



**Report
of the
Faculty Senate
Task Force on Research Infrastructure
December 2007**

Faculty Senate Task Force on Research Infrastructure

Andrew Cornelius, College of Sciences
Jennifer Fabbi, Libraries
Nancy Menzel, School of Nursing
Ralph E. Reynolds, College of Education
Denise Tanata, School of Public Health
Paul Thistle, College of Business, Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive Summary | |
| Introduction and Overview | 1 |
| Survey Results | 5 |
| Strategic Planning | 32 |
| Recommendations | 35 |
| Conclusions | 42 |
| Appendix | 44 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Research Infrastructure was charged with determining the impediments to research at UNLV and evaluating the effectiveness and integration of strategic planning for research infrastructure at the College/School and University levels.

To meet the first charge, the Task Force conducted an online survey of faculty and staff during the Fall 2006 semester. Over 500 survey responses were received, and many respondents wrote detailed comments (see Overview for examples). UNLV has been fortunate to hire many active researchers over the last decade or so. It is very clear from the comments that respondents are passionate in their desire to produce first-rate research and are incredibly frustrated by how difficult it can be to conduct research at UNLV.

Based on the survey responses, the Task Force regards the following three areas as **critically deficient** and in need of immediate attention:

- Support Staff
- Policies and Procedures
- Physical Space

Numerous responses indicated that inadequate staff levels, limited training and poor attitude are a serious problem. Many University policies and procedures are outdated, poorly designed and ineffective. Physical space is, in many cases, inadequate to conduct research.

Based on the survey responses, the Task Force regards the following four areas as **seriously deficient** and in need of attention.

- OPRS/IRB
- Office of Sponsored Programs
- Rewards Systems (including sabbaticals)
- Technology

The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects/Institutional Review Boards are widely viewed as extremely slow and excessively bureaucratic. The Office of Sponsored Programs must be upgraded to offer more assistance to faculty wishing to submit grants and contracts. Rewards systems must begin to reflect the university stated emphases on research and teaching. Both research and operational technology must be upgraded.

Survey responses indicated that the libraries and research climate, while not completely free of problems, are generally viewed positively.

To meet the charge of evaluating the effectiveness and integration of strategic planning, the Task Force collected the University strategic plan and all College/School strategic plans. Overall, planning for research infrastructure is weak and, for some Colleges/Schools, nonexistent. College/School strategic plans are not integrated with the University strategic plan.

Introduction and Overview

In the 50 years since it was founded, the University of Nevada Las Vegas has grown rapidly. With 28,000 students, 2,000 staff and 950 full-time faculty, UNLV is now a large institution. Along with the growth in size, in more recent years the University has increasingly sought to attract faculty capable of sustained scholarly contributions to their fields. The faculty now includes many scholars with national and international reputations, including a Nobel Laureate and a MacArthur Prize winner.

As the emphasis on the intellectual contributions of the faculty has increased, there has also been an increasing recognition that conditions at the University are not always conducive to scholarly and creative activity and it is much more difficult to do research than it should be. In Fall 2006, the Faculty Senate formed the Task Force on Research Infrastructure. The Task Force was given the charge to:

“Collect data through an open call to faculty, and other means, on the roadblocks to effective conduct of research at UNLV. Report to the Senate on the state of research infrastructure. Where possible, make recommendations to the Senate on immediate improvements, or on processes for further efforts in this area. Include in your report an analysis of the effectiveness of planning at the unit and campus levels related to the enhancement of research infrastructure.”

To carry out the first part of its charge, the Task Force conducted a survey of faculty and staff during the Fall 2007 semester. Over 500 individuals responded to the survey and many of the respondents wrote extensive and detailed comments. Based on the survey results and other sources of information, it is clear that the research infrastructure at UNLV is seriously deficient. The state of the research infrastructure is clearly described in one of the survey responses:

“The infrastructure was developed when we were a Mom & Pop operation - it is out of control, cumbersome and needs to be scrapped and start over.”

It is very clear from the comments that respondents are passionate in their desire to produce first-rate research and are incredibly frustrated by how difficult it is to carry out research at UNLV.

Based on the survey responses, the Task Force regards the following three areas as **critically deficient** and in need of immediate attention:

- Support Staff
- Policies and Procedures
- Physical Space

The most serious problems are inadequate staff levels, limited training for staff and a poor attitude on the part of many staff. Many University policies are outdated, poorly designed, and interfere with the conduct of research. We would like to point out that the problems with staff and policies and procedures interact. There are far too many areas where too few inadequately trained staff try to implement cumbersome procedures and ineffective policies. This makes it extremely difficult to proceed with research and wastes enormous amounts of time. Physical space for research is very limited. Some estimate that the University needs an additional one million square feet of space. In addition to the limited amount of space, in many cases, existing spaces are simply inadequate to conduct research.

The problems in these three areas are “mission critical.” Improvements in all three areas must be made immediately. Unless improvements are made in the very near term, the University’s ambitions to increase the intellectual contributions of the faculty are not likely to be realized.

These are not the only areas where the University’s infrastructure needs to be improved. Based on the survey responses, the Task Force regards the following four areas as **seriously deficient**:

- OPRS/IRB
- Office of Sponsored Programs
- Rewards System (including sabbaticals)
- Technology

The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects/Institutional Review Boards are widely viewed as extremely slow and excessively bureaucratic. Decision making at OPRS/IRB is seen as erratic and arbitrary. The Office of Sponsored Programs must be upgraded in order to offer more assistance to faculty wishing to submit contract or grant applications. OSP must also provide better support once contracts and grants are awarded. The reward system (i.e., merit raises, promotion and tenure) must be revised to reflect the University's stated emphasis on research. The number of sabbaticals must be increased and the process by which faculty members apply for sabbaticals must be made less cumbersome. Both research and operational technology must be upgraded.

The problems in these four areas are serious and present roadblocks to the conduct of research. Improvements in all four areas must begin to take place soon. Although we can make a case that the problems in each of these four areas need immediate improvement, the problems with Support Staff, Policies and Procedures, and Physical Space are worse and demand priority attention.

Survey responses indicated that the libraries and research climate, while not free of problems, are generally viewed positively. While these two areas are not in need of immediate improvement, they cannot be neglected, and they do need to be maintained at least at their current levels.

To carry out the second part of its charge, to analyze the effectiveness of planning for research infrastructure, the Task Force collected the University strategic plan and all College/School strategic plans as of the Fall 2006. The strategic plans were analyzed during the Spring 2007 semester.

It is clear from an analysis of the strategic plans, as well as the current state of affairs, that inadequate attention has been paid to infrastructure generally, and to research infrastructure in particular, in the strategic planning process. UNLV has significantly expanded the number of undergraduate, masters and doctoral programs and increased its emphasis on graduate education. It is widely known that, in order to gain approval for a new program, the proposal must claim that no additional resources are required to implement the program. However, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to develop high quality programs without adequate funding and without adequate infrastructure. Similarly, it is difficult, if not impossible, for faculty to increase the level of their intellectual contributions without adequate support.

It is also clear from an analysis of the strategic plans that there is little or no connection between College/School plans and the University strategic plan. The quality of strategic planning at the unit level is highly variable, with some units developing fairly detailed plans and others developing very vague, general plans. In most cases, planning for infrastructure receives even less attention than in the University plan. To give just one example, the complete discussion of infrastructure in the College of Business strategic plan is to state that a goal of the College is to “provide state-of-the-art physical facilities and infrastructure.”

If the University is going to continue to grow in stature, it must continue to attract and retain high quality scholars. In order to attract and retain high quality scholars, the University must also provide them with the resources they need to do their jobs. The University strategic plan must take account of these resource requirements and must provide a plan for putting the necessary research infrastructure in place. Strategic planning at the College/School level must take into account the University strategic plan. College/School plans must also provide realistic analyses of their resource requirements and, in coordination with the University strategic plan, provide plans for putting the necessary infrastructure in place.

Survey Results

In the Fall of 2006, the Task Force on Research Infrastructure created and conducted a survey of faculty and staff at UNLV. The survey consisted of 52 items covering a wide range of issues. In addition, there were five open-ended questions. Five-hundred and twenty-five individuals responded to the survey. Many of those who took the survey made extensive comments in response to the open-ended questions. This section of the report describes the responses to the survey questions and provides brief summaries of the written responses.

Support Staff

The survey asked three questions about support staff with regard to research needs at UNLV, relating to adequate numbers of staff, staff training, and staff support for research within Colleges. The results of these questions were as follows:

Support Staff

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 15. An adequate number of support staff is available to facilitate research at UNLV. | 125 | 102 | 63 | 43 | 35 | 4 | 2.39 |
| 24. New support staff at UNLV are trained adequately before assuming duties. | 64 | 84 | 90 | 60 | 23 | 2 | 2.69 |
| 22. My college has an administrative position directly involved in research. | 96 | 65 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 26 | 2.91 |
| Average | | | | | | | 2.65 |

Section Summary: The response average on these three questions was in the lowest in relation to the other nine categories, indicating a strong sentiment of disagreement on the part of campus researchers that there is adequate support staff with adequate training to support their research needs.

Issues mentioned by 10 or more respondents are summarized below:

- Need more of them (typically at the department level) (71)
- They need extensive and current training, and must be better qualified. (55)
- They need a more helpful attitude, oriented toward service. (30)
- They need to be paid well, supported, satisfied, and therefore retained. (21)
- The performance of support staff needs to be accountable to someone. (10)

Several pages of individual comments were submitted with regard to support staff, as illustrated by the following representative comments:

Administrative duties taking away from research productivity—

- Take away the administrative duties that faculty have to bear that take away from research productivity: administering PCards, maintaining account balances so that we know how much money is left in our grants, etc. Increase Graduate Student stipends - ours are ridiculously low and the quality of our students reflects that problem.

- Improve support for external funding and research. This means reducing administrative hurdles for hiring staff and purchasing materials, simplifying and clearly explaining university policies, and eliminating redundant and unnecessary procedures. My staff and I spend 30% - 50% of grant allocated time on administrative procedures as a result of these problems. If I leave UNLV, this will be one of my primary reasons.
- Activities that waste my time, negatively impact my research productivity continually. While, this doesn't necessarily fall under research infrastructure, if time is spent sorting out other problems and issues on campus, research is negatively affected.

Staff Training—

- Training, training, training - more training for support people.
- Need more support people and trained better.
- UNLV research support staff, particularly in the areas of procurement and travel, must be trained in specific needs of research administration...procurement must be sped up to support vital research equipment purchases; and the 'receiving' end of equipment procurement must be streamlined - there have been times when the lag between receipt of a piece of equipment at the receiving dock lags 3-4 months behind actual delivery to the research project.
- Increase training of support people about department protocols cross-campus.
- As was suggested in a recent meeting, train every support staff to answer 'yes' to researcher requests, and then reward them for solving problems and making things happen. Once again, hold them accountable if necessary by recording requests and their solutions. Weed out support staff who don't know how to solve problems. Allow new hires to come on board before old hires leave so there is continuity in staff support - I know you'll respond there is some law or policy that says we can't do that. Then get it changed and start being smart about institutional management.

Support staff service attitude—

- The UNLV support staff, at all levels needs to have the word 'no' removed from its vocabulary. They need to develop a 'can do' attitude.
- In general, UNLV administration needs an attitude change from 'we're here, don't bother us' to 'how can we serve you?' Communication needs to significantly improve. Phone messages and e-mails need to be answered. Rather than inventing new rules and procedures, administrative units need to talk to the people involved first and find out what will work and what won't. Often, the focus is on the procedures ('will the auditor like it?') and not on what needs to be achieved.
- The staff at UNLV seems not very supportive for research. They see active research like myself cause lot extra work for them. For example, travel reimbursement always takes almost 2 months to get it done.
- All research service units need a significant attitude adjustment, emphasizing service to advance research while supporting their 'customers,' faculty and students.

Decentralize research support—

- Administrative assistants in each college and each department devoted specifically to grants and funded research.
- Support staff within the college that researches opportunities and assists with the preparation of proposals and retaining more resources in the college and compensating researchers.
- Each department needs a research-oriented support person.

Section Summary: The survey responses clearly indicate that this is one of the most serious infrastructure problems at UNLV. On a scale of 1 to 6, where statements are positively phrased, the average response of 2.85 imply that respondents have a negative view of policies and procedures at UNLV and view them as a serious impediment to research. This section of the survey generated an extremely large number of comments. The comments cover a very wide range is issues. The general tone of the comments can only be described as very negative.

The three most common issues mentioned, with approximately equal frequency are

1. Teaching loads
2. Office of Sponsored Programs
3. Staff

Those who commented on teaching loads clearly view the current policy of 3-3 teaching loads as inconsistent with a research university. In their view, a 2-2 teaching load, coupled to research productivity, should be standard. For example:

- First, UNLV must go to a differentiated staffing model such that some faculty who are not engaged in research teach more and those who are engaged in research are on a 2-2 teaching load at most. Teaching and research faculty should both have opportunities for merit and should both be rewarded according to the criteria for their position descriptions. Second, tenure and promotion guidelines must change to reward research. No new faculty hired should be able to get tenure without being on a research track. No one should get promoted to full without a nationally recognized research program.
- Teaching load must be reduced. For those faculty members who want to focus on research, there needs to be a program to apply for teaching load reduction. This will be much more helpful than NIA or PIA. (Time is more important than money.)
- Focus on maximizing the potential of faculty. For example, if a faculty member is a strong grant writer/researcher, allow them necessary time to write grants and conduct research as opposed to insisting that they teach 3 classes because 'it is the policy.'
- The biggest problem with research is getting the time to do it, what with 8-10 committee assignments, courses with 120 students enrolled, and consistent course credit overloads.

Those who commented on the Office of Sponsored Programs often comment that OSP could do more to help faculty acquire grants, that policies and procedures could be streamlined, and that having an OSP person in the colleges would be helpful.

- The OSP does not reach out to faculty, particularly junior faculty, to help us learn about funding opportunities. Also, I've been told by senior faculty that OSP is so full of red-tape and bureaucracy that garnering a grant is more trouble than it's worth.
- Bring in someone in OSP who really does outreach and aggressive helping of faculty to get funding ... organize the office to so that it is proactive in the grant writing department
- OSP: Electronic signatures for proposals. Feedback to the PI could be generated automatically, without burdening staff. 2. Post and update all current overhead rates and grad. student fees on a single site. Better: Post a budget template containing current rates so that investigators need to fill in only their numbers to arrive at correct budgets. 3. Some solicitations require matching funds. A clear policy defining the conditions for promising matching funds on the web to investigators would be helpful.
- Put an OSP person in each college that is active in research to help prepare budgets, to help submit proposals to the federal government through their online process, and to help follow expenditures.
- Distribute OSP Program Officers in the Colleges and build a pool of at least two rotating officers who can handle the loads when Program Officers leave.

Those who commented on staff mentioned low staffing levels, poor staff training, and most frequently, poor staff attitude as problems.

- Add administrative support staff in proportion to increases of numbers of research students, research dollars, and research staff.
- Create an accountability policy for office staff, (e.g. routine processes must be completed within one business day) and a computerized tracking protocol. Unresponsive individuals should be moved to where they can do no damage.
- Support staff to handle all of the problems for the researchers that do not pertain to the research i.e.: purchasing, travel, payroll, getting appropriate documents signed, record keeping, reviewing the accounts and accounting categories, making sure equipment needed or (suggested was needed) is purchased before the contract is over) everything should be taken care of for the researcher by a simple request.

The following comment succinctly captures the view of many respondents:

- Support staff are very ineffective. They are poorly trained, often lack work ethic, and have no institutional knowledge.

Other issues mention often, but slightly less frequently than the first three, are:

1. Purchasing
2. Incentives
3. General incompetence

Respondents who commented on Purchasing find that department needs to be completely overhauled. Some representative comments are:

- Encourage the purchasing office to be more friendly to researchers. I have been waiting for my p-card application to be approved since I arrived in July
- Purchasing needs to be completely revamped. Purchasing is too slow and unresponsive. There is no improvement despite repeated complaints or suggestions.
- A change of Purchasing's environment to one of helping accomplish what needs to be done in a timely fashion
- The purchasing process is an example of UNLV's poor research infrastructure. I applied for a purchasing card in August and won't receive one until at least January. I have been told that the person who does the training -- training on how to use a credit card -- was on leave and therefore they are 'backed up.' Faculty who apply for p-cards should receive them in a timely fashion. If I applied for a personal credit card today I would receive it by the end of the week. Is the training really necessary? I have a Ph.D., I think I can at least figure out how to use a credit card. I wonder if staff lack the basic problem solving skills to resolve this issue or if they simply lack motivation.

A number of respondents commented on the incentive system, including merit and promotion and tenure policies. These individuals clearly think there is too little emphasis on the quality of research. Some representative comments are:

- Merit/Tenure guidelines should value quality of research productivity rather than quantity
- Change in COLLEGE merit policies so that they clearly reward quality research. Higher tenure standards so that we only tenure good researchers.
- We are placing a huge emphasize on research and research output in merit, evaluation, promotion and tenure. As we have not yet evolved mechanisms to evaluate quality, we are measuring only the quantity. The Departments are in a better position to evaluate the quality. The current procedure of a college committee going by numbers should be changed.
- As it stands now, the operationalization of the guidelines for promotion, tenure, and merit bear little no resemblance to those at R1 institutions and are determined by who sits on these committees from year to year. Even worse, young assistant professors who do have the capability to publish in top journals are discouraged from doing so (i.e., they learn quickly how the merit system works here.) ... Too often, those who publish only 1 article a year in a top journal are at a disadvantage at merit time compared to their peers who turn out 8-10 short articles in other lesser outlets.

There were a large number of comments that did not mention specific offices but clearly point out that there are serious impediments to research across a range of administrative and service departments. Some representative comments are:

- There needs to be great turnover in administrative positions. People need to be hired who understand and respect research.
- It's not so much the policy and procedures that are the problem (although they do seem to be applied unevenly across departments), but their incompetent and biased application by administrators and even faculty.
- I think it is not always about the office - it is the people in the office. For example, everyone knows how hard purchasing is to deal with. Everyone knows how hard it is to get someone hired on a grant. Everyone knows how some people never answer their phones. The direction has to be given at the TOP. Do not expect the middle to help change a systemic problem of being responsive. They need to not only be responsive but they need to support faculty as they enter the next phase of this university. They may not be helpful because they themselves do not know what a research university is.
- Start over with how and where each bit of paper needs to go for approvals. The infrastructure was developed when we were a Mom & Pop operation - it is out of control, cumbersome and needs to be scrapped and start over. Get information packets to new and existing faculty about policies and procedures. Have seminars - have notebooks available for how to use the UNLV infrastructure. If I want to do a research project at UNLV - what do I need to do? Then go through a list with directions, time-lines, signatures etc. Explain down to the minute level for the person new to UNLV's nomenclature.
- When something doesn't get done FIX IT - don't spend days finger pointing...I DON'T CARE WHO OR WHY OR WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE - I just need it to work so I can fulfill the grant conditions and produce the data. Too often service units care more about blame and CYA than about getting things done. Don't start with 'we can't'...many of us have come from top tier research universities if they can do it we can do it too. DON'T ALWAYS REINVENT THE WHEEL

Physical Space

The survey asked three questions about physical space at UNLV. These questions covered whether or not there was adequate space for researchers at levels, from faculty to graduate students, at UNLV to maximize their productivity. The results of these questions were as follows:

Physical Space

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 7. Graduate students have adequate office space to conduct research activities. | 113 | 85 | 69 | 53 | 35 | 15 | 2.61 |
| 9. My collaborators (colleagues and graduate students) have adequate space to conduct research activities. | 102 | 83 | 67 | 47 | 56 | 16 | 2.78 |
| 26. I have adequate physical space to conduct my research. | 78 | 68 | 44 | 59 | 79 | 33 | 3.25 |
| Average | | | | | | | 2.88 |

Section Summary: The response average on these three questions was in the lower range in relation to the other nine categories, indicating a general dissatisfaction with physical space available for research. Of all of the impediments for performing research at UNLV, a ubiquitous concern of all members of the UNLV community is that there is a serious lack of adequate physical space.

In fact, on the open-ended response section of the survey, over 1 in 5 respondents said much more research space is needed. This was by far the most prevalent response on the survey. It underlies a very serious issue that must be addressed at UNLV. One very visible immediate consequence of this problem is that the lack of adequate space has hindered recruitment

Looking at the individual comments, a wide range of issues became clear. Of the numerous written comments, only 5% conveyed satisfaction with current conditions. Placing the issues into categories, the following issues were mentioned by 10 or more respondents are summarized below:

- There is simply a lack of needed space for all aspects of academic endeavors (111)
- There needs to be a better way to allocate physical space. Namely, clear guidelines need to be implemented, and those that are more research active need to have a mechanism for being allotted adequate space for research (28)
- The space for graduate students is woefully lacking and offices are often not in close proximity to research (26)
- There is a significant amount of space at UNLV that is unusable in its current state(24)

- More, and better, off campus space needs to be procured (12)
- There needs to be significantly faster turn around times for renovations/remodeling (10)

Some representative quotes from the various categories are given to get a general idea of the space related concerns at UNLV.

Space not allowing to procure grants and/or hire new people -

- It is currently impossible to staff up to meet the needs of large research grants because there is no space available to place post-docs, students, and project support staff. This issue has reached critical proportions. UNLV cannot hope to become a major research university if it cannot provide adequate space/facilities/infrastructure support
- I'm told that there is no room for post-docs and grad students. So how do I recruit for research, which is the key criterion upon which I'm evaluated, if I don't have space?
- Space often is limited at many universities, but UNLV is an extreme case. How do you recruit grad students into a lab when there is no lab?
- Available physical space is inadequate to conduct research on campus and to recruit top quality faculty members
- Need new labs and equipment to even try for grants in my area
- an institution is measured, in part, by its grad students, yet we're crammed into tiny offices like sardines. i would challenge any faculty member to be successful in the same setting.
- There are MAJOR needs for adequate faculty lines, space and equipment and support personnel. Unless the UCCSN system and the state legislature is willing to put REAL \$\$ into UNLV to develop the research capabilities, achievement of the University's goal is next to impossible. Major resources are very much needed.

General need for space -

- Researchers have NO labs. We have no office space.
- One million square feet of lab space are still missing before UNLV can claim to be a research University.
- We don't even have room for staff meetings, let alone a small specialized library or space for already-purchased specialized research equipment.
- My office was converted from a storage room. I've been in it since 1999. What do you think?
- Increase the norms for faculty, postdoctoral, and graduate student office/research space.
- UNLV space surveys all show we need to at least double our research and teaching space. We need to start this process if we are going to become a research based university.
- There is a consistent lack of respect for ALL colleges needing space.
- There is no space for research in our college. Not even enough space for faculty let a long support personal, so forget space for equipment.
- It is insufficient and infrastructure decisions are made isolated from the faculty and students that are most affected.
- Convince the regents that physical research space is more than just an ivory tower to serve the hobbies of the Professors - it is the essential space for the activities that may bring UNLV forward.

- If we plan to really make the move to Research I, then we need to start acting like a Research I institution--that means we need real office space, rather than half of one of the 'cracker boxes' inaptly named the 'CDC'-
- Good lord, where to start!?!? -800,000 ft2 of research laboratory space needed immediately

Off Campus space needs to be procured -

- In the near term UNLV should consider leasing more off campus space for units that can be located off-campus. In the long-term more buildings need to be build.
- Use research overhead and start leasing building space off-campus to support funded projects.
- Funded research should lease laboratory space from a building complex dedicated in its entirety to support research. The benefits are two-fold: laboratories are fully used without spaces being idle, and to maintain laboratory space researchers must continue to be productive.
- Subsidize space renovation costs through research overhead, charge rational rates for space renovation, and expedite the hiring of off-campus contractors to complete research-related work.
- Look to having branch campuses so that some classes can be offered at different places and convert some of this space to labs and office spaces. Some research activities could also be moved to branch campuses

Allocating space already here -

- A move-in paradigm for the SE building that is not doomed to failure. Only the star teams (heavy emphasis on COMPETITIVE federal funding and publication record) of science and engineering should be going in.
- Space should only be provided to faculty that are research productive.
- allocate space based upon objective criteria of some form - the faculty will adapt to whatever criteria are used over time
- Physical space when in short supply must be given to productive individuals.
- Set clear priorities and allocate space to those priorities in a timely manner.
- Assign space in proportion to current award\$. Space assignments should be made in proportion to current funds and scholarly publications during the past 2 years, and re-assigned semi-annually irrespective of past allocations. .
- There should be clear association between the level of funding for research and lab space assignment.
- I think if the university wants to support research then it should start by awarding points towards space to divisions/centers/etc that actually do research.
- First, reallocate space to those who are doing research or creative activity. There is much wasted space on campus devoted to non-research activities that should be reallocated.
- Goals have to be set and we, the university community, have to clearly know what they are and how we are going to achieve them. Physical space too falls into this arena. With each space the question should be are we using this in a way that maximizes progress towards our stated goal. It's impossible to believe we can achieve greatness without devoting the space necessary to infrastructure (and resource)
- Immediate review of all research space and research productivity of individuals occupying such space. Immediate contraction of research space held by unproductive researchers (double their teaching load) and expansion of research space by your research stars.

- Allocation of space - committees that determine space allocation should have equal representation from all Departments involved. Different disciplines require different space requirements this seems to have been overlooked in recent planning processes.
- The SEB building has high quality space, but there are still unanswered questions about who will occupy it, even while the building is being built (!!). The building needs a manager with the clout to move tenants back out again if they no longer can justify their use of very valuable lab space.
- Inactive faculty / research programs should NOT be allowed to keep space indefinitely.

Space repaired/renovated in time to perform research-

- Fix facilities so that lab renovations/modifications happen in a reasonable amount of time
- Renovations/upgrades/updates are ESSENTIAL and must be timely for existing, but especially new, tenure-track faculty.
- New faculty come to UNLV and because they cannot get useable lab space in many cases within 2+ years, how can we expect them to get tenure??
- Have a more effective office of Planning and Construction and Facilities Management so that work and renovation requests are completed in a timely manner. Currently, work requests only sometimes are completed, and if so, many, many months after the request was made. Renovations of sub-standard facilities at UNLV take far too long.
- If this is to become a leading research University it is imperative that space is renovated and ready to be used by incoming faculty upon their arrival. Funds have to be made available to renovate the space when the hire is approved. Currently, space renovations do not start before the incoming faculty member arrives at the University. This sends the wrong message to our new faculty and the scientific community as a whole.

Unusable spaces due to conditions -

- My office gets very hot in the fall and spring. Telecommunications are well below standard. Because I work with colleagues at different schools, I often have a need for conference calls, but cannot do that here.
- Inadequate cooling of the CHE building during the summertime (May-Sept) has been a big problem, bad enough to seriously disrupt research.
- Today, you should look carefully at the air-conditioning support for well over \$1M worth of research and educational computer equipment in B377. It is completely unacceptable.
- We have a million dollars of computer equipment in a machine room that the university cannot keep air conditioned. We've had significant equipment losses due to power failures and air conditioning stresses.

The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects/ Institutional Review Board

There were seven questions relating to the OPRS/IRB.

OPRS/IRB

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|---|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 27. The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board - IRB) provides sufficient researcher support to submit protocols. | 59 | 42 | 58 | 76 | 43 | 12 | 3.13 |
| 36. The Institutional Review Board reviews my protocol proposals and revisions in a timely manner. | 50 | 39 | 41 | 65 | 40 | 11 | 3.16 |
| 32. The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board) provides timely and clear responses and replies to my inquiries. | 47 | 41 | 58 | 70 | 39 | 11 | 3.17 |
| 39. The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board) is helpful in explaining policies and procedures. | 40 | 39 | 58 | 68 | 33 | 12 | 3.20 |
| 29. The Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board) gives a clear rationale for what constitutes an exempt protocol. | 42 | 39 | 56 | 82 | 45 | 7 | 3.26 |
| 8. The Social/Behavioral Sciences and Biomedical Sciences Institutional Review Boards use comparable criteria in their decision-making processes. | 31 | 38 | 42 | 88 | 34 | 6 | 3.31 |
| 38. I understand how the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board) determines which of the two IRBs reviews a protocol. | 37 | 35 | 50 | 69 | 49 | 19 | 3.44 |
| Average | | | | | | | 3.24 |

Section Summary: Survey results indicate a need for improvement in the Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) (Institutional Review Board). On a scale of 1 to 6, where all six relevant statements were positively phrased, the average response was 3.24, which indicates

that responses were neutral, between “Disagree Somewhat” and “Agree Somewhat.” Those who selected “Disagree Strongly” outnumbered those who selected “Agree Strongly” by a ratio of 6 to 1 on the statement that OPRS “gives a clear rationale for what constitutes an exempt protocol.” The ratio was unfavorable (2 to 1 for “Disagree Strongly” to “Agree Strongly”) for the statement “I understand how the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (Institutional Review Board) determines which of the two IRBs reviews a protocol.”

Comments about OPRS appeared in several open-ended sections. Twenty-seven respondents identified “streamlining the OPRS process” as “one or two of the most important changes to any unit's policies and procedures that would most improve the research infrastructure at UNLV.”

Comments reflected strong emotions.

Sample comments:

- The OPRS does not support UNLV's goals of research quality or quantity. They are a roadblock to getting research completed at UNLV.
- Totally revise IRB. It takes months to get a response from the IRB board for even exempt protocols. I've had students who have had to wait 3 months to get approval of their research.
- The IRB process here is less efficient than other universities. There should be online submissions and timely returns. I submitted the same proposal as two other faculty members did at two different public research 1 institutions, and they received approval nearly a month before me. This process makes it very difficult to collaborate with faculty at other universities as well.
- IRB (social/behavioral) is a disaster in terms of research productivity -- clear need for overhauling procedures and adding staff. Grants administration is slow and unresponsive to PIs' needs.
- The people that sit on the IRB should be reminded about what it means to 'protect' research subjects. For example, humans participating in a research project will not be harmed by a spelling mistake in a survey instrument. As the UNLV community seeks to perform more biomedical research that uses human subjects, perhaps the IRB committee can survey/visit other schools that have a long standing IRB. The IRB committee should be reminded that their job is to protect human subjects but that does not mean to hinder research productivity.
- One of the most important things would be to significantly simplify the IRB reviewing requirement and shorten the process. They need to be more flexible with different reward structures for human subjects. They ask for too many documents, some of which are NOT critical to the research project or the protection of human subjects (such as printed advertisement!). The application document is about 20 pages, while it is only

about half of the length in other research universities. I've heard more than one time from colleagues that IRB makes you regret doing research!

- IRB's procedures are too slow to process and seem to focus on irrelevant issues (typos, etc) or on issues that they have little or no ability to judge in the context of a domain. I've heard people say about currently published research... 'we could never do that at here (UNLV)!'
- Improve IRB. I had an expedited review take over one semester. This is unacceptable.
- The new regime has been very helpful - a welcomed improvement. They have been supportive and timely in all dealing I have had with them. It appears however that they are not always in agreement with the office of research...this has caused problems in who is running what. And in some cases the university attorney and the president's cabinet (the old cabinet) has made grant decisions. I do not think that the foundation director, athletic director, student services VP should have ANY input into academic grants or research.
- Through a series of delays caused in part by the OPRS, and to another part by the IRB, I lost a grant recently (summer 2006) without ever getting IRB approval for a simple, zero-risk, non-invasive project. In frustration, my sponsor finally chose to pursue an alternate route. I'll be happy to provide detailed documentation if someone is interested in the facts (G. Mauer-MEG).
- THE CURRENT IRB IS ABSOLUTELY USELESS - they impede research, fail to offer useful suggestions, and spend most of their time addressing grammar instead of the heart of the research protocol. The IRB is poorly run and far too slow to respond to researchers' needs. Our IRB should accept reviews from other respected entities - for example, one of my proposals was accepted in a matter of 3 days when reviewed by a collaborating Ivy League institution, but was held up by UNLV IRB for over 2 months...WHY?????? The IRB impedes the ability of our graduate students to do research - I have had 2 students thus far who have had to extend their desired graduation date because the IRB could not respond quickly to a review of simple questionnaires that would have unidentifiable information

The thirteen relevant open-ended responses to the question "What are the two most important suggestions you would make in regards to Support Staff?" indicated OPRS needed more staff:

- The OPRS needs more staffing – it cannot be a roadblock.
- The IRB needs more staff so that protocols can be reviewed and decisions can be distributed in a timely fashion.
- OIT and IRB are totally worthless organizations. They are poorly staffed and run by largely incompetent administrators... The OIT lacks competent administration and doesn't have the basic research infrastructure (e.g., general support staff, an SPSS statistical consultant) to assist faculty research
- Although I have [*sic*] OPRS to be helpful and friendly, they seem lately to be woefully understaffed and many proposals have taken longer than necessary to gain approval.

Overall summary of comments:

Need for streamlining the IRB process, for more support staff, and rededication to protecting human subjects while not impeding research through unnecessary delays.

The Office of Sponsored Programs

The survey asked six questions related to the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). The results are below.

Office of Sponsored Programs

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 35. The Office of Sponsored Programs provides comprehensive support and guidance to researchers at UNLV. | 39 | 51 | 81 | 61 | 46 | 5 | 3.14 |
| 25. The Office of Sponsored Programs provides adequate support in administration and implementation of grants and contracts. | 50 | 62 | 71 | 80 | 51 | 9 | 3.15 |
| 44. Staff in the Office of Sponsored Programs are knowledgeable about research opportunities. | 36 | 60 | 55 | 79 | 46 | 8 | 3.22 |
| 43. The Office of Sponsored Programs is helpful in explaining policies and procedures. | 33 | 50 | 49 | 80 | 61 | 7 | 3.38 |
| 45. The Office of Sponsored Programs responds quickly to the needs of researchers. | 31 | 50 | 56 | 69 | 59 | 13 | 3.41 |
| 31. The Office of Sponsored Programs has been helpful in my attempts at obtaining extramural supports. | 32 | 45 | 66 | 74 | 54 | 18 | 3.44 |
| Average | | | | | | | 3.29 |

Section Summary: Survey results indicate that faculty respondents perceive a need for improvement in the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). On a scale of 1 to 6, where all six relevant statements were positively phrased, the average response was 3.29, which indicates

that responses fell between “Disagree Somewhat” and “Agree Somewhat.” Looking at the proportions of those with strong feelings of agreement or disagreement gives a more complete picture. Those who selected “Disagree Strongly” outnumbered those who selected “Agree Strongly” by a ratio of 8 to 1 on the statement that OSP “provides comprehensive support and guidance to researchers at UNLV.” Ratios for the other items indicated a higher proportion of those disagreeing strongly compared to those agreeing strongly.

Although the survey had a section for OSP open-ended responses, comments about OSP appeared in other sections. Nine survey respondents identified OSP issues as “one or two of the most important changes to any unit's policies and procedures that would most improve the research infrastructure at UNLV.” Summary of comments: “OSP needs to hire experienced people and to find research opportunities.”

OSP staff issues recurred in response to the question “What are the two most important suggestions you would make in regards to Support Staff?” A summary of those 6 comments is that OSP needs more staffing. Three more respondents identified the need for “someone who can spot research funding opportunities.” There were numerous open-ended responses to the question, “What are one or two of the most important changes to the Office of Sponsored Programs that would most improve the research infrastructure at UNLV?” The overwhelming majority identified need for improvement. Issues mentioned by 10 or more respondents are summarized below.

COMMENT SUMMARY (frequency)

- OSP needs to be streamlined – improve communication & eliminate bottlenecks (26)
- The staff needs to be more helpful and proactive. (23)
- OSP should identify and tell us about grant sources or help us to locate them. (18)
- The OSP needs more staff (especially post-award). (15)
- Distribute the OSP staff to the colleges/departments. (14)
- OSP needs more visibility. (13)
- They need to provide more help with grant writing. (13)

- They need to hire people with experience from the outside. (10)

Sample comments:

- Office of sponsored programs is an impediment to research and fights you every step of the way trying to bring in research dollars to UNLV. There needs to be a paradigm shift to this office if you expect faculty to even want to write research proposals.
- UNLV received less than 200 grants from NSF in its history. This is substantially less than even teaching universities. Typical research universities get hundreds of NSF funding per year. We should get more competitive grants. OSP can search and offer assistance more actively, by providing the templates, checking the progress of the faculty members (a little push will help), offering personalized services (collecting CFP in interests area, consulting time management, visiting faculty offices, etc).
- The people who work in the Sponsored programs office (new hires) know very little and I feel that I have to navigate more than they do. They need to already know how to submit to NSF Fastlane for example, rather than relying on a new researcher like myself. I feel that they should hire experienced staff.
- More space is needed for the OSP if we are to grow and support the research infrastructure.
- More staff.
- Pre- and post-award services should work together as one unit in order to allow continuity with ongoing grants. UNLV needs more staff in order to support researcher with budget development for their grant requests.
- Distribute OSP Program Officers in the Colleges and build a pool of at least two rotating officers who can handle the loads when Program Officers leave.
- OSP: 1. Electronic signatures for proposals. Feedback to the PI could be generated automatically, without burdening staff. 2. Post and update all current overhead rates and grad. student fees on a single site. Better: Post a budget template containing current rates so that investigators need to fill in only their numbers to arrive at correct budgets. 3. Some solicitations require matching funds. A clear policy defining the conditions for promising matching funds on the web to investigators would be helpful.
- Get people with experience with ALL the agencies and who know how to support researchers not try to bend researchers to support them.
- I think the OSP does a good job and I have always found them helpful. I have no complaints here.

Summary of comments from all sections:

The most common themes were the need for more OSP staff (and improved retention), more help from OSP staff, and improved management and communication.

Reward System

The survey included four questions about the reward system, including merit and promotion and tenure.

Reward System

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|---|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 19. The UNLV merit guidelines reward high quality research. | 51 | 71 | 65 | 73 | 61 | 12 | 3.17 |
| 18. UNLV's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines distinguish between quantity and quality of research. | 38 | 68 | 77 | 83 | 42 | 11 | 3.18 |
| 21. UNLV's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines support the university's goal to become a nationally recognized research university. | 27 | 50 | 68 | 97 | 67 | 8 | 3.48 |
| 40. The UNLV merit guidelines reward research productivity. | 33 | 37 | 53 | 89 | 79 | 17 | 3.63 |
| Average | | | | | | | 3.38 |

Section Summary: The main concerns expressed by the survey respondents were the lack of rewards for research generally and rewards that emphasized the quantity of publications rather than quality and scholarly impact of the research. Perceived inconsistency across units was also raised as an issue. Some respondents also raised the issue of extra-contractual compensation.

Some representative comments are given below.

Lack of rewards -

- Send a consistent message about the role of research in promotion, tenure, and merit. Don't talk about the importance of research and then constantly ask faculty to teach another class with larger enrollments or increase the number of service requirements to the community
- The basic problem, in my opinion, is that administrators use resources to make their lives easier at the expense of productivity.
- Deans should be required to establish policies that provide merit rewards to faculty who are successful in securing funded grant projects. In my college no added consideration is given to faculty with funded research. Likewise, Deans should be required to develop a mechanism by which they will grant course reassignments to faculty who have funded research projects. As it stands, the merit and course reassignment process is too subjective and gives the deans too much power. Deans must be required to reconcile college level policy concerning course reductions with university level policy.
- Addressing compensation for faculty who work 40% or more of their time on research projects. We are limited in terms of actual compensation and course buy-outs that we can do. The incentive to pursue additional projects is not there.
- There should be more grants available to faculty who are active and high-quality researchers. Currently, only NIA provides fund for more than 5k, and that is only open to

new faculty. SITE grants are so small, yet that is all that's available for relatively senior faculty (who pass their 3 year at UNLV) who are still active researchers, who do not have much industrial connections, and whose discipline does not provide much resources of external funds (such as College of Business as compared to College of Engineering). There should be more types of grants available for faculty at different stage of their careers and who have different needs.

- We are placing a huge emphasize on research and research output in merit, evaluation, promotion and tenure. As we have not yet evolved mechanisms to evaluate quality, we are measuring only the quantity. The Departments are in a better position to evaluate the quality. The current procedure of a college committee going by numbers should be changed. Teaching should be given equal importance as it eventually feeds into research. Developing a new course or a minor or a program or even revising an existing course is very time consuming and are essential to train a work force that will be competent in the market place. This will also significantly improve the standing of the university. Service should be given more importance. To build a high profile research university, we need to have efficient go-getting departments. Those who sacrifice their time in building a modern research oriented department should get their due credit.

Emphasis on quality –

- Award merit on the basis of research impact. Provide space and personnel based on grants received.
- Change in COLLEGE merit policies so that they clearly reward quality research. Higher tenure standards so that we only tenure good researchers.
- Merit should reflect promotion and tenure.
- Appoint administrators who value quality research. Link merit to quality research
- Number of publication is an important measure how successful you are in research. However, the more important measure should be quality of your publications. In addition, we have to acknowledge that different research fields have different expectations in terms of publication numbers. For example, publications from experimental studies should not be treated the same way to those of theoretical studies, that is unfair.

Consistency across units –

- Provide equal reassignment time for comparable research for all colleges. Fine Arts faculty who bring in major grants and publish still teach nine credits and do not get the same reassignment for research as faculty from other colleges.
- Recognition that many faculty in the liberal arts need time and travel money to support research trips to libraries in the United States and elsewhere. This is relatively cheap in terms of use of university resources but is often overlooked because of a focus on the hard sciences.
- move to make definition of and rewarding of 'research' and 'quality research' more uniform across colleges/schools for purposes of P&T and merit

Extra Contractual Compensation –

- Extra Contractual Compensation: The recent changes to policies concerning the draw down of extra contractual compensation (ECC) during the academic year really prohibit the advancement of faculty research agenda. It is unrealistic to expect that faculty can be productive researchers when they only have the summer months to complete projects. Disallowing ECC during the academic year will translate into many researchers not being able to get extra work done during the year. Buy-out Formula: The course buyout rate is unrealistic and extremely too high. At my current salary, I am required to

pay more than \$20,000 to buy out of one 3 credit hour course. The buy-out rate is a disincentive to faculty who would like to conduct research. Dawn Neuman's office (Deb Powell et al) should complete an organizational self-assessment in order to determine how they might be more responsive to faculty needs concerning the processing of EDOCs. There should be university-level support for the start-up of college or department level research centers.

Sabbaticals

The survey asked three questions about sabbaticals.

Sabbaticals

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|---|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|------------------|
| 46. The Faculty Senate is the appropriate place to determine sabbaticals. | 51 | 41 | 47 | 79 | 48 | 14 | 3.26 |
| 2. An adequate number of sabbatical opportunities is available to support research. | 41 | 56 | 68 | 93 | 80 | 8 | 3.40 |
| 30. The sabbatical policies and procedures support research. | 33 | 38 | 66 | 90 | 65 | 0 | 3.40 |
| Average | | | | | | | 3.40 |

Section Summary: The survey results suggest that improvements in the sabbaticals are needed, both in terms of the number of sabbaticals available University-wide and in the policies governing sabbaticals. Of those who have a positive view of sabbaticals at UNLV, relatively few feel strongly (answer "Agree Strongly"). Of those who have a negative view, a larger proportion register strong opinions (answer "Disagree Strongly").

Individual comments suggest some areas where the current sabbatical system could be improved. Some representative comments are:

- Rules for sabbaticals could be easily accessible and clear once you find them -- you might think they are -- but they are not.
- Sabbatical should be accrued (as it is in most major research institutes) and not applied for.
- Sabbaticals and release time for jr. faculty members BEFORE TENURE!!!! Expand sabbatical funds (my understanding is that the fund has stayed the same, while eligible pool has increased)

In many cases, comments about the number and frequency of sabbaticals were combined with comments regarding the need for reduced teaching loads, and, more generally, the need for more time to do research.

Technology

The survey asked three questions about the technology infrastructure with regard to research needs at UNLV, relating to staff expertise and responsiveness in the Office of Information Technology, as well as a general question about the campus network capabilities. The results of these questions were as follows:

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|--|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 34. The Office of Information Technology staff has the expertise to meet my technology needs for research. | 36 | 43 | 58 | 87 | 63 | 20 | 3.51 |
| 37. The Office of Information Technology responds in a timely fashion to my technology needs for research. | 31 | 31 | 56 | 92 | 71 | 19 | 3.66 |
| 28. The UNLV campus has adequate network capabilities to meet my technology needs for research. | 38 | 36 | 51 | 101 | 94 | 21 | 3.70 |
| Average | | | | | | | 3.59 |

Section Summary: The response average on these three questions was in the middle range in relation to the other nine categories, indicating mixed feelings on the part of campus researchers in response to technology infrastructure, with little difference in the responses between the three questions. A slight edge was given to the campus network capabilities in general, over OIT staff expertise and responsiveness.

Issues mentioned by 10 or more respondents are summarized below:

- Modernize technology and communication tools; OIT not research-oriented (14)
- Need more IT people or people with a technical orientation connected to research (11)

Individual comments that may shed light on this result are broken down into general concerns; technology space needs; support for software and specific systems; and items that are specific to a particular college or discipline, as follows:

General—

- Sufficient funding to provide: modern technology, computing, network strength and capability, and communication tools, sufficient support staff, high quality students to become involved.
- OIT...are totally worthless organizations. They are poorly staffed and run by largely incompetent administrators...The OIT lacks competent administration and doesn't have the basic research infrastructure (e.g., general support staff, an SPSS statistical consultant) to assist faculty research.
- We need more IT people.
- Stress the need for more support staff and technological support.
- The computer system admin. support is no where near the level for a research institution
- More funding for online technology training
- Needs more support staff....more knowledgeable re technology.
- Immediate support staff help in software, IT trouble shooting and occasional technical typing.
- Increase IT training for support staff
- Telecommunications are well below standard. Because I work with colleagues at different schools, I often have a need for conference calls, but cannot do that here. Also, caller ID would be helpful.
- I would like OIT and the president's office to articulate a vision for technology.
- I think OIT supports student computing and networking quite well, but they are not equipped to handle research computing. There needs to be some support for this at a modern campus. The goals for research computing are so different. Probably best to build the infrastructure at the department and college level for research computing.
- The wireless network on the campus is inadequate. The entire university should be wireless at this point.
- Technology and technology support should be available to researchers on a university wide basis. For example, technology workshops

Technology Spaces—

- Faculty need a well equipped faculty lab with digital video capabilities. Support staff coming from OIT need to carry business cards so we can get in touch with them. The advisors need software so that they do not manually check student's records. Adjuncts and PTIs should be using UNLV email.
- Need more space and high tech space.
- All classrooms must be internet equipped and have computers and projectors.
- I would like to see faculty have more access to computer labs. Most labs are dedicated to teaching - research takes a backseat.
- Updated building space with technology.
- Some rooms with media technology (projectors, computers, etc) available for research. Now those rooms or materials are not available due to official classes

- There needs to be significantly more space available for research staff in the social sciences. This includes technology and office space with telephones for graduate assistants and research faculty.

Software/Specific Systems Support—

- UNLV needs more bandwidth to support web site files. The WebCampus grade book needs to mesh with the SIS.
- Technology issues really need to be addressed. It is ridiculous that we cannot obtain specialized software and that IT support staff have to install all software.
- Increase IT support for data management tools. We need campus licenses for qualitative data management as well as quantitative data management.
- Add some web specialists at the Office of Technology who are capable of assisting faculty and students in the creation and maintenance of websites.
- better computing support, including UNIX
- Get a full time Research Staff (including people competent in SPSS, geo-mapping, and other statistical software).
- need someone who can support SAS users
- Technology needs to make decisions based on the needs of those of us using it not their own preferences. Our email system is embarrassingly bad and out of date but technology seems to have other priorities.
- Get a decent spam filter!

College/Discipline Specific—

- Computer support (including OIT) in the College of Engineering is joke! I have had down times as long as 6 week to several months. It makes for an embarrassing sponsor review.
- The law school should provide more technological support.
- More space for computer labs for students within a dept. would be helpful for students working on faculty research projects.
- Our college needs a dedicated support person for research computing. Our department could almost use a full time dedicated person in this position.
- We have only one computer tech who is great when available, but does not have the time to be available very often.
- Increase the number of support staff needed from secretaries to instrumentation technicians and also add more computer systems people to help in our dept.
- The College of Engineering badly needs informed management of the computing infrastructure of the College. There has existed a long history of poor hardware, software, and computer personnel support. Today, you should look carefully at the air-conditioning support for well over \$1M worth of research and educational computer equipment in B377. It is completely unacceptable. Also, the college computer support staff needs a budget to acquire the software and/or hardware needed to improve security and services provided to all staff.
- UNLV needs support Linux/Unix systems, the Computational Science is very important and goes to every disciplinary. For real computational person like myself, I am still use 7 years old Linux system, UNLV does not upgrade my computer facility.

Libraries

The survey asked two questions about the libraries at UNLV. The questions were modified from the “information control” section of the LIBQUAL+ survey that is administered by the University Libraries every two years to chart library service quality. The results of these questions were as follows:

| | Disagree Strongly | Disagree | Disagree Somewhat | Agree Somewhat | Agree | Agree Strongly | Response Average |
|---|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 5. The UNLV Libraries provide access to the printed materials that I need for my research. | 12 | 15 | 43 | 85 | 171 | 54 | 4.45 |
| 1. The UNLV Libraries provide access to the electronic materials that I need for my research. | 7 | 10 | 20 | 79 | 203 | 84 | 4.77 |
| Average | | | | | | | 4.61 |

Section Summary: The response average on these two questions referring to printed and electronic information needed to conduct research was the second highest of the ten categories, with a slight edge being given to the provision of electronic materials. This result indicates that relative to the other research infrastructure categories, information and materials provided by the Libraries are meeting the needs of the majority of campus researchers, with a few exceptions.

A few individual comments indicating a departure from this overall positive result are as follows:

- There are many journals which are available only electronically---and the links to these often fail. I would like to see more actual journals OR a better system of retrieving them.
- Please, purchase electronic journal subscriptions for the most important research journals. We need this. These days, electronic form (instead of paper) is best way to spend the money.
- One of my biggest complaints is that we do not have easy access to all peer-reviewed scientific journals. Inter-library loan has been a nightmare for me every time that I have used it. We need to make the acquisition of journal articles simple because research scientists do not have time to jump through hoops to retrieve an important article.

Section Summary: The area of research climate had the highest score of any of the areas asked about in the survey. Generally, respondents feel that there is support for the goal of increasing research productivity within their Departments. However, support for that goal is perceived to be weaker at the College and University level. The comments suggest faculty and staff who are successful in research and publication should be accorded more respect.

Sample Comments:

- We should not worry about treating everyone the same. WE are different. Plus if we want to be a research university we have to treat our researchers differently than others. Not with a lack of respect but there is a hierarchy in research universities.
- Respect for research and publication. Too many of those involved in merit, resource allocation and other decisions have little respect for research and are mediocrities in their own fields.
- UNLV, as well as other urban institutions, have a bright future. However, I find that we spend too much time generating ideas and innovations from within and not with learning from others who have faced similar issues in the past. We could learn a lot from some comparative analysis.
- I wish UNLV would appreciate and reward competitive researchers, if it wants to be a nationally recognized school. When I look around, my impression is that most of our faculty publish in low quality journals (because it is easier), increase their publication numbers by inserting their names to other persons' papers. With regarding to grant, some researchers at UNLV are exceptionally rich because of earmark money (not peer-reviewed grant), but they are doing enough in research. They claimed they were buying fancy instruments and building up infrastructures with such a huge money. But I wonder when they really do 'real' research? Maybe when earmark money stop coming, they will start their research.
- A strategic plan is needed for the types of research to be supported by UNLV. For after all we can not do all things well. This would call for an evaluation of what is focused on at UNR versus UNLV. The overhead required by UNLV for grants limits the organizations that faculty can obtain grant funding from. Some are not willing to pay for lights to be on in buildings that will be on whether the research they fund is performed or not. Untenured faculty should NOT be asked to develop new programs/departments at UNLV. It is too much to ask of anyone that is also be required to teach and publish. What generally suffers is the person's research productivity. When this happens their chance at receiving tenure is greatly diminished.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

The Task Force was charged with analyzing "... the effectiveness of planning at the unit and campus levels related to the enhancement of research infrastructure." The Task Force reviewed the University and all College/School strategic plans as of the Fall 2006. Based on the review of the strategic plans, it is clear that not enough attention has been paid to research infrastructure. It is also clear that, even when research infrastructure needs have been recognized in strategic plans, resources have not been allocated. The current state of affairs is the result of underinvestment in research infrastructure over a long period of time.

In the University's strategic plan for 2002-2007 research infrastructure is mentioned in four places:

- "UNLV will encourage faculty and staff to seek external funding and will create a research infrastructure that will support that effort, including a research foundation under the auspices of the UNLV Foundation." (p. 7)
- "The University will:
 - Provide employees with access to services and resources they need in order to meet their goals for success
 - Be more competitive in recruiting and compensating graduate students. (p. 9)
- "UNLV will:
 - Improve the infrastructure (labs, equipment and computing facilities) by following recommendations from the American Association for the Advancement of Science team that visited the campus in 2000.
 - Expand research-related support staffing." (p. 10).
- "the University will:
 - Develop, maintain and continuously upgrade a research computing environment designed to support the high-speed computational, communication and educational needs of students and faculty engaged in research and creative activities." (p. 15)

It is clear that this discussion does not recognize the full range of research infrastructure that is needed at UNLV. For example, the University's strategic plan does not discuss the effect that staff shortages and policies and procedures have on research productivity. It is also clear that, while some of the goals set forth have been achieved, little or no progress has been made in achieving other goals.

Strategic planning at the College/School level is highly variable in quality. Some units appear to have done a good job of planning, developing fairly detailed strategic plans that could be implemented. For example, the College of Sciences strategic plan lists goals and metrics for determining success in meeting those goals. Other units have very vague, general strategic plans that could not be implemented. For example, the College of Business strategic plan is fewer than 200 words. Strategic planning at the College/School level appears to have proceeded independently from planning at the University level. The University strategic plan lists eight goals. These goals are not mentioned in many College/School strategic plans. The University strategic plan lists eleven “research macrothemes.” Again, these research macrothemes are not mentioned in many of the College/School strategic plans.

Planning for research infrastructure at the College/School level is also highly variable in quality. Most units barely mention the need for research infrastructure. For example, the College of Business strategic plan has a goal to “Provide state-of-the-art physical facilities and technology.” Similarly, the College of Hotel Administration says only that “... it is critical that our physical image and space issues are addressed.” Neither strategic plan discusses what this means in concrete terms or how the goal is to be achieved. On the other hand, some units developed specific plans for necessary research infrastructure. For example, the College of Sciences specifically mentions the needs for physical space, technical support staff and information technology, among others. The School of Public Health strategic plan discusses the need for physical space and equipment and discusses how renovation of the space and acquisition of the equipment will be funded.

UNLV has significantly expanded the number undergraduate and graduate programs that it offers. The University now offers over 100 bachelor’s degrees and, more importantly for research infrastructure, over 100 graduate degrees, including 32 doctoral degrees. The addition of graduate programs, especially Ph.D. programs, has important implications for research infrastructure. Graduate programs are more demanding of faculty time. Graduate students

need to be able to carry out the research needed to complete their degrees, which places additional demands on the research infrastructure. There seems to have been little recognition of these facts. It is widely known that, in order to gain approval for a new program, the proposal must claim that no new resources are needed. However, it is impossible to develop high quality programs, especially graduate programs, without adequate funding and without adequate infrastructure.

The University needs to develop an understanding of the resources that are necessary for the faculty to be able to do their jobs to the best of their capability in research and in graduate education. We see little advantage in introducing new programs, especially at the graduate level, unless adequate resources are made available. Proposals for new programs at all levels need to be consistent with the University's strategic plan and need to include realistic assessments of the resources required to operate the program successfully.

Recommendations

The first three areas, Support Staff, Policies and Procedures and Physical Space are **critically deficient**. The University needs to begin implementing the following recommendations for these areas immediately.

Support Staff:

- The University needs to increase the number of support staff. Critical offices, such as Purchasing, Travel and OSP, among others, appear to be understaffed given their responsibilities. There are too few technical staff. The Colleges of Sciences and Engineering are short of technical staff to maintain equipment and operate labs efficiently. The College of Business has one Information Technology person responsible for over 130 faculty and staff. Other examples are easy to find. The result of these shortages is that faculty spend time carrying out tasks that should be handled by staff, and spend less time on research and creative activity. The long term goal should be to have all problems not directly related to research and creative activity (purchasing, travel, hiring, payroll, accounting, etc.) handled by staff. In the meantime, the most critical staff shortages need to be identified and remedied.
- People who understand and respect research should be hired, especially in administrative positions.
- Support staff should be trained so that they are knowledgeable about the needs of research administration, knowledgeable about policies and procedures and knowledgeable about how to solve problems.
- Staff should be cross-trained so that critical services do not become unavailable if one person is sick or on vacation.
- Support staff should have a “customer service” orientation toward supporting research. The words “No” and “I (we) can’t” should be banished from staff’s vocabulary.
- Support staff should have specific performance goals, such as responding to phone calls and emails within 24 hours, providing travel reimbursement in two weeks (not the current two months), issuing P-cards within one week (not several months), etc.
- Newly hired staff should be allowed to start work before the old staff person leaves to allow for training and to improve continuity in support. If University rules prevent this, the rules need to be changed. If NSHE or State rules prevent this, ways to circumvent the rules must be found.
- The University must change its basic approach to human resources management. The University needs to adopt current best practices approaches. These “high performance” practices include, among others, alternative job design practices such as work teams,

job enrichment and job rotation, and formal participatory practices, such as quality circles and problem-solving groups. Adoption of best practices will motivate staff and faculty to develop, share and apply their knowledge and skills more effectively than under current practices and increase efficiency.

- The fact that classified staff work for the State rather than UNLV creates problems. The administration should restructure the classified staff system so that support staff are employees of the University or NSHE. This would allow the University to adopt better human resource management practices for classified staff, rather than being forced to use work practices better suited for the DMV or similar state agencies. This would allow the University more control over their pay and reward systems, making it easier for the University to reward and retain high quality classified staff people.

Policies and Procedures

- Policies and procedures in many areas are outdated, cumbersome and ineffective. The combination of bad policies and understaffing creates severe problems. Particular areas where the administration should revamp policies and procedures are Purchasing, Travel, Human Resources, OSP (including pre- and post-grant administration), OPRS/IRB and graduate student admissions and support. Policies in these offices, which are critical to research productivity, need to be redesigned from the ground up. Aspirant (not peer) university with strong reputations for research need to be identified and their policies and procedures adopted. Active researchers who are affected should be consulted in the process of revising these policies and procedures, rather than having policy simply imposed by administrators. It may be necessary for administration to use outside consultants or to replace administrators and staff who are resistant to change in order to redevelop policies and procedures in research critical areas.
- Once grants have been awarded, the University should provide “bridge financing” to the researcher so that equipment can be purchased and research staff hired. Research personnel and equipment should be in place at the start of the grant period so that research projects can be started on time.
- The University should adopt a “differentiated staffing” model. Faculty who are actively engaged in research and creative activities should have 2-2 teaching loads at most and faculty who are not active in research should teach more. Reduced teaching loads need to be linked to continued research productivity.
- The University needs to make it easier (simpler procedures and lower cost) to “buy out” courses. Course “buy outs” should be in addition to, not a substitute for, research reassignments.
- The University should move, wherever possible, to electronic transmission of forms and documents. Researchers (or research support staff) should be able to track the status of grants and related activities through a single online portal. However, implementation of this should be delayed until after policies and procedures have been upgraded.

- A comprehensive electronic policy manual should be created to address all areas of research policy, procedures and support on campus. The manual must be easily accessible and must be kept up-to-date.
- The Graduate College should simplify the admissions process. Graduate student support should be competitive with aspirant universities.

Physical Space

- UNLV is critically short of research space. The obvious solution to the problem is to build more research space. If space cannot be built on campus, then the needed space should be purchased or leased near campus.
- The administration should survey all existing space on campus. Unused or underused space should be allocated for research. Existing space that is unsuitable for research needs to be renovated and brought up to current standards. The renovations need to be carried out in a timely manner.
- HVAC systems need to be fully functional on a year-round basis. This is particularly true for areas containing equipment that is sensitive to heat/cold/humidity. Administrators need to remember that active researchers often work on holidays and over breaks to take advantage of the ability to work on research projects without interruptions. Labs and offices need to be accessible and heated/cooled during these periods.
- Existing space needs to be better utilized. The University needs to develop clear guidelines for allocating research space so that faculty and programs with successful research programs have adequate research space. One possibility is to “lease” laboratory space to researchers. Laboratories would then be fully utilized, and researchers would need to continue to be productive in obtaining funding to maintain the lab.
- New and renovated classroom buildings need to be designed with large lecture halls. Classes, particularly introductory classes, should be taught in large sections, freeing up faculty to teach advanced courses and/or conduct research.

The following four areas, OPRS/IRB, OSP, Reward Systems and Technology, are **seriously deficient**. The University needs to begin implementing the following recommendations as soon as possible.

OPRS/IRB

- The OPRS/IRB needs to be much more focused on getting research protocols that adequately protect research subjects approved so that the research projects can be

carried out. The VP for Research should study and adopt policies and procedures for OPRS/IRB at aspirant universities. The IRB should shorten the application and streamline the application process. These offices need to be adequately staffed and the staff well trained.

- OPRS/IRB needs to respond in a timely manner. Many research protocols are routine and should be approved within days, not months. No protocol should take months to review.
- Once new policies and procedures are adopted, the application and review process should be online as far as possible. The OPRS/IRB should prominently post and keep up to date on its website clear guides to its policies and procedures.

Office of Sponsored Programs

- The OSP needs to provide “cradle to grave” support for carrying out research under competitive grants from all major granting agencies. This includes identifying possible funding sources, assistance with writing the proposal, providing budget templates, providing “boilerplate” language, assistance with purchasing equipment and hiring tracking accounts, etc. Pre- and post-award support needs to be integrated and function seamlessly. OSP needs to have sufficient trained and knowledgeable staff to carry out these functions.
- OSP procedures should streamline its procedures. The VP for Research should identify and adopt “best practices” from universities with histories of success at obtaining competitive research grants.
- OSP needs to develop a “customer service” orientation and improve communication with researchers.
- OSP personnel should be distributed to the Colleges/Schools. These College/School “branch offices” need to be staffed with personnel who are familiar with the research programs of the College/School faculty and with the relevant funding sources. Faculty should be informed of RFPs that are relevant to their research agendas -- a “shotgun” approach to informing faculty of RFPs is ineffective.

Reward Systems (including Sabbaticals)

- The reward system (annual evaluation, merit, promotion and tenure, research reassignment, sabbaticals, allocation of laboratory space) needs to consistently reward high quality research and creative activity. For example, faculty should earn lower teaching loads as a result of research productivity. Annual evaluation and merit formulae for such faculty should then place more weight on research productivity.
- Colleges/Schools must develop objective criteria for evaluating research quality. Rewards need to be based on the consistent application of these criteria, to provide incentives to carry out high quality (not high quantity) research and creative activities. The process for determining rewards should be apolitical, objective and transparent.

- The current number of sabbaticals is inadequate. Since the number of sabbaticals is limited by state law, the University needs to develop a “Research Leave” program that is functionally identical to sabbaticals.
- The Faculty Senate should streamline the sabbatical application process. Rules for sabbaticals need to be clear and easily accessible. The application needs to focus on relevant information (the proposal and the applicants’ record for high quality research) and evaluation of proposals needs to focus on their substance and not on trivia (e.g. tabs). Sabbatical applications should be electronic.

Technology

- OIT needs to increase support for research computing. In particular, OIT needs more staff familiar with and capable of supporting research computing, including providing software support and IT troubleshooting. To the extent that research computing and information technology needs are College/School specific, OIT personnel should be distributed to these units. These OIT “branch offices” need to be staffed with personnel who are familiar with the technology needs of the College/School.
- Technology spaces needed include computer labs for research (not teaching) and rooms with digital video capabilities.
- OIT should provide support for widely used statistical packages such as SPSS and SAS. These personnel need to be capable of providing assistance with the advanced programming problems that arise in research.
- OIT should provide increased support for web sites, including increased bandwidth and file space and increased support for development and maintenance of web sites.
- The wireless network should be campus-wide, not just in selected buildings.
- Telecommunications needs to be improved. In particular, it should be possible to make conference calls from any faculty office.

The final two areas, Libraries and Research Climate, are generally viewed positively.

Nonetheless, there are some recommendations that should be implemented.

Libraries

- Access to electronic versions of journals should be simple. For most researchers, electronic versions of journals are more convenient. The libraries should move to electronic versions of journals only and away from hard copies, especially if this will allow the Libraries to increase the number of available journals. Links to electronic journals must be kept working and up to date.

- Adjunct faculty should have access to the library year-round.
- The Inter-library loan process should be simple, straightforward and fast.
- The Law Library should be more technologically and research-service oriented.
- The Music Library holdings should be in one location.

Research Climate

- There needs to be increased recognition and respect for productive researchers. Incentives need to be aligned with the goal of high quality research and creative activity. In addition to tangible rewards (merit, promotion, etc.), there need to be more intangible rewards in the form of positive recognition, especially from Department Chairs and Deans, of significant accomplishments in research and creative activity. Faculty, staff and administrators need to recognize that success is not a zero-sum game.
- Support for increased research productivity is perceived to be weaker at the College/School level than at the Department level, and weaker at the University level than at the College/School level. University and College/School administrators need to do a better job of communicating their support for high quality research and creative activities.

The following recommendations regarding strategic planning should be implemented in the current planning cycle.

Strategic Planning

- The University's strategic plan must take account of the infrastructure that will be required to achieve the goals set out in the plan. In particular, the planning process must include a realistic assessment of the staff and space requirements implied by the strategic planning goals.
- Strategic planning, especially planning for research infrastructure, at the College/School level should be improved. As with the University plan, unit plans should include realistic assessments of the infrastructure necessary to achieve the goals set out in the plan.
- Strategic planning at the College/School level should be better integrated with planning at the University level.
- Proposals for new programs, especially graduate programs, need to include an analysis of the resources required for the program to be successful. The analysis should include discussions of the faculty, graduate student support, lab and office space, IT support, etc, that the program requires.

CONCLUSIONS

Many of the problems with the research infrastructure described in the survey results are well-known and long standing problems. This is the result of underinvestment in research infrastructure over a long period of time. Substantial resources have been required to keep up with the rapid growth that UNLV has experienced. However, the underinvestment in research infrastructure is also due in part to strategic decisions to allocate resources to other uses. In particular, the area with the highest growth rate over the last decade has not been the number of students or faculty, but the size of the central administration.

If UNLV is to achieve its goal of increased national and international recognition for high quality research and creative activity, it must improve its research infrastructure beginning immediately. The areas of Staff, Policies and Procedures and Physical Space are critically deficient and are a serious roadblock to the effective conduct of research. Correcting the deficiencies in these areas is a challenge that the University must face now. The problem of providing adequate space is the most difficult. The shortage of space is severe, and correcting the problem will be expensive. The problem of providing an adequate number of high quality staff will also present a challenge. There will be costs to hiring additional staff and improving training for new and existing staff. Developing effective and efficient policies and procedures will also have its costs. But in many areas, improving policies and procedures is simply a question of finding the political will to make the necessary changes. Nonetheless, the University must find ways to surmount the challenges in these three areas or it will extremely difficult, if not impossible, to increase research productivity.

The areas of OPRS/IRB, OSP, the reward system and technology are seriously deficient and also are roadblocks to the effective conduct of research. Improvements in these four areas must begin to take place in the very near future. Many of the changes that need to be made in

these areas reduce to the need for sufficient numbers of high quality staff and for effective policies and procedures. Again, there will be costs to hiring and training staff and there are costs improving policies and procedures. But again, the University must find the resources and the political will to make the changes.

The areas of the libraries and the research climate are generally viewed positively. There are improvements that can be made in these areas. Improving libraries collections and services will have costs. Improving the research climate is largely a matter of changing the culture of the University.

The recommended changes in the Universities strategic planning process are in principle straightforward. Once the goals of the strategic plan are established, there must be a realistic assessment of the resources, and in particular the research infrastructure, required to achieve those goals. This needs to be done at the University and at the College/School levels.

Many fine people have been attracted to UNLV because of its potential. But unless UNLV solves the problems with its research infrastructure, that potential will never be realized.

APPENDIX

DEMOGRAPHICS

Rank?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Provost / Vice Provost | 0 | 0.0% |
| Vice President / AVP | 4 | 0.8% |
| Dean | 2 | 0.4% |
| Chair | 12 | 2.3% |
| Professor | 83 | 16.0% |
| Associate Professor | 95 | 18.3% |
| Assistant Professor | 94 | 18.1% |
| Lecturer | 26 | 5.0% |
| Professional Staff | 125 | 24.1% |
| Other | 78 | 15.0% |
| <hr/> | | |
| Total Respondents | 519 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 6 | |

College?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Business | 30 | 5.9% |
| Dental Medicine | 18 | 3.6% |
| Education | 56 | 11.1% |
| Engineering | 34 | 6.7% |
| Fine Arts | 18 | 3.6% |
| Graduate College | 4 | 0.8% |
| Health & Human Sciences | 16 | 3.2% |
| Honors | 0 | 0.0% |
| Hotel | 10 | 2.0% |
| Law | 7 | 1.4% |
| Liberal Arts | 76 | 15.0% |
| Libraries | 12 | 2.4% |
| Nursing | 16 | 3.2% |
| Public Health | 12 | 2.4% |
| Sciences | 65 | 12.9% |
| University College | 3 | 0.6% |
| Urban Affairs | 38 | 7.5% |
| Other | 90 | 17.8% |
| <hr/> | | |
| Total Respondents | 505 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 20 | |

Department?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|---|----------------|------------|
| Accounting | 3 | 0.6% |
| Anthropology | 8 | 1.7% |
| Architecture | 5 | 1.1% |
| Art | 2 | 0.4% |
| Biological Sciences | 32 | 6.7% |
| Chemistry | 17 | 3.6% |
| Civil and Environmental Engineering | 6 | 1.3% |
| Communication Studies | 2 | 0.4% |
| Computer Sciences | 7 | 1.5% |
| Criminal Justice | 6 | 1.3% |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 12 | 2.5% |
| Dance | 1 | 0.2% |
| Economics | 8 | 1.7% |
| Educational Leadership | 8 | 1.7% |
| Educational Psychology | 16 | 3.4% |
| Electrical and Computer Engineering | 5 | 1.1% |
| English | 12 | 2.5% |
| English Language Center | 1 | 0.2% |
| Environmental Studies | 2 | 0.4% |
| Film | 1 | 0.2% |
| Finance | 11 | 2.3% |
| Food and Beverage Management | 2 | 0.4% |
| Foreign Languages | 3 | 0.6% |
| Geoscience | 8 | 1.7% |
| Health Care Administration & Policy | 3 | 0.6% |
| Health Physics | 4 | 0.8% |
| Health Promotion | 3 | 0.6% |
| History | 11 | 2.3% |
| Hotel Management | 5 | 1.1% |
| Journalism & Media Studies | 6 | 1.3% |
| Kinesiology | 3 | 0.6% |
| Management | 3 | 0.6% |
| Management Information Systems | 3 | 0.6% |
| Marketing | 3 | 0.6% |
| Marriage Family & Community Counseling | 1 | 0.2% |
| Mathematical Sciences | 7 | 1.5% |
| Mechanical Engineering | 13 | 2.7% |
| Music | 5 | 1.1% |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| Nutrition Sciences | 3 | 0.6% |
| Philosophy | 2 | 0.4% |
| Physical Therapy | 3 | 0.6% |
| Physiological Nursing | 7 | 1.5% |
| Physics | 3 | 0.6% |
| Political Science | 7 | 1.5% |
| Psychology | 25 | 5.3% |
| Psychosocial Nursing | 3 | 0.6% |
| Public Administration | 5 | 1.1% |
| Social Work | 12 | 2.5% |
| Sociology | 4 | 0.8% |
| Special Education | 16 | 3.4% |
| Sports Education Leadership | 0 | 0.0% |
| Theatre | 4 | 0.8% |
| Tourism and Convention Administration | 3 | 0.6% |
| University Studies | 2 | 0.4% |
| Women's Studies | 1 | 0.2% |
| Other | 127 | 26.7% |
| Total Respondents | 475 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 50 | |

Years at UNLV?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Less than one year | 78 | 15.1% |
| 1 - 5 years | 215 | 41.6% |
| 6 - 10 years | 100 | 19.3% |
| 11 - 20 years | 91 | 17.6% |
| More than 20 years | 33 | 6.4% |
| Total Respondents | 517 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 8 | |

Are you tenured?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Yes | 180 | 34.8% |
| No | 204 | 39.5% |
| N/A | 133 | 25.7% |
| Total Respondents | 517 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 8 | |

Gender?

| | Response Total | % of Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Male | 240 | 47.4% |
| Female | 266 | 52.6% |
| Total Respondents | 506 | 100.0% |
| (skipped this question) | 19 | |