create a better process for appropriating and distributing resources; perhaps a hybrid process in which some funding is centralized and allocated by the administration and some is allocated by the deans, chairs and directors.

8. There should be a model or mechanism for reviewing and enhancing the successful aspects of the RGI program which would include:
   a. Finding funding to support the increase in quality proposals
   b. Follow-up on RGI grants over time
   c. Providing for a greater understanding of budgetary limits and tracking both the funds used and the results

9. In addition to enhancing the RGI program the University should also continue to develop and enhance its successful intramural programs while pursuing ideas for new intramural programs, incentives and initiatives.

10. Bridging funds should be allocated to cover gaps between grants.

11. Current policies on the classification and definition of research expenditures in accounting should be re-examined for the purpose of creating a clear, practical and standard definition of a "research expenditure" and that definition should be accommodated in our accounting structure so that our

reports and records more accurately reflect our progress toward our research goals and are consistent with national measures pertaining to research expenditures.

12. The University development officer and the UWM Foundation should aggressively pursue funding for the University's research mission. There should be development personnel dedicated to pursuing private funding for Graduate School research, named professorships, and the support of graduate students.

> **SUBCOMMITTEE #8**
> **How do we ensure a culture of ethics, inclusivity and research integrity?**

Assessment:

To achieve research integrity requires attention to ethics and inclusivity.

Regarding ethics and integrity:

1. There is a perception of a lack of value placed on ethics by University leadership. As a result researchers faced with bureaucratic or other obstacles have little or no support to assist them in dealing with ethical issues, adhering to codes of conduct or overcoming the obstacles in the face of frequent "no" answers. Ethics may be seen as more of an encumbrance than as a guide.

2. Various codes of ethics, committees and policies do exist at UWM but they exist in separate places. They are perceived as being bureaucratic in nature and "The culture of guidance for ethics is non-existent." There is a need for leadership and inspiration on the ethics of research.

3. The absence of attention to ethical issues may be derived from the fact that UWM was not originally a research university. The compliance policies that do exist were developed in response to Federal policies.

4. Compliance sets only minimum standards and does not necessarily address ethical conduct. Research and ethics issues are much larger than compliance and should involve statements of guiding principles to inform researchers as to their ethical responsibilities. The process for creating and changing culture is a long process. The structure of compliance is driven by ethics as in the Institutional Review Board process.

5. There are rare known examples of research misconduct on externally sponsored projects; however, as the university obtains more externally sponsored research, the risk of unethical behavior increases and the misuse of funds may occur knowingly or unknowingly due to a lack of knowledge of appropriate laws, rules or codes of conduct.

Regarding Inclusivity:

1. The committee members offered the following working definition of "inclusivity" for the purposes of this project:

    A. It involves research, scholarship, and knowledge creation.
        1. Sponsored and non-funded research

2. Basic and applied research
3. Arts, humanities and cultural creation

   B. It takes place across all departments, schools and colleges.

   C. It works across all groups both internally and externally
      1. People doing research
      2. People who are the subject of research
      3. People who benefit from research.

2. Levels of funding in the different disciplines are not equal. There is a perception that researchers outside the sciences will not be successful in gaining university resources to pursue funding opportunities.

3. We have made progress in areas where inclusivity is a clear priority. There is still work to be done in creating a culture of inclusivity.

Recommendations:

1. Instill integrity in the University culture. The Chancellor should be the voice of the University in articulating ethical values and culture in the conduct of research. The deans should be the major transmitters for ethical behavior to ensure the beliefs and values of ethical conduct are internalized.

2. Pull all of the existing codes, regulations and compliance together in a centralized office of compliance and research integrity. Reinforce and align the drivers of cultural change including orientations, training, incentives, and best practices. Work with the appropriate governance groups to ensure a smooth transition to centralization. Create a confidential process for reporting misconduct.

3. Pursue equity in the distribution of research opportunities. Recognize and reinforce the value of all people and all disciplines while understanding that different research spheres have different metrics and produce different types of gains.

4. The administration should work to make compliance easy and transparent and show strength in leadership to enhance the protection and integrity of research by being proactive. An organizational statement articulating ethical standards should be developed and widely disseminated.

5. Create a vision for inclusivity that is consistent, enduring and embraces research in its myriad of forms.

6. Create a culture of inclusivity among schools and colleges and across all job classifications that recognizes the signal importance of full participation based on our commitment to diversity including, race, gender, ethnicity, age, class, sexual orientation and religious beliefs.

7. Identify and modify policies and procedures that inhibit inclusivity and change them.

8. Develop and implement a comprehensive communication plan on the process, vision and goals of inclusivity.

9. Develop links between all of the resources that promote and sustain inclusivity.

Subcommittees Goals, Structure and Membership

Goal: To provide an assessment and a series of options for the next chancellor to recognize UWM's research strengths and what is needed to move to the next level.

Overarching Steering Committee is comprised of the Co-Chairs of each subcommittee

Subcommittees
To report back to Steering Committee by April 30, 2011 with preliminary recommendations such that these can be provided for the new chancellor at his/her installation.

Subcommittee Topic Question and Members

1. **How do we recognize the diversity of research across the university, and promote the strengths/reputation of UWM in research and education?**

   Co-Chairs: Mark Schwartz (Distinguished Professor of Geography/UC) and Phyllis King (Associate Provost/Professor of Health Sciences)

   Members: Margaret Atherton (Distinguished Professor), Dick Blau (Film Department), Gisele Durham (Director, Office of Assessment and Institutional Research), Carlos Galvao-Sobrinho (History and University Library Committee), Bill Holahan (Economics), Kathleen Koch (Graduate School staff), Tom Luljak or rep, Richard Meadows (Dean L&S), Rudi Strickler (Distinguished Professor of Biological Sciences), Doug Woods (Psychology/Graduate School associate dean)

2. **What research space, equipment and other critical support infrastructure are necessary?**
   Co-Chairs: Prasenjit Guptasarma (Physics/Research Policy Committee Chair) and Rodney Swain (L&S)

   Members: Eva Barczyk (Library), Karen Brucks (L&S Associate Dean), Naira H. Campbell-Kyureghyan (College of Engineering and Applied Science), Dave Crass (Acting Director of Research Cyberinfrastructure, UITS), Chukuka Enwemeka (Dean Health Sciences), Rick Goetz (Freshwater Sciences and Research Policy Committee)

3. **How do we move centers of excellence to the next level?**
   Co-Chairs: Anne Wysocki (Chair GFC, Professor English) and Michael Fendrich (Center for Addiction and Behavioral Health Research/Helen Bader School of Social Welfare),

   Members: Patrick Brady (Physics), James Cook (Distinguished Professor of Chemistry), Bob Greenstreet (Dean Architecture and Urban Planning), Sandra McLellan (Freshwater Sciences), Tim Patrick (Health Sciences), James Peoples (Economics), Pradeep Rohatgi (Distinguished Professor of Materials), Luc Vanier (Dance Department), Marcia Parsons (Dance and UC)

4. **How do we promote multi- disciplinary research?**
   Co-Chairs: Michael Brondino (GFC – Chair Curriculum Committee) and Mark Harris (Freshwater Sciences)

   Members: Kathleen Koch (Graduate School staff), John Buntin (Biological Sciences), Arun Garg (Distinguished Professor), Val Klump (Freshwater Science), Marc Levine (Director, Consortium for Economic Opportunity), Nancy Mathiowetz (Sociology), Jessica Meunick-Ganger (Academic

Staff, Art and Design) David Petering (Chemistry/Distinguished Professor), James Wasley (Architecture)Michael Weinert (Distinguished Professor of Physics and Director of Lab for Surface Studies)

5. **How do we re-engineer administrative processes to the needs of a research university? ("Reducing administrative hurdles")**
   Co-Chairs: Alan Wiseman (Physics) and Ginny Stoffel (GFC, Fellows Committee),

   Members Patricia Arredondo (Interim Dean School of Continuing Education), Heidi Janzen (Social Welfare),: Pat Kissinger (L&S dean's office), Paula Rhyner (Health Sciences), Mustafa Yundem (BFS), Rachel Schiffman (Nursing/CTSI), Sara Tully (Academic Staff Council), representatives of HR and purchasing?

6. **How do we create and improve partnerships with other institutions, businesses, non-profits and government agencies?**
   Chair: Mary Kunert (Nursing and UC)

   Members: Brian Thompson (UWMRF), Steve Percy (Interim Dean of Public Health), Ron Cisler (Health Sciences), Wendy Fall (Graduate School staff), Joan Prince (VC Partnerships), Mike Krauski (CEAS), Sally Lundeen (Dean Nursing), Gregory Jay (Cultures & Communities), Roger Smith (Health Sciences)

7. **What do we need to do with budgeting and incentives to meet our research and educational missions?** - Co-Chairs: Bruce Wade (GFC – Graduate Program Committee) and Marija Gajdardziska-Josifovska (Physics and UC)

   Members**:** Fred J. Helmstetter (Psychology), Margo Anderson (History), Tim Smunt (Dean Lubar School of Business), Ed Rodreguez (Provost's office), Eddy Tysoe (Chemistry/Distinguished Professor), Ryo Amano (Research Policy Committee), Linda Berg (Graduate School staff), Wade Hobgood (Dean Peck School of the Arts), T.C. Jen (Interim Dean CEAS)

8. **How do we ensure a culture of ethics, inclusivity and research integrity?**
   Co-Chairs: William Velez (Sociology and UC) and Stan Stojkovic (Dean Helen Bader School of Social Welfare)

   Members: Elizabeth Buchanan (SOIS), Janice Eells (Health Sciences), Larry Martin (Education/Research Policy Committee), Marjorie Piechowski (CEAS), Cheryl Ajirotutu (Associate Vice Chancellor), Mark Doremus (Graduate School staff), Eric Larson (Health Sciences), Jeffrey Merrick (L&S Associate Dean - Humanities), Hope Olson (Interim Dean SOIS), John Krezoski (Director of Safety and Assurances), Patrice Petro (Vice Provost for International Education)