

Administrative Review of the Office of the Vice President of Research

University of Iowa

Date 4/15//2024

Committee Members

Teresa Marshall, College of Dentistry (Chair)

Rodica Curtu, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Amany Farag, College of Nursing

Waltraud Maierhofer, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Peter Thorne, College of Public Health

Sarah Vigmostad, College of Engineering

Steven Ackerman, Former Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, University of Wisconsin (External Consultant)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	3
II. Review Process	3
III. Interview Summary	4
IV. Faculty Survey Summary	9
V. Summary and Recommendations	13
VI. Appendix A: OVPR Self-Study	
VII. Appendix B: OVPR Self-Study Addendum	
VIII. Appendix C: Invited Interviewees	
IX. Appendix D: Interview Questions	
X. Appendix E: Faculty Survey	

I. Introduction

In collaboration with the Office of the President, the University of Iowa Faculty Senate is charged with reviewing each of the central academic offices and their senior officials approximately every seven years. The purpose of the administrative reviews is to provide an opportunity for central administrative officials to evaluate their programs and to provide a systematic faculty evaluation of the central offices. The desired outcome of the review process is to make recommendations to improve the central office's administrative structure and performance. The shared review facilitates communication between administrative officials and faculty and is an important piece of shared governance on the University of Iowa (UI) Campus. This review summarizes the report of the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) and is divided into the following categories: review process, interview summaries, faculty survey summaries, and committee recommendations.

II. Review Process

- a. The initial OVPR Review Committee was appointed in the Spring of 2020 by University of Iowa President Bruce Harreld and Faculty Senate President Sandy Daack-Hirsch and held their initial meeting on March 2, 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic interrupted the process, and the OVPR review process resumed with three existing and four new committee members in the Spring of 2023 under the direction of University of Iowa President Barbara Wilson and Faculty Senate President Ana Rodriguez-Rodriguez.
 - a. The previous OVPR self-study was completed in 2003-04, and the review was completed in 2006. As part of the 2018 search process for the Vice President for Research & Economic Development, the search committee chairs, David Gier and Aliasger Salem, met with multiple internal and external stakeholders to gather information and identify opportunities for improvement in the OVPR; the search committee published its findings in the Search's Phase 1 Recommendations report. Committee members reviewed both the 2006 OVPR review report and the 2018 Search Phase 1 Recommendations report.
 - b. The scope of the current review is 2019-present, the time during which Dr. Marty Scholtz has served as the Vice President for Research.
- b. The OVPR prepared a self-study document (submitted March 6, 2023), which was reviewed by the committee. The self-study is included as Appendix A.
- c. Committee members Peter Thorne and Teresa Marshall met with Vice President Marty Scholtz and his Administrative Liaison Mike Weaver on April 17, 2023 to clarify committee questions pertaining to the OVPR self-study.
- d. The OVPR then prepared an addendum to the self-study to fully elaborate efforts to facilitate research, scholarship, and creative activities within the Humanities. The addendum is included as Appendix B.

- e. The committee identified individuals to interview based on their position within the OVPR and/or working relationships with the OVPR and VPR Marty Scholtz. The individuals were invited to be interviewed; the positions of those invited are provided in Appendix C.
 - a. Interview questions were designed to guide the interview process. The general interview question template is provided in Appendix D, but some questions were tailored to the individual/group and/or their relationship with the OVPR and VPR Marty Scholtz.
 - b. Interviews were conducted in October through December of 2023.
 - c. The committee members met on 1/18/24 to discuss and identify primary findings from the interviews.
- f. A survey was designed and administered to all university faculty to gather their perspectives on the OVPR.
 - a. The survey questions were designed based on previous administrative reviews and committee input.
 - b. The survey was administered through Qualtrics.
 - i. All faculty were invited to participate by email on 10/18/23 with reminder emails sent on 10/26/23 and 11/1/23.
 - ii. Survey results.
 - 1. Crosstabs were used to identify differences between respondent demographic characteristics and questions pertaining to OVPR use for questions having 50 or more respondents. Cells with less than 10 respondents were deleted.
 - 2. Responses to open ended questions (Q#29, Q#30, and Q#31) were reviewed and summarized. Qualtrics technology was used to identify word clouds; however, the words were not perceived by the Committee to communicate the respondents' intent and are not included in the document.
- g. An assessment of the IRB-01 conducted by an external consultant in July 2023 was made available to the Committee in March 2024. This review assessed the adequacy of staffing and budget of the IRB and evaluated UI approval times in comparison to those of our peer institutions. This document became part of the review as it provided some benchmarking data for the IRB and the Human Subjects Office.

III. Interview Summary

The OVPR Review Committee met with University of Iowa faculty and staff who work within the OVPR and/or engage with the office. Two or more Committee members conducted individual interviews with twelve administrative members of the OVPR and group interviews with eight groups of administrators, faculty, and staff (n=45) having research administrative roles

and/or conducting research. Four individual interviews were conducted with those unable to attend group interviews. The interview protocol guided the process.

The OVPR's role on campus is to provide the infrastructure to enable faculty, staff, and students to conduct excellent research. The OVPR facilitates compliance with all governmental regulations and university and sponsoring agency policies that govern the research enterprise. Supporting the campus research enterprise requires a research administration central office structure (OVPR) that is both efficient and supportive of the research across campus. Coordination and collaboration between the OVPR, research faculty, and offices that make up the research enterprise is crucial to the success of the university's research program.

Overall, interviewees reported that the OVPR is functioning adequately. Three themes were consistently communicated by interviewees throughout the interview process and include:

- Campus role of the OVPR: Although faculty are somewhat unclear as to the role of the OVPR, the stated goals of the OVPR are aligned with the University's Strategic Plan.
- University institutional priorities: The institutional structure limits the OVPR's ability to have an effective role on campus.
- Funding: The OVPR is underfunded to an extent that it often limits its capacity to perform effectively.

Details supporting these three themes are included with additional comments categorized into the headings: a) What is the OVPR doing well? b) What more could the OVPR do to facilitate research at the University? and c) What else did you hear?

What is the OVPR doing well?

Research is a cornerstone of the US Tier 1 academic institutions, and research-sponsored programs are part of the missions around learning and discovery. Students benefit in an environment with strong research programs. Conducted by NSF, the Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) survey is an annual census of U.S. colleges and universities that collects information on R&D expenditures by field of research and source of funds. The HERD provides an overall picture of the annual expenditures and is one way to measure research activity. The table below presents the change in growth in research expenditures for the UI. Over the last three surveys, research grew from \$40M (7%) to \$594M in FY22. Positive growth over the last three years indicates an overall successful research mission.

Funding Source	FY 2020 Change	FY 2021 Change	FY 2022 Change
Federal	+2.8%	+9.3%	+10.8%
State	-12.7%	-1.7%	+10.4%

Institutional	+8.6%	-2.1%	+0.0%
Business	+26.7%	-9.0%	+26.1%
Nonprofit	+0.5%	-7.3%	+13.4%
Total	+5.9%	+2.8%	+7.3%

A research administrative culture that supports research across the institution is likely to drive success in research and staff/faculty satisfaction. The overall impression is that the OVPR works hard to satisfy different needs and goals of the campus research programs. As stated by one interviewee, "It should be acknowledged more often the important role OVPR played during COVID-19 pandemic. The OVPR did an amazing job navigating the pandemic and had the labs at U Iowa running!" Morale in the OVPR seems good and the leadership is effective. Employees within the OVPR know what is expected of them and are appreciative of open communication with their leadership. Faculty engaging with the OVPR's units (i.e., HSO, DSP, RDO, core facilities) commented that the employees are friendly, outgoing, and generally helpful. The addition of the two half-time AVPRs has been well received.

What more could the OVPR do to facilitate research at the University of Iowa?

- **Role on campus:** The OVPR could clarify its mission and communicate to campus what it can or cannot do due to internal rules and available budget. Faculty's overall frustration appears to be associated with a limited understanding of the current financial constraints of the OVPR resulting in unrealistic expectations about what the OVPR can accomplish. It is unclear what steps the OVPR has taken to effectively advocate for additional resources.
- **Interdisciplinary projects:** While the OVPR is perceived to be supportive of interdisciplinary research, its actual role is considered more facilitative than actively engaged. The OVPR staff is dedicated but is thought to have insufficient numbers for such processes. The University of Iowa's interdisciplinary research environment would benefit if the OVPR had the resources to provide support for large cross-departmental grant proposals from development through submission, especially for colleges without pre-award research support staff.

The limited resources are a structural barrier to campus interdisciplinary cross-college projects. Currently, the budget model is perceived to empower the Deans and Provost, leaving the OVPR with limited leverage and/or resources to engage in the process. As a result, the OVPR's ability to function as an intellectual leader on campus is considered limited.

- Research infrastructure: Interviewees consistently shared that the research infrastructure is inadequate for a Research 1, Big10 institution. The lack of modern infrastructure impacts research and scholarly work across campus. Clinical research is compromised by lengthy IRB and DSP processes, with IRB perceived as being unnecessarily risk averse. Interestingly, the 2023 external assessment of the IRB-01 found that UI approval times lagged behind those of our peer institutions despite current staffing levels and budgets that are appropriately sized for the numbers of applications.

Pre- and post-award support is inconsistent and inequitable across campus and compromises research completion. The OVPR, particularly DSP, lost competent staff members following COVID-19 in part because the university was restrictive about options for remote work. Recruitment of competent and retention of experienced staff are necessary for the research enterprise to succeed.

Individual colleges do not have the autonomy nor funding to support the creation of new laboratory space. This impedes faculty recruitment and retention. In the current structure the OVPR has little ability or agency to respond to laboratory space needs.

Core facilities on campus are an important resource for researchers. Current subventions are inadequate to set aside funds to support major equipment maintenance, upgrades, or replacements. The OVPR should have the resources to provide additional support to faculty and/or core directors to ensure that large equipment grant applications to NIH and NSF are competitive. Current deficits in the research infrastructure are a consequence of insufficient institutional support.

The OVPR's limited discretionary funds to offer seed grants and/or bridge funding is another barrier to successful research efforts by faculty.

- Faculty recruitment and retention: The VPR and OVPR could facilitate efforts to recruit and retain highly productive faculty. Currently, the process is left to the Deans via the Provost's office, and the OVPR has little engagement in the conversation. Active engagement by the VPR in strategic research hires (i.e., Transformational Hires) would enable the VPR to guide future university research and build research capacity. In addition, it is perceived that the OVPR lacks the financial resources to meaningfully engage in retention and recruitment which is different from some other universities.

NIH grants and other funding opportunities are becoming more competitive, and faculty require more assistance to have successful grant applications. The OVPR has

sponsored faculty engagement activities to create networks for pursuing large center grants but could provide more comprehensive support and be more proactive across campus as some colleges and faculty feel left out.

- Humanities and social sciences scholarship: Although administrative and faculty interviewees from the humanities and social science disciplines do not feel supported by the OVPR, they welcomed the addition of a Humanities AVP and feel supported by their initial efforts. IRB-02 is considered a barrier to conducting social sciences research; however, better communication between HSO and colleges/faculty using IRB-02 might facilitate the process. In addition, the lack of transparency with leadership changes in the PPC has impacted morale and raised questions about due process from faculty within the PPC and/or social science disciplines.
- Office of Innovation: With respect to IP, tech transfer, and the entrepreneurial enterprise, the UI is behind our peers. It doesn't seem to be a priority at the UI (and hasn't for the past 35 years). The Office of Innovation was recently separated from the OVPR, and the two offices do not appear to share a similar vision, communicate, and/or work together effectively. The UI has lost top performing faculty because of this weakness. The UI Research Park has met expectations but continues to be a work in progress.

What else did you hear?

- Administrative systems: The research administration systems are primarily homegrown because the homegrown systems appear to operate better than purchased systems. While this is working, and they have a goal to make the operating systems work better, the OVPR should continue to monitor the efficiency and cost of homegrown vs. purchased systems given the likelihood of potential growth in federal compliance requirements.
- P3 funding: The process by which P3 funds are being distributed to campus entities has evolved over the past few years, and the distribution policies have not been clearly communicated to faculty. The perception exists that the P3 monies were to support research infrastructure at UI. This perception is supported by the first-year availability of P3 funded seed grants distributed by the OVPR, which the OVPR competed for. The seed grants were perceived by many as highly successful and were well-received by faculty. Faculty assumed that the seed grants would be recurring. The lack of recurring P3-funded seed grants and/or infrastructure support has given interviewees the impression that research is not sufficiently valued at the UI and that the OVPR is unable to adequately support research across campus.

IV. Faculty Survey Summary

The survey was sent to all UI faculty regardless of track or rank (n=2839 faculty). Four hundred thirty-eight faculty started the survey, and 408 faculty completed the survey for a 15% response rate and 93% completion rate. Fifty percent of respondents identified as male and 48% as female; 74% identified as white and 13% as Asian; and less than 10% identified as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latinx. The highest proportion of respondents (36%) have been employed by the UI for over 15 years; 15% of respondents have been employed for 11-15 years, 20% for 7-10 years, 17% for 3-6 years, and 11% for 0-2 years. The majority of respondents' primary collegiate home is the CCOM (37%) or CLAS (32%) with 5% or fewer respondents from each of the remaining Colleges. Seventy-two percent of respondents were tenure/tenure-track faculty, 18% were clinical track faculty, and 7% were instructional track faculty. Faculty rank distribution of respondents included 39% professors, 33% associate professors, 24% assistant professors, and 5% instructors or lecturers.

Sixty-six percent of respondents (n=261) reported that they engaged with the OVPR. These individuals were asked to identify which of the offices and/or services provided by of the OVPR they used. The percent and number of respondents using OVPR offices and/or services are reported in Table 1. Faculty respondents who reported using an office or unit were then asked about their level of satisfaction. The percentage of respondents reporting being 'extremely' or 'somewhat' satisfied are also reported in Table 1. Very few respondents reported being 'extremely' or 'somewhat' dissatisfied with any unit; the exception was the HSO of which 22% of respondents communicated some level of dissatisfaction.

Table 1: Faculty respondents using OVPR's office/units.

Office/Unit	Respondents using Unit		Satisfied respondents*
	Percent	Number	Percent
Center for Biocatalysis and Bioprocessing (CBB)	1.86	3	100
Center for Health Effects of Environmental Contamination (CHEEC)	9.64	16	78
Central Microscopy Research Facility (CMRF)	33.52	60	83
Division of Sponsored Programs (DSP)	91.03	203	80
Environmental Health and Safety Office (EHS)	41.44	75	80
High Resolution Mass Spectrometry Facility (HRMSF)	11.66	19	69
Human Subjects Office (HSO) including Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Conflicts of interest in Research (COIRResearch)	77.42	168	65
Injury Prevention Research Center (IPRC)	7.27	12	92

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)	27.75	48	92
Materials Analyses, Testing, and Fabrication Facility (MATFab)	13.61	23	81
Obermann Center for Advanced Studies (Obermann)	45.31	87	91
Office of the State Archaeologist (Archaeology)	1.85	3	100
Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) formally known as the Iowa Center for Undergraduate Research (ICRU)	56.08	106	88
Public Policy Center (PPC)	23.16	41	80
Research Development Office (RDO)	48.96	94	84
Research Information Systems (RIS)	18.56	31	86
University of Iowa Research Foundation (UIRF)	38.92	72	75

*Extremely or somewhat satisfied.

Crosstabs analyses were used to identify differences among respondent demographic characteristics and OVPR user responses. Overall, there did not appear to be many differences according to demographic characteristics; however, it is important to note that the majority of respondents were white. Individuals who identified as white or multiethnic/other racial identity were more likely to use the OVPR than those who identified as Asian ($p=0.01$). Individuals employed by the UI for more than 11 years reported more satisfaction with the HSO than those employed less than 7 years ($p=0.01$)

All faculty respondents were invited to answer three open ended questions at the conclusion of the survey. These questions are identified below, and responses are summarized.

Q#29: What do you appreciate most about the OVPR?

Faculty's appreciation for the OVPR's office was screened with several themes emerging from the comments. In the first theme, some faculty expressed significant appreciation for the OVPR's efforts to support research and cited specific services as essential to their ability to conduct research. Specific services cited most frequently included the DSP, described by one respondent as 'a reliable and responsible group despite a monumental and frankly daunting set of responsibilities,' the Obermann Center, the OUR (former ICRU), and RDO. The OVPR's grant training, research training, and networking programs were identified as very helpful to enable interdisciplinary and interdepartmental research and to build collaborative relationships. A second theme that emerged was an appreciation for the OVPR to improve campus research and creative work funding opportunities with the AHI program and bridge funding specifically noted. Additionally, efforts to communicate external research funding opportunities and to provide the campus infrastructure necessary to pursue these opportunities were valued by faculty respondents. A third theme noted by faculty was their appreciation of the OVPR's efforts to

promote research and creative matters success with the Banner Campaign and Book Matters specifically noted. And, finally, multiple faculty expressed appreciation for individual staff within the OVPR office and units, specifically for their collaborative, professional, and kind engagement to facilitate the faculty member's research efforts.

Q#30: What could the OVPR do to better facilitate your research and/or scholarship at the University of Iowa?

Faculty responses to how the OVPR could better facilitate a faculty member's research and/or scholarship were reviewed; two central themes (i.e., infrastructure, research support) and numerous additional topics emerged.

First, the lack of adequate infrastructure and resources to support a R1 institution was mentioned most often. OVPR units designed to facilitate grant submission and research conduct were cited as significant barriers to obtaining funding and executing research. Specifically, although recent improvements in IRB-01 timelines were noted, faculty continue to be frustrated by lengthy IRB (particularly IRB-02) and DSP (contract processing) timelines, a lack of consistent policies across OVPR units, and concerns that both the IRB and DSP overstep their authority by questioning scientific soundness and protocols. These concerns were especially frustrating to faculty who a) previously had approval at other institutions for similar proposals or b) felt the IRB was risk averse and created more harm than good for politically sensitive research topics. Infrastructure issues were mentioned as a concern for actually receiving approved funds from granting institutions, multisite collaborative clinical research, faculty retention, and (for social science faculty) an impediment to conducting research. Inadequate and obsolete core facilities resulting in an inability to conduct or significant delays in conducting studies were also noted as significant infrastructure deficits leading individuals to conduct their research at peer institutions and/or outsource their science. Cost sharing for core facilities was deemed high for the services provided. A suggestion was made that the OVPR could take better advantage of federal grant opportunities to upgrade core research facilities. Similarly, UI overhead expenses for industry-funded clinical trials are reported to be higher than peer institutions, which precludes financial feasibility for some UI faculty participation.

Second, faculty noted that the OVPR could take a more proactive approach to facilitating science on campus. Biomedical sciences – particularly CCOM science – is perceived to be of higher value by both the OVPR and the Central Administration of the UI. The comment was made that all science should be valued and supported – that the OVPR focuses on enterprise and entrepreneurship as opposed to culture, the environment, and society. Specifically, support for social sciences by the OVPR was questioned. While efforts to improve arts and humanities scholarship were noted, additional support is necessary to retain faculty. A very specific suggestion recommended hiring 'arts agents' to promote creative scholarship by the arts and humanities faculty. Faculty across disciplines suggested the OVPR fund more small,

collaborative seed grants targeting STEM, the arts, wellness, and social sciences. Additional engagement with faculty to understand their challenges was suggested. It was also suggested that the OVPR develop and communicate a strategic vision so that current researchers know where the OVPR plans to invest funding and develop the necessary infrastructure accordingly.

Faculty at different stages of their careers and with different research experiences would welcome additional assistance in pursuing research opportunities, which suggests that the services available are not known. Suggestions included having the OVPR provide more grant writing bootcamps, research leadership career development, and translational research guidance. Faculty who had participated in networking sessions designed to facilitate development of center grants suggested that these efforts would be more fruitful if the OVPR staff facilitated the meetings and provided support for the writing of larger center grants. A number of faculty stated that they did not understand the OVPR's role on campus and were unaware that it could help with their research, while others suggested that OVPR staff members could attend faculty meetings to highlight their research assistance programs.

Q#31 Do you have any additional comments for the OVPR Review Committee?

Faculty were asked if they had any additional comments for the OVPR Review Committee. As one would anticipate, several faculty elaborated on issues previously discussed in response to questions #29 and #30. These thoughts are included in the previous responses. Additional thoughts expressed by faculty include:

- Are women and/or minority faculty ensured equal opportunities on campus? Has there been any effort to identify barriers that limit opportunities for these faculty members? Women and/or minority faculty who leave are often more successful at other institutions which supports this concern. This concern was raised for both the arts and STEM fields.
- A number of faculty compared UI's OVPR to similar offices at peer institutions. Specifically, comments suggested that UI's office has a limited budget with limited autonomy and power relative to other institutions. As a result, Iowa's OVPR lacks the infrastructure to be effective. The lack of resources was noted to be an ongoing issue that has been raised before. This thread was reiterated in numerous comments throughout the open comment sections. Faculty suggested the insufficient funding has resulted in hiring inexperienced staff at all levels in the OVPR. While kind and helpful, the staff have a limited vision that is perceived to be maintaining current funding as opposed to research growth. Several faculty raised the basic question – what is the OVPR's vision and is there a plan to achieve this vision?
- Faculty appreciate the OVPR's efforts to bring potential research funders to campus to help investigators establish relationships with new external funders. Concerns were

voiced that faculty engagement is not equitable, and they requested equal opportunities for such engagement. Faculty expressed caution be exercised to ensure that researchers are not used by companies as unpaid consultants.

- Multiple faculty commented that the PPC restructuring process was not handled professionally. Poor communication and limited future planning impacted individuals who called the PPC home. Faculty that use this resource are concerned about the long-term implications for cross-disciplinary research.

V. Summary and Recommendations

The OVPR is necessary for faculty to conduct research on campus. The OVPR is to be commended for supporting the University's research enterprise throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Post-COVID-19 staff turnover and continued resource limitations compromise the OVPR's effectiveness. The high staff turnover and perceived funding limitations are longstanding concerns that have previously been noted, most recently in the 2018 Vice President for Research & Economic Development Search Committee's Phase 1 Recommendations. The review committee consistently heard concerns regarding campus's value and appreciation of research throughout the administrative review.

Committee recommendations:

1. The University administration is encouraged to identify its vision of university research and how the OVPR fits within this vision. Articulation and communication of the OVPR role to campus constituents will enable realistic expectations by faculty for OVPR services.
2. Consistent with the University administration's expectations of the OVPR, the VPR is encouraged to identify and communicate their vision and strategic plan to campus constituents. In addition, meaningful engagement with university constituents is encouraged to guide the university's research direction.
3. The OVPR is encouraged to conduct benchmarking activities to determine if indeed individual units are under-resourced relative to peer institutions. In addition to benchmarking numbers, efforts should be made to determine if the right people are in the right positions. The results should be used to either hire additional staff or reassign responsibilities to enable the OVPR to provide services, especially concerning compliance, in a timely manner.

4. The OVPR is encouraged to advocate for additional funding to:
 - a. Offer seed grants for pilot projects.
 - b. Better support multidisciplinary teams of scholars to compete for large extramural grants.
 - c. Meaningfully engage with potential research faculty hires by contributing to start-up packages and/or providing research core services.
5. Identify a funding mechanism to maintain equipment and/or replace obsolete equipment in the core facilities.
6. Evaluate the working relationships between the OVPR and Office of Innovation to ensure effective collaboration and support for shared goals.
7. Provide staff support to aid in the development and submission of interdisciplinary research grant applications.
8. With respect to the external review (IRB Efficiency Initiative) conducted in 2023, continue to evaluate recommendations and implement those deemed relevant to improve IRB efficiencies. Benchmarking should be conducted for IRB-02 in a similar manner.

Other suggestions to facilitate research on campus include to:

1. Provide meaningful feedback to faculty when rejecting internal letters of intent (or funding requests) to help future proposals become more competitive.
2. Consider a redistribution of indirect cost returns to support campus research facilities including core facilities and seed grants.
3. Better align future internal grants with external opportunities. Provide the support to ensure collection of sufficient pilot data and consistent timeframes.
4. Ensure equitable distribution of internal funds for collaborative grants; one unit (i.e., college) should not receive most of the funding/credit at the expense of other units.
5. Consider supporting funding opportunities for instructional track faculty to attend conferences and/or support graduate student research during the summer.



OVPR Administrative Review Self Study

March 1, 2023

- 1. Goals. What are the various goals of the office? How are these goals established? What priorities are given to the principal goals of the office? How have these priorities changed, or what plans for changes in priorities are envisioned? What are the goals of the sub-units of the office? How well do the subordinate administrative units perform?**

The Office of the Vice President for Research provides resources and support to researchers, scholars, and creators to forge new frontiers of discovery. Through strategic initiatives, administrative and compliance infrastructure, and core facilities, we facilitate a thriving campus culture of collaboration, creativity, and innovation (<https://research.uiowa.edu/>).

OVPR goals align with the institutional strategic plan, particularly those under the Innovative Research and Creative Discovery priority area. Objectives and Strategies can be found at <https://strategicplan.uiowa.edu/ircd-priorities-and-objectives>.

See included unit summaries for reporting unit missions and activities.

- a) With respect to both office and unit goals, what are the current or perceived barriers to achieving these goals?**

Resources (funding, staffing, space), and the evolving funding and compliance landscape are the primary ongoing challenges for the office.

- 2. Services and Programs. What services and programs are offered by the office? How effective are these programs and services and how was that determination made? What are their strengths and weaknesses? How do these activities support academic programs and relevant teaching or research missions?**

See included unit summaries.

- 3. Staffing. What is the organizational structure of the office? Is the staff appropriately compensated and trained? Is the current staff adequate to provide the programs and services of the office? What are future staffing plans?**

See included unit summaries, accompanying organizational charts, and budget worksheets.

Low unemployment in the regional labor market has made it challenging for some of our units to achieve and maintain full staffing. We currently have approximately 15 open positions across the organization, down from more than 40 open positions at the peak. Hiring and retention bonuses have helped somewhat to reduce the number of vacancies in some areas, but turnover is expected to

be an ongoing issue given the competitive labor market.

In recent years the OVPR has advocated heavily for additional personnel lines to manage an expanding workload and improve efficiency in research compliance units. OVPR has been granted additional resources through the Budget Review Board funding request process. As these lines are filled and staff are trained and deployed, we believe our units will be in a better position to meet target metrics while providing vital support services. As the research needs of campus grow, OVPR must continually “right size” its staff, hire additional personnel when needed to meet the increased demands, and not burn out existing staff. Skilled research administration staff are in high demand across the country. We need to continue to offer flexibility with hybrid and remote work arrangements for our “back of the office” functions. Lastly, we need to be able to offer competitive salaries and career paths to retain our staff. Some units are better situated, but others struggle due to the sources of their funding.

4. Resources.

a) **What is the budget for the office? What priorities govern the allocation of budget resources administered by the office?**

The org budgeted for \$16.8 million in general education funding and \$33.6 million across all funding sources for FY23. The included unit summaries and budget worksheets provide detailed information for each reporting unit. The annual budget process follows an incremental model with units asked to create their budgets based on the prior year’s allocation utilizing guidance that includes any expected changes to the overall org’s budget (percent increase/decrease to GEF allocations). The OVPR then works with the units to finalize budgets and salaries at the institution level.

While discretionary funds are limited, priority is given to activities that support research, scholarship, and creative activities. Examples of discretionary funding programs include:

- Arts and Humanities Initiative
- OVPR Early Career Scholars
- Discovery and Innovation Awards
- Book Matters
- Bridge Funding
- Cost Sharing

b) **What have been the changes in budgetary support for the office in recent years?**

1. Budget Review Board funding:

- Research Compliance and Administration staff -- \$500K recurring
- Core Research Facilities Equipment Systems Refresh -- \$300K recurring
- Postdoctoral Scholars Program UIRF -- \$300K nonrecurring for FYs 20, 21, 22
- In FY23 the OVPR began receiving a portion of facilities and administrative costs charged to grants on campus. These funds are subject to a 6-year ramp up. In year 6 OVPR will receive approximately 2.4% of the F&A generated by the university. Long-term, this will allow the OVPR to scale its operations with the changing needs of campus.

2. OVPR support for internal funding mechanisms has been reduced over time due to budgetary constraints, which still exist. However, P3 funds were awarded to OVPR through two different programs to fill the gap in programming that supported seeding research initiatives that built capacity for researchers to seek external funding. The

existing budgetary constraint has been temporarily filled with P3 funds, but the short-term nature of these awards makes it difficult to make long-term strategic investments in building the capacity of researchers to seek and win external funding. These programs are 100% pass-through and OVPR does not receive any salary support from its P3 awards.

- FY21 Jumpstarting Tomorrow: A collaborative research pilot program for interdisciplinary research communities (\$2 million)
- FY 22 Seeding Excellence: Strengthening the University as a Destination for Research and Scholarship (\$4 million over two years)
- FY22 Academic Analytics Subscription (Institutional - \$579,500 over three years)

c) Are administrative costs allocated appropriately?

OVPR reviews unit budgets on an annual basis. Newly allocated funds (when available) are distributed strategically and open staff lines are evaluated for potential cost savings at both the unit and organization levels.

d) Are the facilities adequate? In general, what new resources are needed to effectively conduct the office's core responsibilities?

Overall, space across the org is adequate and we have been able to upgrade/move units with support from central administration. Some moves have been in response to pandemic-related changes in work arrangements. OVPR was one of the first orgs at UI to implement hybrid work arrangements in 2020. This has resulted in a decreased need for administrative space and allowed for the consolidation of several units into spaces on campus such as Hardin Library. Environmental Health and Safety is currently in the process of moving to Hardin Library (move planned pre-pandemic) and the Division of Sponsored Programs and the University of Iowa Research Foundation will move next year due to decreased space requirements. This will allow for the former administrative space to be repurposed toward the institution's academic mission.

Additional changes in facilities include a planned move for the OVPR to Gilmore Hall. The Public Policy Center recently moved from South Quad to a newly renovated building on Jefferson Street.

5. Internal and External Evaluation. What are the procedures used by the office for the review and evaluation of the office and its staff? What is the timetable for such reviews?

In addition to annual personnel and budget reviews, many of our units have advisory bodies that provide continuous feedback (see included unit summaries). Formal unit reviews are conducted on an ad hoc basis, for example: CMRF (2017), EHS (2017) and HSO/IRB in (2018). Ad hoc reviews are often initiated in response to changes in leadership, reorganization, audit findings, or other issues that arise. Current reviews include the Public Policy Center and the Iowa Center for Research by Undergraduates.

Reviews by external agencies are common in research administration and compliance activities. Examples of external review within OVPR managed programs include:

- Accreditation of the UI Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) by AAHRPP, the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs includes a full review of all UI policies, procedures and activities related to human subjects research every five years.

- Accreditation of the UI Animal Care and Use Program by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International (AAALAC), conducts a full review of UI policies, procedures, activities, and facilities involving animal research and husbandry every four years
- The USDA reviews UI animal programs and facilities annually
- The Iowa Department of Public Health reviews the UI radiation protection program annually and conducts periodic audits of specific functions in research or health care
- The CDC performs audits of the UI select agency program annually
- Various state and federal agencies perform audits or site visits either programmatically or for cause

6. Relationships with Other Offices. How does the office interact with other offices internal and external to the University? Does it maintain effective communications, cooperation, and coordination? Is there duplication or overlap in functions and responsibilities?

The OVPR interacts closely with other central administrative units such as the Office of the President, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, Governmental Relations, Strategic Communications, Finance and Operations, General Counsel, and others. Close working relationships with the colleges are maintained through the Associate Deans for Research and the Council of Deans. Office of the Vice President for Research functions are well defined, and overlap/duplication is not generally seen as a problem. OVPR staff regularly lead or participate in meetings, committees and working groups, e.g. strategic planning, space allocation and policy development committees, executive level searches, etc., with partners throughout the institution.

OVPR engages in proactive communication and collaboration with State and Federal regulatory and oversight offices, to ensure that UI is up to date on current regulations, guidance, and industry best practices.

In addition, OVPR is actively engaged with numerous professional associations, including:

- Association of American Universities
- Association of Public Land Grant Universities
- Federal Demonstration Partnership
- Council on Governmental Relations
- Association of Research Integrity Officers
- Association of University Export Control Officers
- National Council of University Research Administrators
- University Industry Demonstration Project
- National Association of Biomedical Research
- Various Big Ten Academic Alliance research administration groups

7. Strategies for Improvement. What areas of the office's performance are most in need of improvement? How does the office intend to improve its performance?

Current resources are strained and don't scale with the size of the research enterprise, resulting in limited capability to seed and accelerate research and respond to growing queues for our units who provide vital research services. We are challenged to replace or add new equipment to our core units and deliver new IT functionality to researchers.

OVPR units encounter difficulties in working with faculty start-ups and other small businesses located in or near UI research buildings. Issues include understanding UI's responsibilities for the health and safety of company employees, competition with UI researchers for resources such as space, research cores and animal facilities, and appropriate compensation for research services.

Institutional liability for regulatory violations and accidents is also a concern. OVPR plans to work closely with UI Ventures to develop a framework for the business incubator and commercialization activities on campus which may coexist with, but are distinct from, UI research and researchers.

8. If and/or how lingering COVID related issues are impacting the Office? Are there lessons learned from COVID that the review committee should consider?

The initial response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020 is a good example of the OVPR working across the institution. We were able to partner with central administration and the colleges to institute an appropriate ramp-down of research activities, while maintaining activities critical to ongoing projects and to the institution. Following the initial response, the OVPR was able to work with the same groups to institute safety measures that allowed for the ramp-up of research activities. Hybrid work arrangements that were allowed early in the pandemic were modified and, in some cases, made permanent making the OVPR an institutional leader in modernizing its workforce. This flexibility has proved valuable in recruitment and retention and has allowed the OVPR to decrease its footprint on campus.



May 2, 2023

Additional Information Regarding Arts and Humanities Support

In response to the request by the co-chairs of the Faculty Senate Administrative Review Committee for additional information regarding arts and humanities support from the Office of the Vice President for Research, we have compiled the following list of ongoing and planned activities. This list is not exhaustive but provides a broad summary of many of our highest profile activities.

OVPR Support of Arts and Humanities:

- **AHI:** \$150,000/year spread over two review cycles (spring and fall). These grants support three discrete funding areas:
 - *Standard Grants* (up to \$7,500) support individual or collaborative grants that focus on humanities scholarship and work in the creative, visual, and performing arts.
 - *Major Project Grant:* Up to \$30,000 supports novel projects to develop new collaborations and enable the PI/PD to submit competitive applications for external grants or leverage substantial unit/departamental/collegiate support. Successful applications are highly innovative and impact the field, discipline, or broader community defined in the proposal with an emphasis on collaboration and interdisciplinarity.
 - *Major Conference Grant:* Up to \$10,000 supports new conferences, symposia, seminars, colloquia, or workshops. Preference may be given to humanities conferences designed to result in a scholarly product and to arts conferences designed to result in a public display or representation.
- **Subvention** to College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: \$75,000 in FY 22 & FY 23, increased from \$50,000/year to accommodate increased demand for performance-related travel post COVID. This funding is primarily used to assist faculty in finishing projects. Examples include book subventions (hiring copyeditor, indexer, etc.), assistance with performances, and support for art exhibitions.
- Support for the **International Writing Program, Writing Exchange Program** since FY21. \$56K in FY21 and \$54K in FY22. There will be future commitments as well.
- Support for ½ FTE grant support staff person who is housed in **International Programs**, who helps specifically with Fulbright proposals. ~\$31,500/year
 - <https://international.uiowa.edu/faculty/grant-and-fellowship-assistance>
- Support for **Obermann Center Director Teresa Mangum** for in person writing retreat (summer 2023) in person and one half-day writing retreat led by InkWell on Zoom. Additional support for Environmental Humanities OC initiative. \$20,000/year.
- Funding/support for Obermann Center's **Wide Lens** Fall 2022 and spring 2023 events held at The Stanley Museum of Art. OVPR assists with advertising and catering

expenses. Attendance at Fall 2022 event was 75+ attendees. Second Wide Lens event will be May 5, 2023.

- Annual Distinguished Achievement in Arts and Humanities Research Award
- Communicating Ideas workshop and other trainings to support scholars and research in communicating their work to audiences outside academia. 30% of participants in 2022 were from A&H disciplines. This program will take place again in 2023/2024
- Additional investments: Annual membership in the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) (\$8,000), Digital Publishing Graduate Research Assistantship & Whitman Archive (\$20,000), Hawkeye Poll course support (\$2,000), Small Grants for the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (partnership with the Graduate College) (\$8,200)

Facilitating Conversations and Collaborations between and among Arts, Humanities, Social Science Scholars:

- Currently planning an early **summer research catalyst gathering** for faculty in public environmental humanities and with research related to the state of Iowa to connect and share ideas informally which will hopefully be a catalyst for research collaborations. Planning in collaboration with RDO Director Aaron Kline
- **Ongoing meetings and collaborations with:** CLAS Dean Sara Sanders, Associate AD Humanities Roland Racevskis, (CLAS) and Associate Dean Josh Weiner (CLAS), Dean Amanda Thein of Grad College and Associate Dean Christine Getz (CLAS), Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences DEOS
- **Pre-AHI application informational Zoom session:** In collaboration with RDO, hosted a Fall 2022 Zoom informational session for faculty planning to apply to Spring AHI round of funding. Solicited feedback from participants was positive and six of the thirteen applicants this spring 2023 round had attended the Fall 2022 Zoom information session. We will continue the info session at the beginning of each semester.

New Initiatives to Facilitate, Support, and Celebrate Faculty's Research

- In collaboration with Leslie Revaux, Casey Westlake, and Prairie Lights' Jan Weismiller and Kathleen Johnson: One Book Matters Event per semester to highlight and celebrate a newly published book. Fall 2022: Victor Ray's (Sociology and Criminology) new book *On Critical Race Theory*. In Conversation with Lina Maria Murillo (History, GWSS). Spring 2023: Tara Bynum's (English, African American Studies) new book *Reading Pleasures*. In Conversation with Asst. Prof. Ashley Howard (History; African American Studies). Planning for Fall 2023 and Spring 2024 now.
- In collaboration with Leslie Revaux, Casey Westlake, and Stanley Museum Director Lauren Lessing and her staff on two Book Matters events/year featuring 3-4 books on a theme. Our first event planned for Spring 2023 was cancelled due to a severe winter storm and we have rescheduled for mid-October 2023. Theme: Community engaged scholarship/scholars and their new books: Mary Cohen (Music); Samantha Zuhlke (Planning and Public Affairs); Stephen Warren (American Studies, History) with Chief Ben Barnes. Planning for spring 2024 now; potential theme: Feminist scholarship (Lina Murillo, Meena Khandewal, Brady G'Sell new/forthcoming books). Also, Celebration Iowa Authors event that featured 25 arts and humanities authors.
- Creative Matters with Chris Merrill, Leslie Revaux, Casey Westlake. Our first, rebooted and in-person Creative Matters series event was Spring 2023 featuring the Ojibwe author, David Treuer at the Old Capitol.

- Currently planning for fall 2023 and spring 2024 Creative Matters events with Chris Merrill, Leslie Revaux, and Hancher leadership team).
- P3 Proposal: Writing for the Public Good. Waiting to hear if our proposal will be funded. If funded, we will work with campus Communicators, DEOs, and other stakeholders to build a network of faculty who are trained to write for the broader public and who publish their OpEds and long-form essays in venues such as The Conversation.
- Aaron Kline - Created half-day arts and humanities driven grant writing seminar. Will be offered annually going forward.
- Dare to Discover with Leslie Revaux - downtown banner campaign featuring 12 A&H students in current cohort.

APPENDIX C: Title and Office of Individuals Invited for Interviews

Title(s)	Office(s)
President	Office of the President
Vice President for Research	Office of the VP for Research
Associate Vice President for Research	Office of the VP for Research
Associate Vice President for Research	Office of the VP for Research
Director	Obermann Center
Director	Public Policy Center
Director	Office of Undergraduate Research
Associate Vice President for Research	Office of the VP for Research
Director of Operations	Office of the VP for Research
Executive Director	UI Research Foundation
Chief Innovation Officer	Innovation and Economic Development at Iowa
Graduate College Dean	Graduate College
Associate Deans for Research	Medicine Dentistry Engineering Nursing Pharmacy Public Health CLAS CLAS
Associate Deans for Research	Business Education Law CLAS
Research Council	Charter Committee
Center/Core Facility Directors	Center for Biocatalysis and Bioprocessing (CBB) Center for Global & Regional Environmental Research (CGRER) Materials Analysis, Testing, & Fabrication Facility (MATFab) Central Microscopy Research Facility (CMRF) High Resolution Mass Spectrometry Facility (HRMS) Center for Health Effects of Environmental Contamination (CHEEC)

VPR-related Office Directors	Division of Sponsored Programs (DSP) Office of Animal Resources (OAR) Institutional Animal Care and Use Office (IACUO) Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Research Information Systems (RIS) Research Integrity Officer (RIO) Human Subjects Office (HSO) and Conflict of Interest in Research (COIR)
<i>CCOM Research Institutes</i>	<i>Iowa Institute for Biomedical Imaging</i> <i>Iowa Institute of Human Genetics</i> Iowa Neuroscience Institute <i>UI Institute for Vision Research</i> <i>Institute for Clinical and Translational Science</i> <i>Pappajohn Biomedical Institute</i>
<i>Junior Faculty/Sciences</i>	<i>Medicine</i> <i>Medicine</i> <i>Medicine</i> <i>Medicine</i> <i>Medicine</i> <i>Dentistry</i> <i>Dentistry</i> <i>Pharmacy</i> <i>Pharmacy</i> <i>Public Health</i> <i>Public Health</i> <i>Public Health</i> <i>Engineering</i> <i>Engineering</i> <i>Nursing</i> <i>Nursing</i> <i>CLAS</i> <i>CLAS</i> <i>CLAS</i>
Collegiate Grant Accounting Staff	CLAS Nursing Dentistry
Title(s)	Office(s)

APPENDIX D: Interview Questions

Potential Interview Questions (tailored to the interviewee) 6/29/23:

1. Please explain what your role is on campus and how you interact with the OVPR.
2. Tell us about your interactions with Vice President Scholtz, and your impressions of his leadership. What is going well and what could use improvement?
3. Do you have sufficient access to Vice President Scholtz (keeping in mind the balance between access and the need for efficiency in the reporting structure)?
4. What are the major strengths of the OVPR?
5. What are the major areas needing improvement within the OVPR?
6. Do you perceive structural barriers within the OVPR?
 - a. If so, how might these be resolved?
7. Which parts of the ongoing Strategic Planning address new and future trends in federal and/or industry research and/or scholarship? Are they adequate?
8. What are the most pressing needs of the OVPR right now? *This question could be tailored to the specific units being queried.*
9. The HERD survey indicates a modest growth in research expenditures. How does the OVPR help increase funding opportunities for investigators/scholars? Are there particular areas of research in which the OVPR is strategically investing?
10. How could the OVPR be more efficient and fairer in supporting research/scholarship by faculty? In recent years, considerable efforts have been made to increase visibility and awareness among faculty of its services available; which additional measures (from the Strategic Planning document) will have priority? How is support for large, interdisciplinary and intercollegiate research proposals coordinated between the OVPR and the Provost's Office?
11. What is your impression of the services offered by the OVPR Core Facilities (Central Microscopy, High Resolution Mass Spectrometry, MATFab. And Fermentation)?
12. What is your impression of the effectiveness of the OVPR's Office of Animal Resources, the Human Subjects Office, and Environmental Health and Safety?
13. How could the OVPR support recruitment of new faculty with specific considerations for new equipment and maintenance of said equipment or other research infrastructure.
14. What research support services are currently inadequate and/or missing?
15. UI Ventures – essentially, the office for economic development led by Jon Darsee – was separated from the OVPR in 2019. Can you describe the interaction between UI Ventures and the OPVR? Do they complement each other and/or what might facilitate the transition from research to development startup companies? How do new UI Ventures feedback to support the OVPR?



Faculty Survey of the Office for the Vice President for Research

Faculty Survey of the Office for the Vice President for Research

What gender do you identify with?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- Different identity

What is your racial identity?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Middle Eastern
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- White
- Multiethnic/other

Do you identify as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latinx?

- Yes
- No

How many years have you been employed at the University of Iowa?

- 0-2

- 3-6
- 7-10
- 11-15
- 15+

What is your primary collegiate home?

- Carver College of Medicine
- College of Dentistry
- College of Education
- College of Engineering
- College of Law
- College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- College of Nursing
- College of Pharmacy
- College of Public Health
- Tippie College of Business
- Graduate College
- University College

What is your faculty track?

- Adjunct/Visiting
- Clinical
- Instructional
- Research
- Tenure/tenure-track

What is your faculty rank?

- Instructor or Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Other

Do you engage with the Office of the Vice President for Research ([OVPR](#))?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following offices within and/or services provided by the OVPR do you use?

	Yes	No
Center for Biocatalysis and Bioprocessing (CBB)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Center for Health Effects of Environmental Contamination (CHEEC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Central Microscopy Research Facility (CMRF)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Division of Sponsored Programs (DSP)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Environmental Health and Safety Office (EHS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
High Resolution Mass Spectrometry Facility (HRMSF)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Human Subjects Office (HSO) including Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Conflicts of interest in Research (COIResearch)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Injury Prevention Research Center (IPRC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Materials Analyses, Testing, and Fabrication Facility (MATFab)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Obermann Center for Advanced Studies (Obermann)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of the State Archaeologist (Archaeology)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) formally known as the Iowa Center for Undergraduate Research (ICRU)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pentacrest Museums (Museums)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Policy Center (PPC)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research Development Office (RDO)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research Information Systems (RIS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
State Hygienic Laboratory (SHL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
University of Iowa Research Foundation (UIRF)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Center for Biocatalysis and Bioprocessing ([CBB](#))??

- Extremely Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Center for Health Effects of Environmental Contamination ([CHEEC](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Central Microscopy Research Facility ([CMRF](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Division of Sponsored Programs ([DSP](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Environmental Health and Safety Office ([EHS](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the High Resolution Mass Spectrometry Facility ([HRMSF](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Human Subjects Office ([HSO](#)) including the Institutional Review Board ([IRB](#)) and Conflicts of Interest in Research ([COIResearch](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Injury Prevention Research Center ([IPRC](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee ([IACUC](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Materials Analyses, Testing, and Fabrication Facility ([MATFab](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies ([Obermann](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Office of the State Archaeologist ([Archaeologist](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Office of Undergraduate Research ([OUR](#)) formally known as the Iowa Center for Undergraduate Research ([ICRU](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Pentacrest Museums ([Museums](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Public Policy Center ([PPC](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Research Development Office ([RDO](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the Research Information Systems ([RIS](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the State Hygienic Laboratory ([SHL](#))?

- Extremely satisfied

- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

How satisfied are you with the services provided by the University of Iowa Research Foundation ([UIRF](#))?

- Extremely satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Extremely dissatisfied

What do you appreciate most about the OVPR?

What could the OVPR do to better facilitate your research and/or scholarship at the University of Iowa?

Do you have any additional comments for the OVPR Review Committee?

