Research and Innovation Task Force
Executive Summary

The charge of the Research and Innovation Task Force was “identify and oversee progress in implementing cross-university strategies and initiatives that have the greatest possibility to increase scholarly productivity, research funding, economic impact and the impact of scholarly output in solving global and local problems across the theme areas”. In coming up with our recommendations, the Task Force members\(^1\) broke into subgroups, and focused on specific deliverables as listed in the original charge from the Provost. Subgroup members met with key stakeholders (faculty, members of university leadership, staff) for their input, as well as researched effective programs at peer institutions. It is through these efforts that these recommendations are offered; the recommendations are grouped across four broad categories: projects/programs that will require large investment; projects/programs requiring smaller investment; policy recommendations we must implement; and policy recommendations that require further study. This Executive Summary gives an overview of the recommendations; detailed information prepared by the subgroups can be found in Appendix 1, attached to this report.

We recognize as a committee that some of the recommendations in this document may present implementation challenges because of the complexity and the cost. While we estimate the amount of financial resources needed (see Table 1 – Task Force Recommendations), we acknowledge that additional discussion and assessment will be required to effectively launch the recommended programs. However, our recommendations requiring investment as well as policy changes will significantly enhance the research and scholarly environment at UB, and could represent transformational changes to the university, and will align with our goals of achieving academic excellence as articulated in *Realizing UB 2020*.

**Summary of Recommendations:**

**Large Investment:**

- **Program Investment:**
  - Establish Communities of Excellence as a mechanism to support research priority areas; *Signature Program*.
  - Target investment in additional areas with known potential; *Signature Program*.
  - Launch a new Innovation Scholars program with funding awards for faculty; and expand current faculty in leadership program to include innovation scholars; *Signature Program*.

---

\(^1\) Membership:
Alexander Cartwright, Vice President for Research and Economic Development (CHAIR)
Laura Hubbard, Vice President for Finance and Administration
Michael Cain, Vice President for Health Sciences and Dean, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Nancy Wells, Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations
Bruce Pitman, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
James O’Donnell, Dean, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Robert Genco, Vice Provost, Science, Technology Transfer and Economic Outreach
Jean Wactawski-Wende, Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives
Thomas Purlani, Interim Associate Vice President for Information Technology
Laurie Read, Professor, Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Erik Seeman, Professor, Department of History
Sarbajit Banerjee, Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry
Incentive Programs:
- Invest further/more significantly in seed funding programs.
- Establish an Investigator Incentive program that provides flexible funding to investigators in support of their research, with an emphasis on using the funds to support new projects that will further or broaden their research.

Administrative Support:
- Invest in better administrative support for research activities across the entire institution: enhanced proposal development, provide better post-award administration, hire project support staff in the College/schools/departments to work directly with faculty researchers; reduce the administrative burden currently placed on PIs by virtue of their success in receiving research funding.
- Invest in better business systems/tools: restructure pre- and post-award processes into an easily navigated system that minimizes PI administrative burden and provide continuous, seamless support throughout the life cycle of a sponsored program.
- Continue efforts to stabilize SPS; expand staffing and reduce turnover.

Research Infrastructure:
- Shared facilities should be centrally supported: establish a formalized process for maintenance, access, charges, and use of central facilities to allow for more efficient use, and with common access and billing for UB and non-UB clients. Allocate annual funding for administrative support of key scientific core facilities.
- Enhance IT infrastructure support for research and scholarship (IT systems, etc.).

Small Investment

Program Investment:
- Establish an annual/recurring Arts and Humanities Innovation Fund to support innovative and creative projects; provide seed money to achieve short-term goals, allowing faculty to increase their chances of obtaining external funding for larger projects.
- Additional annual funding should be directed towards enhancing scholarship, artistic expression and creative works in the arts and humanities and other disciplines with limited access to extramural support.
- Increase the number of postdoctoral fellowship opportunities at UB: establish a “University Postdoctoral Fellowship” program; put resources in place to support increased applications for institutional training grants (pre-doctoral, post-doctoral) to enable additional recruitment of quality pre-doctoral and post-doctoral students.
- Establish a University-Industry Matching Grants program to better foster industry sponsored research.

Administrative Support:
- Provide resources (staffing and other costs) to support an institutional program to increase the number of nominations for faculty awards and recognition.

Policy Recommendations We Must Implement

- Review the budget model and other financial tools to ensure the financial resources that are possible due to research activity are reinvested to best support current and future research.
- Provide better information to the research community regarding university support of sponsored research activities.
Set metrics and goals; use this to inform areas of potential investment
Expand experiential learning in degree programs to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities.
Revise faculty promotion and recognition programs to incorporate innovation.

Policy Recommendations That Require Further Study

Establish expectation that all new faculty hires should meet or exceed departmentally-specified metrics.
Create an innovation policy and practice committee to evaluate, formulate, and advance new approaches to promoting innovation among faculty, personnel and students.
Introduce student innovation award programs at undergraduate and graduate levels.
Introduce an incentive program for personnel that has small funding award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes as allowable for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles.
I. **Large Investment:**

**Program Investment**

a. Establishing **Communities of Excellence** as a mechanism to support research priority areas has overwhelming support of the UB research community. A formal process via an open competition should be implemented with clear requirements in an RFP, with detailed information and goals of Communities, amount of funding available in what categories, criteria for judging applications, and plans and metrics that will be used to review funded communities. The Communities of Excellence should not just be a faculty hiring plan, but should also allow for support of other infrastructure that might include staff and student support, and vital instrumentation/infrastructure needs. The application process should require a clear demonstration of how each proposed Community would relate to the themes, and if appropriate how they will merge existing strategic strengths and other University strengths into the communities. **Importantly,** since these will serve as a mechanism to improve our research stature, the likelihood for substantial and significant productivity should be the key metric by which the proposals for Communities are reviewed. The review process for winning proposals should be rigorous and carried out by an external panel of reviewers who would judge the application according to the criteria set out in the RFP.

It is recommended that the Office of the Provost consider awarding Communities at a level of 100% central funding (as opposed to requiring a 50% match from decanal units), and a sustainable financial model for the Communities should be established. One rationale for such a recommendation is to ensure that the best proposals that serve the entire University are funded and supported. There should be a detailed plan of resources available and provided by units (current faculty, resources, and facilities), but we recommend there should be no match required for support of the new faculty lines by the Decanal Units. This will help ensure that the resources will be used to support the communities and will help to reassure faculty that “new” investments will not come at the expense of programmatic hiring. It is observed that 50:50 splits that have been the prior practice at this institution did not allow for full realization of the potential of these interdisciplinary efforts.

b. In addition to establishing Communities of Excellence, the university should **target investment in areas with known potential** or in areas where we have the greatest potential for growth. One example of a central facility that is poised to grow where investment in building infrastructure has already been made is the CTRC. Building on the CTRC, UB has the potential for substantial growth in the area of clinical trials and further support of a clinical trials facility/infrastructure. This is just one example; there are other areas where investment should be made to maximize areas of great potential.
c. It is recommended that an **Innovation Scholars Program** be launched with funding awards for faculty to promote the recruitment or development of faculty who combine outstanding scholarship with the application of their scholarship to creating real world impact. It is likely that leaders/directors of Communities of Excellence or other strategically important UB programs could be identified as an Innovation Scholar, thus the successful launching of this program could assist both in faculty recruitment and retention, and in building out critical research capacity in areas of strategic interest to the university.

**Incentive Programs**

a. It is recommended that support of **seed funding programs** be continued, and available funding increased over time (to be more in line with AAU peers). The program should be regular and predictable, with dates posted and adhered to so individuals and groups can plan; and the dates should be posted on the web for the next 2-3 funding cycles for every program. The process should be peer-reviewed, and feedback of the strengths and weaknesses be given for all applications. The goal of the seed funding programs will always be to increase sponsored funding to the university, or to draw recognition to faculty excellence in other ways.

b. Establish an Investigator Incentive program that provides flexible funding to investigators in support of their research, with an emphasis on using the funds to support new projects, or new directions, that will further broaden their research. The recommendation is made to correlate in some way to the amount of indirect cost reimbursement investigators’ grants are charged each year – this is both a symbolic and functional recommendation. This is an area that continues to be a university-wide challenge: finding ways of providing meaningful, sustainable rewards and incentives to faculty for advancing the teaching, research and outreach mission. In a climate of continued fiscal challenge and increasing needs for accountability, it is more important than ever to offer faculty incentives that advance progress toward university goals. Incentives for faculty who meet or exceed expectations on funding should be considered as a means to promote additional research, either personal incentives or incentives to further support those programs. The focus of this recommendation is to identify meaningful incentives to support faculty pursuit of excellence in scholarship, as well as success in obtaining external funding to develop and support programs of research and creative activity. Leadership should consider financial and non-financial incentives directly to colleges, schools, departments and faculty for the purposes of securing additional extramural funding, advancing instructional quality, new course development, and innovation. The expected outcomes of this recommendation include:

- Increased number of extramural funding proposal submissions
- Improved success rate for extramural funding awards
- Improved recruitment and retention of research-active faculty
- Increased generation of institutional facility and administrative (F&A) cost recovery
This recommendation was reiterated amongst many of the faculty Task Force members interviewed. The prevailing feeling is that there should be some return directly to investigators from their sponsored research activities that either incentivizes them to do more research – or, more simply, to provide some sort of discretionary dollars to investigators that can be used by them to support their research. The need to return more flexible funding to Principal Investigators, based on their level of research, is more critical now than it has ever been – this is because increased federal regulations or sponsor restrictions make it very difficult for investigators to charge general research expenses to their sponsored research accounts.

**Administrative Support**

a. Invest in better administrative support for research activities across the institution. In addition to investing in new programs (Communities of Excellence, targeted investment in areas with known potential, Innovation Scholars, regular and increased funding of seed programs, and an Investigator Incentive program), it is absolutely essential that the university examine its current level of administrative support of sponsored research activities with an eye towards improving UB’s research environment. As stated by one stakeholder we interviewed through our process, “In general the university has not paid sufficient attention to what it takes to get research done and funded. This is a major area needing improvement. We run the risk of hiring high profile faculty who if they come are surprised at how underdeveloped our research infrastructure is.”

Some key recommendations are as follows:

1. Administrative support for all proposal development should be enhanced, and better post-award administration should be provided to principal investigators. This could be supported in part by permanently funding and potentially expanding the Office of Research Advancement. Investment in further staff to support this expanded proposal development should be considered. In addition, support for seminars similar to the “NIH or NSF grant writing workshop” should be continued, and regularly sponsored (annually) so faculty can better plan attendance and participation. Further support of similar activities that assist the university faculty to be as successful as possible should be considered.

2. Project support staff should be hired by the university, and placed directly in departments or centers that deal directly with the faculty and their research programs. Because this administrative support is largely disallowed by federal funding agencies, and this support is so critical to the successful management of sponsored research activities, this should be a high priority investment made by the university (either centrally, or school-based).

3. The pre- and post-award processes should be restructured into an easily navigated system that not only minimizes the administrative burden on principal investigators, but also provides continuous, seamless support throughout the life cycle of a sponsored program.

4. Continue efforts to stabilize SPS; expand staffing and reduce turnover.
Research Infrastructure

a. Shared facilities should be centrally supported and uniform cost structures (service center) implemented: shared and core facilities that are highly functioning and sufficiently staffed will be important to the future of academic research institutions. Bolstering UB’s shared and core facilities will help maximize research output. The Task Force recommends a formalized process for maintenance, access, charges, and use of central facilities, which will allow for more efficient use of these facilities. Providing consistent support to cores to vastly enhance the ability of UB researchers to perform the cutting edge studies that are crucial for successfully garnering grant funding from key federal and state agencies is critical. Robust and consistent university administrative support for core facilities will be a cornerstone in attracting, supporting and retaining the best faculty, significantly increasing grant funding, and allowing UB to further develop its research excellence. Facilities are currently supported inconsistently, and may not be best leveraged to support the wider university community (e.g., a department-based or school-based facility may not be known about by faculty in other departments or schools). Designing a fee structure that builds in equipment replacement costs would provide a mechanism to keep facilities current and state-of-the-art.

b. Enhance IT infrastructure support for research and scholarship (IT systems, etc.).

II. Small Investment:

Program Investment

a. We recommend that the university establish an Arts and Humanities Research Innovation Fund designed to foster research, scholarship and creative activity in the arts and humanities, broadly defined, to support excellence in these disciplines, to increase competitiveness for external grants, and to reach beyond traditional scholarly audiences. The purpose of the enhancement plan is to provide seed money to achieve short-term goals, allowing faculty to increase their chances of obtaining external funding for larger projects, and to engage our local communities in UB’s programs that contribute so significantly to the rich cultural environment of Buffalo.

Via this program, faculty will work to help UB and non-academic communities understand the role of arts and humanities. Funds will be used to support projects that explore and push the boundaries of traditional arts and humanities scholarship. A recurring annual fund should be established to support innovative and creative projects that go beyond the traditional realm of book and article publication. Once this program is successful, and has an established track record of arts and humanities innovation, additional sustained funding could be sought through Development (individual donors or corporations and foundations). The selection committee would be open to many models of innovation and would expect to see proposals that:
• Apply knowledge created at UB to solve real-world problems
• Engage with new audiences beyond UB
• Collaborate within and beyond the academic community
• Reimagine teaching practices
• Use or create new means of disseminating or producing scholarship

b. Direct additional annual funding to support arts and humanities projects. As a university community, we value the scholarly and creative activities of the faculty in the arts and humanities—they make an important contribution to the university’s comprehensive scholarly portfolio. However, these disciplines traditionally do not garner substantial levels of sponsored research awards—indeed, this is a national trend and not particular to UB. In order to support the scholarly and creative activities of these faculty, and to enhance UB’s reputation and distinctiveness in creative activities, it is recommended that, in addition to the Arts and Humanities Research Innovation Fund, additional dedicated funding be made available to these faculty to support their artistic expression and creative works. This funding should not necessarily be tied to the possibility of future (sponsored) funding, but rather should contribute to the region’s artistic, cultural and civic communities.

c. Increase the number of postdoctoral fellowship opportunities at UB: Establish a “University Postdoctoral Fellowship” program that will award fellowship support of up to five top postdoctoral fellows for two years (five new fellows each year bringing the total number of fellows to ten, each at $50,000) in any research program at the university. This should be a university-wide competition that is advertised widely, and is open to current fellows and those whom we are trying to recruit to UB. In addition, put resources in place to support increased applications for institutional training grants (pre-doctoral, post-doctoral). This level of funding would attract high quality postdoctoral candidates to further support UB research.

d. Promoting Industry Sponsored Research: In order to enhance industry sponsored grants and contracts at UB, we suggest the consideration of a University-Industry Matching Grants Program. The goal is to foster research and development between UB faculty and industrial partners. A secondary goal will be to help identify problems (new products, new processes, and new information) needed by industry that will further the development of products and services that are commercially important and that will benefit society. Many of these projects identified by Industry will likely be of interest to our faculty, who will be able to apply their skills to solving them. They may also be of great interest and benefit to the University as they can be a vehicle for funding valuable UB research and training programs. It has been suggested that there are some major institutional barriers that stand in the way of UB’s ability to promote industry sponsored research. It is therefore recommended to consider policy changes that could fundamentally change the way we work with industry regarding industry sponsored research with a goal to reduce the transaction time and barriers to doing more industry sponsored research.
Administrative Support

a. Faculty Awards and Recognition: From our initial review of UB-to-peer metrics, as well as anecdotal evidence, it appears that UB’s number of faculty awards is low in comparison to our AAU peers and to AAU aspirational peers. The Task Force recommends the creation of a committee/structure to review faculty for nomination for potential awards, which should be prioritized centrally (as opposed to at the department level) in the university. This activity should be staffed by one dedicated FTE, and supported with an adequate operational budget. This committee can also work with the deans and departments to encourage nomination for awards at all levels (local, national, etc.). The Task Force recommends a central process be established to act as a monitor and catalyst to developing faculty recognition through nominations to Distinguished Professorships, National Academies, and other awards and methods of recognition of excellence. A university-wide initiative will increase the visibility of UB faculty and programs to the scientific and scholarly community from around the globe, which will enhance the odds that our faculty can be admitted to membership in these distinguished groups and directly impact AAU metrics.

III. Policy Recommendations We Must Implement

a. Review the budget model and other financial tools to ensure the financial resources that are possible due to research activity are reinvested to be support current and future research. In addition to the recommendation to establish an Investigator Incentive program that correlates in some way to the amount of indirect cost reimbursement investigators’ grants are charged each year, we also recommend a university-wide review of practices related to the salary recovery mechanism (IFR). We note that some units do not widely support the notion of academic year salary being charged to sponsored research activities in ways that are conducive to increased scholarship; others provide smaller amounts back to the investigators. The continued additional university charge on IFR funds (that was put in place at the beginning of the state and university fiscal crisis) should be clawed back – this is having a direct impact on faculty’s ability to support their own research. IFR funds are used by faculty to collect pilot data, invest in preliminary ideas, pay staff who could not be paid off grants (i.e., administrative support), attend professional meetings, etc., all towards supporting their research and scholarly activities.

Thus, the recommendation is to closely examine current practices across the university to design programs that provide some direct revenue support to research-active faculty investigators. This will further incentivize principal investigators, and may reduce the perception that the university does not truly value their contributions as they conduct their funded research programs.
b. Setting Metrics and Goals; Use this to Inform Ares of Potential Investment: The Task Force supports the provost in sending metrics to departments for review, discussion and establishment at the departmental level. Review of the metrics should be done at the department level and include the review of both the department and individual faculty against the metrics. Although special consideration must be given to variation in metrics across disciplines, what should be clearly established is that the metrics and goals should be embraced at each department so that further excellence at UB, department by department, can be achieved.

c. **Expand experiential learning** to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities. Expand experiential learning where to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities, leveraging Start-Up NY among other methods of connecting with industry, community, and others. Expansion of UB partnerships and engagement with private sector to yield more positive perceptions and exchange of resources for mutual benefit, enrichment of student and faculty knowledge, support of career development and job opportunities and placement, and increased appeal of UB education by meeting market demand for UB to provide such experiences.

d. **Revise faculty promotion and recognition programs to incorporate innovation.** Identify promotion policies that recognize innovation (e.g., SUNY Distinguished Professor) and develop and implement specific recommendations for inclusion of innovation-related criteria at UB. This program should be coordinated with SUNY-wide efforts in this arena which are already underway. This will provide clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB (including patents, licenses and start-up companies with an emphasis on those that benefit the public) to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation-oriented activity as a contributor to promotion and recognition goals of faculty.

IV. **Policy Recommendations that Require Further Study**

These last recommendations “require further study” predominantly because they will require Faculty Senate approval or other necessary university/committee review and approvals. As stated by one, “we should avoid university wide policies insufficiently sensitive to the variation in research methods and funding models across disciplines; we should honestly acknowledge that the maintenance of AAU membership and the pursuit of excellence are mutually reinforcing, but independent goals”

a. **Faculty Hires:** An expectation that all new hires should meet or exceed all departmentally-specified metrics, helping the campus improve its measures of research expenditures and/or scholarly output. In addition, in order to immediately improve UB’s scholarly and research productivity, it is recommended that recruitment and hiring of a number of Associate Professors and Professors (in addition to Assistant Professors), who could immediately bolster UB’s research productivity, be part of all faculty hiring plans. We recommend that dedicated funding (from central resources and through incentive programs offered by SUNY and the Research Foundation for SUNY) be identified to enable more mid-level and senior-level faculty hiring.
b. **Create an innovation policy and practice committee** to evaluate, formulate, and advance new approaches to promoting innovation among faculty, personnel, and students. Establish a committee comprising key internal and external stakeholders who will meet on a regular basis to continue to identify needs and opportunities to enhance the innovation agenda for UB. This will provide clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation and positive perception and the availability of an ongoing structure to drive innovation initiatives as a priority.

c. **Introduce student innovation award programs** at undergraduate and graduate levels with funding awards to support initiatives with a two-tiered structure including a smaller amount (four figures) to seed new innovation efforts, and a larger amount (five figures) for matched follow-on efforts or more significant initiatives. These innovation awards should in part be directed to entrepreneurship training that encourages student start-up business formation. This will provide clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation-oriented activity among students.

d. **Introduce incentive program for personnel** that has a small funding award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes (as allowable) for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles. Introduce incentive program for personnel that has small funding (e.g., four figures) award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes as allowable (e.g., three to four figures in value) for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles. This will provide clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural and process transformation and positive perception, and improved processes for handling and supporting the increase in innovation-focused activities.

**Conclusions/Summary:** The recommendations of the Research and Innovation Task Force outline plans for new investments in programs, administration, and infrastructure. As these recommendations are implemented, the goals as set out in *Realizing UB 2020* will be met: new faculty will be recruited through Communities of Excellence and in areas with known potential, thereby increasing the depth and breadth of UB’s research, scholarly and creative activities; new administrative staff will be hired – either centrally or in academic units nearer to the faculty – who will provide better support of all faculty research and scholarship; and infrastructure needs (equipment through scientific cores, IT, libraries) will be enhanced. The recommendations also consider how the university can best support innovation and increased activities with our industry partners to further economic development in our region. All of these recommendations – as well as recommendations being made by other Task Forces formed through *Realizing UB 2020* – will represent a cornerstone in attracting and retaining the best faculty, significantly increasing grant funding, showcasing our scholarship and creative works, and allowing UB to further develop its research excellence. The strategies outlined in this report will build additional strength in our research, education and public service missions while addressing global challenges through enduring scholarship and intellectual innovation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Recommendations</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARGE INVESTMENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Investment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Communities of Excellence as a mechanism to support research priority areas; <em>Signature Program</em></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target investment in additional areas with known potential; <em>Signature Program</em></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch a new Innovation Scholars program with funding awards for faculty; and expand current faculty in leadership program to include innovation scholars; <em>Signature Program</em></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest further/more significantly in seed funding programs</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an Investigator Incentive program that provides flexible funding to investigators in support of their research, with an emphasis on using the funds to support new projects that will further or broaden their research</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high³</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in better administrative support for research activities across the entire institution: enhanced proposal development, provide better post-award administration, hire project support staff in the College/schools/departments to work directly with faculty researchers; reduce the administrative burden currently placed on PIs by virtue of their success in receiving research funding</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high³</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in better business systems/tools: Restructure pre- and post-award processes into an easily navigated system that minimizes PI administrative burden and provide continuous, seamless support throughout the life cycle of a sponsored program</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue efforts to stabilize SPS; expand staffing and reduce turnover</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared facilities should be centrally supported: establish a formalized process for maintenance, access, charges, and use of central facilities to allow for more efficient use, and with common access and billing for UB and non-UB clients. Allocate annual funding for administrative support of key scientific core facilities</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance IT infrastructure support for research and scholarship (IT systems, etc.)</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low³</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task Force Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMALL INVESTMENT: Program Investment</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>Cost (Annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish an annual/recurring Arts and Humanities Innovation Fund to support innovative and creative projects; provide seed money to achieve short-term goals, allowing faculty to increase their chances of obtaining external funding for larger projects</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional annual funding should be directed towards enhancing scholarship, artistic expression and creative works in the arts and humanities and other disciplines with limited access to extramural support</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low³</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of postdoctoral fellowship opportunities at UB: establish a “University Postdoctoral Fellowship” program; put resources in place to support increased applications for institutional training grants (pre-doctoral, post-doctoral) to enable additional recruitment of quality pre-doctoral and post-doctoral students</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a University-Industry Matching Grants program to better foster industry sponsored research</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Support</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>Cost (Annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources (staffing and other costs) to support an institutional program to increase the number of nominations for faculty awards and recognition</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS WE MUST IMPLEMENT:</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>Cost (Annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the budget model and other financial tools to ensure the financial resources that are possible due to research activity are reinvested to best support current and future research</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better information to the research community regarding university support of sponsored research activities</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set metrics and goals; use this to inform areas of potential investment</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand experiential learning in degree programs to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise faculty promotion and recognition programs to incorporate innovation</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Recommendations</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Overall Impact</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS THAT REQUIRE FURTHER STUDY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish expectation that all new faculty hires should meet or exceed departmentally-specified metrics</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an innovation policy and practice committee to evaluate, formulate, and advance new approaches to promoting innovation among faculty, personnel and students</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce student innovation award programs at undergraduate and graduate levels</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce incentive program for personnel that has small funding award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes as allowable for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Use existing staff and infrastructure
2 Will require additional funds
3 Necessary; impact on UB community as well as outside of UB
4 Some costs could be covered through an effective cost center mechanism
Appendix 1:
Research and Innovation Task Force
Subgroup Recommendations

Identify priority research strength areas within theme structure

Emerging recommendations:

1. **SETTING METRICS and GOALS; USE THIS TO INFORM AREAS OF POTENTIAL INVESTMENT:** The subgroup supports the provost in sending metrics to departments for review, discussion and establishment at the departmental level. Review of the metrics should be done at the department level and include the review of both department and individual faculty against the metrics.

However, the subgroup recommends supplementing the Office of the Provost metrics especially in item #3 rely on AAU, to include additional local research/grant metrics that reflect activity not represented on the AAU level (e.g., co-I effort).

Three such measurements for consideration include: 1. Total percent effort covered by individuals on grants (beyond just PPI); 2. The indirect percentage assigned to the departments on behalf of the individuals; 3. List participation on grants that include collaboration of multiple investigators, departments and institutions. We feel this recommendation would help to capture collaborative grant proposals where only the PI effort is acknowledged in the AAU metrics. Such data should be locally available from the VPRED office. Our emphasis in collaborative, large multi-investigator initiative grants needs to be recognized in an evaluation proposed. If not currently possible, an easily implementable change can involve requiring apportioning of credit amongst different investigators in the same department when considering indirect effort in the SPS Electronic Proposal Submission system.

In addition we note the following:

- The subgroup agrees that the Office of the Provost’s data is useful, but recommends using caution when decided how to use this data. It is important for the subgroup to understand the AAU data and all of its nuances, particularly in areas where it could be misunderstood. The data should serve valuable in identifying strengths, and not be used for punitive purposes. The subgroup recommends setting a timeline for review and response by the departments, a timeline for review by the provost, and a timeline for establishing the metrics that are acceptable by both the department and the provost. The subgroup agrees that the data should be shared at the department chair level and feedback should be elicited regarding any discrepancies before it is considered by anyone in review (i.e., deans, provost, VPR) or made publically available.

- The subgroup also recommends collecting many different metrics -- against departments, peers, and AAU-- that will help departments to set priorities and goals in a way that does not overlook individual talented faculty and unique expertise.
• The determination of who will be provided the final data should be made clear and for what purposes it is intended to be used. The subgroup recommends that data be compiled and provided, with thoughtful consideration of: To whom? How? In what timeframe? And cautions that individual departments will be nuanced. The subgroup recommends that the deans work with faculty representatives in each unit to discuss and help interpret the data.

• We suggest that one school “pilot” these efforts to identify potential obstacles and make useful suggestions before implementing University wide, if possible.

• The subgroup recommends that it might be useful to assemble a cohort of faculty who can work with Craig Abbey’s office regularly to help review the metrics and assist in interpretation so the information might be most useful to departments when they arrive there. This group might be made up of assistant deans for research and department chairs.

• Recommend that data from the past 3-5 years be provided as well as a summary of the past 3-5 years. The question is whether the data will be updated annually once the metrics are agreed upon and then used to benchmark improvements.

2. **COMMUNITIES OF EXCELLENCE:** The subgroup recommends that the Provost’s pending Communities of Excellence Request for Proposal (RFP) be implemented as a mechanism to support research priority areas. Suggested structure as follows:

• An open competition should be implemented with clear requirements in an RFP.

• The Office of the Provost should award Communities at a level of 100% central funding (as opposed to requiring a 50% match from decanal units), and overhead from grant awards should be split between the Community and corresponding decanal unit, which will help to make the Communities model sustainable. One rationale for such a recommendation is to ensure the best proposals that serve the entire University are funded and supported. There should be a detailed plan of resources available and provided by units (current faculty, resources, and facilities) but there should be no match required for support of the new faculty lines by the Decanal Units. This will help ensure that the resources will be used to support the communities and will help to reassure faculty that “new” investments will not come at the expense of programmatic hiring. This sub-group strongly feels that 50:50 splits that have been the prior practice at this institution did not allow for full realization of the potential of these interdisciplinary efforts.

• The RFP should be detailed with information and goals of the communities, the amount of funding available in what categories, criteria for judging applications, and plans and metrics that will be used to review funded communities in 3-5 years after they are awarded and other details to provide guidance in preparing the applications. The Communities of Excellence should not just be a faculty hiring plan but should
also allow for support of other infrastructure that might include staff and student support, and vital instrumentation/infrastructure needs. For the plans, a gap analysis should accompany the proposal indicating the current assets and strengths, and specifically the support needed and rationale for the support.

- We recommend that a Letter of Intent (LOI) from interested faculty groups be done from which a committee will decide which will be invited to prepare a full proposal. This will help ensure that the applications will be responsive to the RFA and limit the burden for both preparation and review.

- Determination of how often the requests will be made (once only? Or annually for a number of years?).

- The application process should require a clear demonstration of how each proposed Community would relate to the themes, and if appropriate how they will merge existing strategic strengths and other University strengths into the communities. They should clearly develop goals, aims, methods to achieve their objectives; they should also be reviewed based on the significance of the research, the quality of the faculty, and the staff and students and infrastructure needed for each year. They should also address how the communities will benefit education and economic development goals of the University. *Importantly*, since these will serve as a mechanism to improve our research stature, the likelihood for substantial and significant productivity should be the key metric by which they are reviewed.

- While the funding levels for each community of excellence can be (vastly) different, the sub-group strongly believes that the most sustainable model will involve selecting a few targeted efforts funded at a high level instead of thinly spreading limited resources across very many efforts. However some may require fewer faculty hires than others.

- The evaluation criteria should take into account metrics evaluating excellence in the proposed communities from the Office of the Provost (*What is the track record of the proposing teams? How do they rate in comparison to AAU peers?*). In addition, alignment of the proposals with existing and emerging federal and state funding priorities should be considered, and those proposals with potential for impact. The Communities of Excellence should be allowed to plan and lead interdisciplinary faculty searches with departmental affiliations being addressed after the hire is made to ensure that we can recruit truly interdisciplinary researchers. This is really made possible by funding centrally all the hires as noted above. Communities of Excellence should be encouraged to hire not just junior faculty but also target strategic mid and senior-level hires where funding levels would be expected to be higher and results more immediate.

- The review process for winning proposals should be rigorous and carried out by an external panel of reviewers who would judge the application according to the criteria
set out in the RFP. Those with the best scores should be funded after review by the provost.

- UB should put into place a bold faculty recruitment strategy reflecting this strategic investment. Perhaps a full page ad in Nature or the New York Times.

- Faculty hired within the Communities need to be, at minimum, at the level of the hiring Community’s (department) stated goals. Faculty hired at 100% funding have to be exceptional and meet not just the requirements of a single department, but tangible metrics of relevance to the entire school and across the institution. When possible, UB should strive to hire faculty who are already funded, without overlooking young, rising stars.

3. **TARGETED INVESTMENT IN AREAS WITH KNOWN POTENTIAL:** Some consideration of targeted investment in areas we have great potential for growth. One example of a central facility that is poised to grow where investment in building infrastructure has already been made (CTRC) to consider where UB has the potential for substantial growth is in the area of clinical trials and further support of a clinical trials facility/infrastructure. There may be other areas where investment should be made to exploit areas of great potential.

4. **PROMOTING INDUSTRY SPONSORED RESEARCH:** In order to enhance industry sponsored grants and contracts at UB, we suggest the consideration of a University-Industry Matching Grants Program. The goal is to foster research and development between UB faculty and industrial partners.

A secondary goal will be to help identify problems (new products, new processes, and new information) needed by Industry that will further the development of products and services that are commercially important and that will benefit society. Many of these projects identified by Industry will likely be of interest to our faculty, who will be able to apply their skills to solving them. They may also be of great interest and benefit to the University as they can be a vehicle for funding valuable UB research and training programs.

Accordingly, we propose a new UB-Industry Matching Grants Programs for UB. Implementation of this program could consist of the following steps:

1. Potential projects are identified by industry in collaboration with our faculty.
2. These projects are proposed to be funded through a Letter of Intent (LOI).
3. The funding will consist of up to $50,000 from the University (funding initially of 10 per year is suggested). This is matched 2:1 by industry in cash. SBIR funds can be used as the industry match.
4. Those proposals deemed feasible and of excellent potential quality from the LOI will be asked to submit a concise proposal with a 1 year budget.
5. The proposals will be scored based on well-defined criteria, and those 5 with the best score will be funded.
6. There will be 1 round per year for at least 5 years.
7. Progress reports every 3 months (2 pages) will be submitted by the investigators and the budgets will be monitored also every 3 months.

8. The overhead will be 10% to cover administrative costs.

9. Non-Disclosure Agreements, Intellectual Property clauses and publication issues will follow the same UB procedures administered by the VPRED and STOR.

10. The outcome measures will include:
   a. Total industrial funding directly associated with the UB-Industry Matching Grants Program.
   b. Total industrial funding for UB.
   c. Patents, licenses and publications.
   d. Government funding resulting from the program (eg. SBIR, federal grants, state funding).
   e. Revenue to UB from licenses, equity, and patent reimbursement.
   f. Numbers of graduate and undergraduate students employed by these companies, initially as interns and eventually as full employees.

Details of an RFP, grant application, administration structure, administrative costs, outreach to industry to generate interest in programs, mechanisms for matching with faculty and other issues will need to be developed if the program is potentially funded.

5. **SEED FUNDING:** The subgroup recommends support of seed funding. Initially we should take an inventory of all existing seed funding programs and examining existing gaps, with the intention of making recommendations to bridge those gaps. Current and future seed funding programs should be structured in such a way that all awardees will make public presentations in some forum at the end of twelve months, and be expected to submit a grant application within twelve to twenty four months of receiving seed funding. The following guidelines should be included in the structuring of seed funding programs:

- The goal of the seed funding is to increase research and training funding and scholarship.

- The process should be peer-reviewed and feedback of the strengths and weaknesses be given for all applications.

- Programs should be regular and predictable, with dates posted and adhered to so individuals and groups can plan. The dates should be posted on the web for the next 2-3 funding cycles for every program.

- Programs should be monitored for return on investment with reports on success expected by 24-36 months after investment.

6. **INCREASE THE NUMBER OF POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITIES** at UB: establish a “University Postdoctoral Fellowship” program that will award fellowship support of up to five top postdoctoral fellows for two years (five new fellows each year bringing the total number of fellows to ten) in any research program at the university. This should be a university-wide competition that is advertised widely, and is
open to current fellows and those whom we are trying to recruit to UB. In addition, put resources in place to support increased applications for institutional training grants (pre-doctoral, post-doctoral).

7. **CENTRAL FACILITIES:** The subgroup recommends a formalized process for maintenance, access, charges, and use of central facilities, which will allow for more efficient use of these facilities. The subgroup recommends that a portion of start-up funds for faculty includes these up-to-date, well-managed and well-maintained central facilities and equipment when appropriate. The use of these central facilities is intended to complement, and not supplant, start-up packages. Competitive startup packages will need to be provided as part of hiring plans especially if there is to be a focus on hiring outstanding candidates at the junior and tenured faculty levels.

8. **CENTRAL SUPPORT OF OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADVANCEMENT:** The subgroup recommends continuation and potential expansion of the Office of Research Advancement (ORA), including providing administrative support for submission of large, multi-disciplinary applications and/or proposals of institutional priority. Investment in further staff to support this initiative should be considered, as needed. In addition, support for seminars similar to the “NIH grant writing workshop” be continued. Further support of similar activities should be considered that assist the university faculty to be as successful as possible.

9. **FACULTY AWARDS and RECOGNITION:** From our initial review of UB-to-peer metrics, as well as anecdotal evidence, the subcommittee believes that UB’s number of faculty awards is low in comparison to our AAU peers and AAU aspirational peers. The subgroup recommends the creation of a committee/structure to review faculty for nomination for potential awards. We believe this should be prioritized centrally (as opposed to at the department level) in the university. This committee can also work with the deans and departments to encourage nomination for awards at all levels (local, national etc). A list of the awards considered by the AAU should be circulated and the committee should identify potential candidates to nominate. Also an inventory of current members (IOM etc.) should be done and these people serve on such committee. The subgroup recommends a central process be established to act as a monitor and catalyst to developing faculty recognition through nominations to Distinguished Professorships, National Academies, and other awards, and other methods of recognition of excellence.

10. **INCENTIVES:** Although under a separate subcommittee, incentives for faculty who meet or exceed expectations on funding should be considered as a means to promote additional research, either personal incentives or incentives to further support those programs.

11. **HIRES:** An expectation that all new hires (or at minimum the 100 or so hired as part of Communities), should meet or exceed all departmentally-specified metrics, helping the campus improve its measures of research expenditures and/or scholarly output. In addition, in order to immediately improve UB’s scholarly and research productivity, it is recommended that the recruitment and hiring of a number of Associate Professors and Professors (in addition to Assistant Professors), who could immediately bolster UB’s
research productivity, be part of all faculty hiring plans. We recommend that dedicated funding (from central resources and through incentive programs offered by SUNY and the Research Foundation for SUNY) be identified to enable more mid-level and senior-level faculty hiring.
Innovation at UB, Innovation Scholars Program

Deliverable #2: “Formulate short and long-term strategies to enhance the processes of innovation at UB and in the region in targeted investment areas. Key aspects of this process will include recommending the guidelines and procedures for the implementation of the Innovation Scholars.” (note: the charge for Start-Up NY has been moved from this subcommittee’s deliverables)

In line with the overall strategy of a) shaping a new definition of innovation for UB, b) establishing policies and practices that encourage innovation, and c) extending the basic tenets of UB 2020 to support innovation, the following tactical recommendations/initiatives are being proposed:

Recommendations/Initiatives for Innovation at UB, Innovation Scholars Program

1. Expand experiential learning in degree programs to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities.
2. Create an innovation policy and practice committee to evaluate, formulate, and advance new approaches to promoting innovation among faculty, personnel, and students.
3. Launch a new Innovation Scholars program with funding awards for faculty with a two-tiered structure for junior investigators and senior investigators.
4. Expand the current faculty leadership mentor program to include innovation scholars.
5. Revise faculty promotion and recognition programs to incorporate innovation.
6. Introduce student innovation award programs at undergraduate and graduate levels.
7. Introduce an incentive program for personnel that has a small funding award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes (as allowable) for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles.

Initiative 1: Expand experiential learning in degree programs to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities.

Summary:
Description: Expand experiential learning where possible in degree and non-degree programs to engage students and faculty with external parties involved in innovation activities, leveraging Start-Up NY among other methods of connecting with industry, community, and others (note: this recommendation likely aligns with other task force recommendations, given that it is part of UB 2020 strategy).

Outcomes: Expansion of UB partnerships and engagement with the private sector to yield more positive perceptions and exchange of resources for mutual benefit, enrichment of student and faculty knowledge, support of career development and job opportunities and placement, and an increased appeal of UB education by meeting market demand for UB to provide such experiences.

Implementation Plan A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan could include implementation of experiential learning for Start-Up NY participants who are inclined, and for those UB academic
programs which are or wish to be involved in expanding their internships and related learning opportunities (e.g., SEAS).

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>X (use existing staff and infrastructure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Plan B/C: Signature approach would include the implementation of experiential learning throughout all degree programs at UB (as well as through initiatives like Start-Up NY), which would require extensive curriculum and infrastructure redesign (e.g., similar to co-op institutions).

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>X (hire new staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to implement and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that UB implement a hybrid of Implementation Plan A and Plan B/C, which would involve immediate progress on Plan A, while pilot academic units (e.g., likely SEAS given it is already pursuing experiential learning very actively) would pursue a robust integration of experiential learning into their curriculum with the appropriate infrastructure, policy, and process development over time; along with an introduction of new resources that require funding as such support can be procured. This mirrors somewhat the introduction of the website content management system over time at UB, although this initiative has much greater complexity for Plan B/C due to the impact on curriculum with its many requirements.

**Initiative 2:** Integrate an innovation policy and practice agenda in an existing UB committee to evaluate, formulate, and advance new approaches to promoting innovation among faculty, personnel, and students.

**Summary:**

Description: Establish a committee comprising key internal and external stakeholders who will meet on a regular basis to continue to identify needs and opportunities to enhance the innovation agenda for UB.

Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation and positive perception, availability of an ongoing structure to drive innovation initiatives as a priority, and assumed significant impact of subsequent initiatives that would be developed by the committee.

**Implementation Plan A:** Fundamental/Foundational Plan would involve establishing the committee, which may be developed from existing UB committees if desired, within 2-3 months.
of the decision to proceed. The first charge of the committee would be to develop a formal agenda for assessing and expanding innovation initiatives.

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan  
B: Signature  
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>X (use existing staff and infrastructure)</td>
<td>X (initial launch)</td>
<td>X (initial launch)</td>
<td>X (initial launch)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
It is recommended that UB proceed with a Fundamental/Foundational Plan which would be intended to yield signature and transformative initiatives over time.

**Initiative 3**: Launch a new Innovation Scholars program with funding awards for faculty with a two-tiered structure for junior and senior investigators.

**Summary**:

Description: Establish a university recognition program (Innovation Scholars) with financial awards that would be available to existing and new faculty to support innovation activities. The program would need to define mission, eligibility, submission qualifications and review process, award amount and number (e.g., 2-tiered, 2-3 year award to a half dozen people annually with renewal to encourage continued innovation), and launch timeline; as noted in straw man information below:

- Mission of Innovation Scholars: To promote the development of faculty who combine outstanding scholarship with the application of this scholarship to creating real world impact.
- Definition of Innovation Scholars: Existing faculty or new faculty recruits who show promising scholarly activity combined with a) substantial engagement in improving the human condition through creation of new products, services, policies, and practices beyond the university environment, b) collaboration with other faculty and external entities.
• Awards: Scholars may qualify at one of two tiers: young investigator level receiving $50,000 annually for 3 years, and senior investigator level receiving $250,000 annually for 3 years. Renewal is encouraged.
• Eligibility and Submission Qualifications: (TBD in alignment with ‘definition’ above)
• Review Process: Set up a review committee with a process for new candidates and renewal of existing awardees (TBD, consider engaging current faculty awards committee).

Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation activity due to direct financial incentives.

Implementation Plan B: Signature implementation.

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>X (initially)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
It is recommended that UB proceed with a medium cost plan that would be considered signature, so that the program will attract attention and participation. After a pilot period of 2-3 years, expansion of the program may be considered.

Initiative 4: Expand current faculty leadership mentor program to include Innovation Scholars.

Summary:
Description: Create dedicated slots in the current faculty leadership mentor program that will be filled by Innovation Scholars.
Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation-oriented activity via professional development of faculty through mentorship.

Implementation Plan A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan would involve the coordination of a new Innovation Scholars program with current faculty mentoring program.

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>X (use existing staff and infrastructure)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
It is recommended that UB proceed with a Fundamental/Foundational Plan in alignment with the roll out of the Innovation Scholars program.

Initiative 5: Revise faculty promotion and recognition programs to incorporate innovation.

Summary:

Description: Identify promotion policies and recognition programs (e.g., SUNY Distinguished Professor) and develop and implement specific recommendations for inclusion of innovation-related criteria. The program would be coordinated with SUNY-wide efforts in this arena which are already underway.

Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation-oriented activity as a contributor to promotion and recognition goals of faculty.

Implementation Plan B: Signature approach that involves UB-wide implementation would be necessary to make a meaningful impact in establishing UB among the leaders in higher education in recognizing and rewarding innovation.
Recommendations
Given the low cost of this initiative, it is recommended that UB elevate the priority and intensity of its current efforts in concert with SUNY to implement this initiative. While this is complex to implement from a process standpoint given all the various parties who need to be involved, a consistent, concerted effort will accelerate achieving the desired result.

Initiative 6: Introduce student innovation award programs at undergraduate and graduate levels.

Summary:

Description: Introduce student innovation award programs at undergraduate and graduate levels with funding awards to support initiatives with a two-tiered structure including a smaller amount (four figures) to seed new innovation efforts, and a larger amount (five figures) for matched follow-on efforts or more significant initiatives. These innovation awards should in part be directed to entrepreneurship training that encourages student start-up business formation. (Note this is one of proposal criteria to measure innovation research from the Provost per email 12/1/13 1:03 pm – see attached).

Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural transformation, positive perception, and increased innovation-oriented activity among students.

Implementation Plan B: Signature approach that involves UB-wide implementation across academic programs at both the graduate and undergraduate level.

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>X (use existing staff plus will require new funds for initial launch)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
While a signature implementation plan is proposed, it is noted that this program has been introduced at a low cost level to start this year with increased investment (e.g., award amounts and number) in subsequent years in order to achieve a high level of impact.

**Initiative 7:** Introduce an incentive program for personnel that has a small funding award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes as allowable for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles.

**Summary:**

Description: Introduce an incentive program for personnel that has a small funding (e.g., four figures) award for new initiatives, recognition awards with prizes as allowable (e.g., three to four figures in value) for leadership in establishing and supporting innovation processes, and new positions with innovation-related titles.

Outcomes: Clear confirmation of the importance of innovation initiatives at UB to facilitate cultural and process transformation and positive perception, and improved processes for handling and supporting the increase in innovation-focused activity generated by initiatives 1-6.

**Implementation Plan B:** Signature approach that involves UB-wide implementation.

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

While a signature implementation plan is proposed, it is recommended that this program start with pilot units or processes that will minimize the cost, time, and complexity initially. Successful pilot experiences will then serve to motivate and inform the expanded process reengineering and innovation-orientation among personnel across the university.
Shared and core facilities that are highly functioning and sufficiently staffed will be important to the future of academic research institutions. As federal government agencies are operating with flat or decreasing budgets the competition for federal research awards is growing stronger, and federal grants are increasingly trending toward multi-disciplinary awards that will provide far-reaching research benefits. The subgroup tasked with strengthening research infrastructure to maximize research output makes the following recommendations with the intention of bolstering UB’s shared and core facilities research infrastructure.

I. **Provide consistent support to core facilities to vastly enhance the ability of UB researchers to perform the cutting edge studies that are crucial for successfully garnering grant funding from federal agencies.** Robust and consistent university administrative support for central/core facilities will be a cornerstone in attracting the best faculty, significantly increasing grant funding, and allowing UB to further develop its research excellence. User fees for UB core facilities serve as sources of operational funding, however these funds typically only cover the services performed.

Sorely lacking are accounts for performing Research & Development (R&D) and customization of technical approaches at core facilities. The subgroup recommends creating facilities accounts that would be utilized in cases in which a faculty member has a promising new project whose successful completion requires novel and difficult techniques. Under this proposal that the faculty member would not bear the financial burden for extra time spent in a core facility developing novel approaches that may take extensive time and optimization before they can even be used to generate real data. Nevertheless, it is just these novel approaches that are essential for generating the cutting edge grant proposals that successfully compete for funding. In this regard, administrative support of core facilities would be an investment that would prime the pump for generating significant additional revenue. UB facilities that would benefit from this recommendation include:

- Integrated Nanostructured Systems Instrument facility
- South Campus Instrument Center
- Chemistry Department Instrumentation Center
- Biological Sciences Imaging Facility
- School of Medicine’s Core Facilities: analytical chemistry and toxicology, genomics proteomics, flow cytometry, histology, confocal microscopy, TEM imaging, PET/CT imaging, and stem cell culture, banking, and analysis.
- Center for Computational Research
- The Comparative Medicine Laboratory Animal Facilities

Proposed budgets for two of the core facilities that would be bolstered by this recommendation include the UB Next-Gen Sequencing and Analysis Expression Core facility and the Proteomics facility, and explanations and budgets are presented below:

1. **Ongoing administrative support for the UB Next-Gen Sequencing and Analysis Expression Core Facility, housed at the CoE in Bioinformatics & Life Sciences.**

Administrative support for the UB Next-Gen Core would be an investment that would prime the pump for generating significant additional revenue. R&D that takes place in the UB Next-Gen Core would also have the potential to support new biotechnology start-up companies that result
from either intellectual property or core services. The Stabilization of Core personnel salaries and equipment upkeep is also critical to the ability of the Core to provide support for the unique needs of UB researchers, thereby contributing to increased grant funding and biotechnology start-up (see supporting data below).

**Cost: MEDIUM**
**Time: MEDIUM**
**Complexity: LOW**
**Impact: MEDIUM**

2. *Administrative support for the Proteomics Facility, housed at the CoE in Bioinformatics & Life Sciences.*

The UB Proteomics Facility is housed at the Center of Excellence in Bioinformatics and Life Sciences (CoE). Director Dr. Jun Qu (UB Pharmaceutical Sciences) oversees the facilities operations and funding. Currently, the UB Proteomic Facility is funded in an *ad hoc* manner by non-renewable grants from numerous sources. User fees generate additional monies, but importantly these funds DO NOT cover the costs of operations. This is the typical situation of university-based proteomics facilities nationwide; these facilities generally have financial support from the university that permit them to work with faculty to develop new technologies that support the types of cutting edge research that gets funded. As with the Genomics Facility, the Proteomics Facility at UB requires an operating budget that will permit them to perform pilot studies in collaboration with UB researchers. Generation of innovative methods through the use of this support will lead to a significant increase in grant revenues.

**Cost: MEDIUM**
**Time: LOW/MEDIUM**
**Complexity: LOW**
**Impact: MEDIUM**

II. **Foundational structural changes to shared facilities**

- *Shared facilities should be centrally supported, with a common access and billing for UB and non-UB clients.*

- *The pre- and post-award processes should be restructured into an easily navigated system that not only minimizes the administrative burden on principal investigators, but also provides continuous, seamless support throughout the life cycle of a sponsored program.*

- *Administrative support for all proposal development should be enhanced, and post-award administration provided.*
  - Expand staffing and reduce turnover in SPS Project support staff should be hired.
  - Link outreach with creative activities and research.

- *Contribute to IT support in the Libraries.*
I. Facilities and administrative costs

- Over a 3-5 year timeline, UB should commit to providing the investigator, his/her department, decanal units and recognized centers with a dollar sum equivalent to a significant fraction (~40-50%) of recovered facilities and administrative (F&A) costs, in order to support clearly identified research-related activities.

- A portion of F&A return (1-2%) should be directed annually towards enhancing scholarship and creative activities in the arts and humanities and other disciplines with limited access to extramural support.
Incentive systems that maximize funded scholarship

Summary:
An area that continues to be a university-wide challenge is finding ways of providing meaningful, sustainable rewards and incentives to faculty for advancing the teaching, research and outreach mission. In a climate of continued fiscal challenge and increasing needs for accountability it is more important than ever to offer faculty incentives that advance progress toward college and university goals as well as to the overall mission. The focus of this project is to identify meaningful incentives to support faculty pursuit of excellence in scholarship, as well as success in obtaining external funding to develop and support programs of research and creative activity.

Leadership should consider financial and non-financial incentives directly to colleges, departments and faculty for the purposes of securing extramural funding, advancing instructional quality, new course development, and innovation.

The expected outcomes of this program include:
- Increased number of extramural funding proposal submissions
- Improved success rate for extramural funding awards
- Improved recruitment and retention of research-active faculty
- Increased generation of institutional facility and administrative (F&A) cost recovery
- Increased compensation for participating employees

Implementation:
A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TIME&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>IMPACT&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
COST<sup>1</sup> Low, recurring investment of under $100K
Medium, recurring investment of under $500K
High, recurring investment of over $500K

**TIME**
- Low – a semester
- Medium – within a year
- High – need more than a year to implement

**COMPLEXITY**
- Low – no policy change, one or two offices only to implement
- Medium – multiple offices but authority clear and quick to implement
- High – major change in policy direction, complex internal team required, external approval required

**IMPACT**
- Low – Foundational – shoring up key infrastructures, services and academic programs that are essential to achieving our goals
- Medium – Signature – investing in areas that will improve UB but may not achieve national and international prominence
- High – National and International Prominence – transformative investments that move UB to a leadership position

**Recommendations**

**Foundational:**
- The pre- and post-award processes should be restructured into an easily navigated system that not only minimizes the administrative burden on principal investigators, but also provides continuous, seamless support throughout the life cycle of a sponsored program.
- Administrative support for all proposal developments should be enhanced, and post-award administration provided.
  1. Expand staffing and reduce turnover in SPS
  2. Project support staff should be hired
- Link outreach with creative activities and research

**Cost:** MEDIUM
**Time:** MEDIUM
**Complexity:** LOW
**Impact:** LOW BUT NECESSARY

**Additional Structural Changes of a fundamental character:**
- Over a 3-5 year timeline, UB should commit to providing the investigator, his/her department, decanal units and recognized centers with a dollar sum equivalent to a significant fraction (~40-50%) of recovered facilities and administrative (F&A) costs, in order to support clearly identified research-related activities.
- A portion of F&A return (1-2%) should be directed annually towards enhancing scholarship and creative activities in the arts and humanities and other disciplines with limited access to extramural support.
• Contribute to IT support in the Libraries

Cost: HIGH
Time: HIGH
Complexity: LOW
Impact: LOW BUT NECESSARY
**Arts and Humanities Scholarship**

**Summary:**

The Arts and Humanities Research Innovation Fund is designed to foster research, scholarship and creative activity in the arts and humanities, broadly defined, to support excellence in these disciplines, to increase competitiveness for external grants, and to reach beyond traditional scholarly audiences. The purpose of the enhancement plan is to provide seed money to achieve short-term goals, allowing faculty to increase their chances of obtaining external funding for larger projects.

Via this program, faculty will work to help the UB and non-academic communities understand the role of arts and humanities. Funds will be used to support projects that explore and push the boundaries of traditional arts and humanities scholarship. We anticipate that the fund will:

- Establish opportunities that will enhance the current strengths of the arts and humanities
- Encourage and support scholarly research and creative endeavors that seek to explore connections across conventional academic disciplines
- Develop innovative programs that impact UB and the broader community
- Create internal funding opportunities that will foster the development of unique and impactful programs
- Commit to increasing the intellectual and advanced research activities that are capable of attracting external funding
- Create projects that will leverage external funding

**Implementation:**

A: Fundamental/Foundational Plan
B: Signature
C: National/International Prominence – Transformative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST¹</th>
<th>TIME²</th>
<th>COMPLEXITY³</th>
<th>IMPACT⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

COST¹: Low, recurring investment of under $100K
Medium, recurring investment of under $500K
High, recurring investment of over $500K

TIME
Low – a semester
Medium – within a year
High – need more than a year to implement

COMPLEXITY
Low – no policy change, one or two offices only to implement
Medium – multiple offices but authority clear and quick to implement
High – major change in policy direction, complex internal team required, external approval required

IMPACT
Low – Foundational – shoring up key infrastructures, services and academic programs that are essential to achieving our goals
Medium – Signature – investing in areas that will improve UB but may not achieve national and international prominence
High – National and International Prominence – transformative investments that move UB to a leadership position

Recommendations
The subcommittee recommends that a recurring annual fund be established to support innovative and creative projects that go beyond the traditional realm of book and article publication.

We propose an initial investment of $50,000 - $75,000. Within this model, we anticipate funding multiple projects. Some projects will receive a one-time investment, while one or two projects will receive multiple-year funding.

A committee of faculty members and non-academics will annually select five new projects. Each project will receive $5,000 for the first year. The two most successful projects will receive $10,000 for a second term, with one project receiving a third year of funding for $20,000. We anticipate coordinating our efforts with UB Development to help identify external sources of funding, while also pursuing federal/governmental funds.

Administered through the Humanities Institute, the fund would invite colleagues to submit proposals for annual funding. The selection committee is open to many models of innovation and expects to see proposals that:

- Apply knowledge created at UB to solve real-world problems
- Engage with new audiences beyond UB
- Collaborate within and beyond the academic community
- Reimagine teaching practices
- Use or create new means of disseminating or producing scholarship