

## **UH Association of Research Investigators Survey of Research Infrastructure Problems and Priorities**

The Executive Committee of the UH Association of Research Investigators (UHARI) conducted a survey of UH faculty on the research infrastructure problems and priorities identified by the ***Report of the President's Special Task Force on Research Infrastructure at the University of Hawaii*** submitted to President Dobbelle on November 9, 2001. However, many of the issues discussed in that report are still being discussed. The UHARI Committee felt it was important to get some sense of what faculty researchers now felt were the most significant problems with research infrastructure at UH, and which earlier recommendations should be given the highest priority.

The survey instrument was based on the Task Force Report. Research infrastructure problems addressed by the Task Force were those reported by members of the Task Force and opinions solicited from faculty by the Chair. The recommendations contained in the survey instrument were taken directly from the Task Force Report or from deliberations among Task Force members. To the degree possible, the wording used in the survey instrument was drawn directly from the report.

The survey instrument had three parts. Part 1 listed *Problems or Issues Affecting Extramural Contracts and Grants*. Participants in the survey were asked to rank those problems and issues as either *High, Medium, or Low* in terms of their importance. Part 2 listed *Recommendations* drawn from the Task Force report. The survey instrument asked faculty to indicate how they felt about the recommendations: *Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, No Opinion, Somewhat Disagree, or Strongly Disagree*. Part 3 asked faculty to provide some information on their status as a PI, their home unit, the number of years at UH, the types of contracts and grants they get, and the amount of funding they have brought in per year.

The survey instrument was posted on the UHARI Website and an e-mail message was set out to the UHARI e-mail list of about 300 faculty on September 29, 2003 with an initial due date of October 10. Follow-up e-mail messages were sent in early October and by October 15, fifty-one surveys forms had been returned. An informal polling of faculty in the College of Social Sciences indicated that they did not see the message about the survey. In early November, the survey instrument was e-mailed out to Deans and Directors asking them to please forward it to their faculty. The second deadline was November 10. An additional 86 survey forms were returned for a grand total of 137.

The results of the survey are presented in the Tables in this report. Not every respondent answered every question. And, this was a self-selected group of respondents and not a random sample of all researchers. Therefore, the results

cannot be portrayed as *representative* of the views of all researchers. However, the respondents appear to include some of our most active research and training faculty. And, the results are consistent with the views expressed to the Task Force and members of the UHARI Executive Committee.

## **Part 1: Problems**

The raw scores ranking the ten problems identified in Part 1 of the survey form are presented in Table 1a. Composite scores calculated based on the distribution of scores (with High = 3 points, Medium = 2 points, and Low = 1 point) are shown in Table 1b.

Clearly those surveyed felt that the Research and Training Revolving Fund (RTRF) has become critical for the management of contracts and grants because of cuts in General Fund resources at UH. A total of 105 out of 134 answering that question felt that was of high importance. Only five felt it was of *low* importance.

The second most *important problem* identified was that *administrative and fiscal procedures and systems are slaves to compliance and control and do not serve research and other sponsored activities*. A total of 96 of 136 felt this was of *high* in significance, ranking second only to the RTRF issue in composite scores.

The deterioration of lab, office and other facilities and of administrative and fiscal infrastructure were seen as serious problems. These clustered as the third most significant in terms of composite scores. Over sixty-two percent ranked the deterioration of administrative and fiscal infrastructure as high priority and over seventy percent ranked deterioration of facilities as *high* in terms of importance.

UH personnel issues clustered as fourth most important. The inadequacy of UH salaries and benefits to attract and retain qualified staff and the inflexibility and cumbersomeness of the UH personnel system. These were ranked as *high* by about sixty percent of respondents.

The existence of two administrative and fiscal systems (one at UH and one at RCUH) ranked next in terms of composite scores, although 50 of 131 responding to this question thought it was of *high* importance and only 35 indicated it was of *low* importance.

The decline in the UH indirect cost rate and problems with contract review process at ORS scored lowest in terms of composite scores. The former is a complicated issue and not well understood by many people on campus. However, it was a major issue of discussion in the Task Force and continues to be a concern for those responsible for research infrastructure. The latter appeared to be most important to those who conduct research and training supported with contracts as opposed to grants. As noted later in this report, a

total of 119 survey respondents said they receive funding through grants compared to 66 who said they receive funding through contracts.

**Table 1a: Problems or Issues Affecting Extramural Contracts and Grants**

Importance or Significance of Problem or Issue (Mark High, Medium, and Low for each of the issues or problems)	Importance			
	H	M	L	T
1. Administrative and fiscal infrastructure at UH have deteriorated while extramural income has increased significantly;	84 62.7%	42 31.3%	8 6%	134
2. The UH indirect cost or overhead rate has declined significantly and is now among the lowest in the country. This has resulted from cuts in general fund support, changes in federal policy, and increases in contracts and grants income;	58 45.3%	45 35.2%	25 19.5%	128
3. RTRF ( <i>overhead</i> return) has become critical for the management of research and training contracts and grants because of cuts in G-Funds for administrative and fiscal support;	105 78.4%	24 18.0%	5 3.75%	134
4. Administrative and fiscal policies, procedures and systems are slaves to compliance and control and do not serve research and other sponsored activities;	96 70.6%	35 25.7%	5 3.7%	136
5. The <i>Just Say No</i> bureaucratic culture at UH is pervasive;	74 55.2%	43 32.1%	17 12.7%	134
6. The Pre-award contract review process at ORS is completely inadequate and contracts cannot be processed in a timely manner;	43 33.9%	48 37.8%	36 28.3%	127
7. The existence of two administrative and fiscal systems (both UH and RCUH) are a significant burden to researchers and support staff;	50 38.2%	46 35.1%	35 26.7%	131
8. The UH personnel system is inflexible and cumbersome;	80 60.1%	43 32.3%	10 7.5%	133
9. UH salaries and benefits are inadequate to attract and retain qualified staff;	82 59.9%	41 29.9%	14 10.2%	137
10. Lab, office and other facilities have deteriorated due to budget cuts, and growth in facilities has lagged far behind growth in contracts and grants.	89 65.9%	35 25.9%	11 8.1%	135

**Table 1b: Problems or Issues Affecting Extramural Contracts and Grants  
Composite Point Scores**

Importance or Significance of Problem or Issue (Mark High, Medium, and Low for each of the following issues or problems)	Importance H=3,M=2, L=1
1. Administrative and fiscal infrastructure at UH have deteriorated while extramural income has increased significantly;	344 mean=2.6
2. The UH indirect cost or overhead rate has declined significantly and is now among the lowest in the country. This has resulted from cuts in general fund support, changes in federal policy, and increases in contracts and grants income;	289 mean=2.3
3. RTRF ( <i>overhead</i> return) has become critical for the management of research and training contracts and grants because of cuts in G-Funds for administrative and fiscal support;	368 mean=2.7
4. Administrative and fiscal policies, procedures and systems are slaves to compliance and control and do not serve research and other sponsored activities;	363 mean=2.7
5. The <i>Just Say No</i> bureaucratic culture at UH is pervasive;	325 mean=2.4
6. The Pre-award contract review process at ORS is completely inadequate and contracts cannot be processed in a timely manner;	261 mean=2.1
7. The existence of two administrative and fiscal systems ( both UH and RCUH) are a significant burden to researchers and support staff;	277 mean=2.1
8. The UH personnel system is inflexible and cumbersome;	336 mean=2.5
9. UH salaries and benefits are inadequate to attract and retain qualified staff;	342 mean=2.5
10. Lab, office and other facilities have deteriorated due to budget cuts, and growth in facilities has lagged far behind growth in contracts and grants.	348 mean=2.6

## Part 2: Recommendations

As noted in the introduction, the second part of the survey asked opinions about recommendations made by the Task Force or considered by the Task Force.

### General Research Administration Decisions

The first set of questions in Part 2 were on research administration and training decisions, which was discussed at length by the Task Force. In response to the question about one of the *principles* agreed to by the Task Force, the *delegation of decision-making authority to the lowest level possible—school or college*, 115 respondents said they agreed with that recommendation compared to 14 that disagreed and 4 with no opinion (see Table 2a).

Almost the same level of support was expressed for the implementation of post-transaction audit approvals whereby all approvals would be at the Fiscal Officer or Principal Investigator level rather than at RCUH or in UH central offices. As the Task Force discussed, this is largely already the case. More people had no opinion on this question than had no opinion on the first question and only ten strongly or somewhat disagreed.

On the question of implementing an electronic research administration, over 84 percent of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that this should be done. Only 8 disagreed and 13 had no opinion. Implementation of this recommendation is actually being pursued by the UH Business Process Council.

**Table 2a**

<b>General Research Administration Decisions</b>					
➤ Revamp Research Administration:					
▪ Delegate administrative decision-making authority to lowest level possible—college or school	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>73</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>
	54.9%	31.6%	3%	8.3%	2.3%
▪ Implement post-audit transaction approvals whereby all approvals would be at the FO and PI level rather than at RCUH or in central UH offices	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>70</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>
	53.4%	28.2%	10.7%	6.1%	1.5%
▪ Implement an electronic research administration system—all transactions done online and automatically posted to an online accounting system	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>83</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
	61.9%	22.4%	9.7%	3.7%	2.2%

## Space

The lack of adequate facilities for research and training at the University of Hawaii was one of the issues discussed by the Task Force. Survey respondents were asked whether RCUH or UH should lease a building to meet research and training needs. As indicated in Table 2b, only 68 out of 133 responding to that question agreed with this recommendation and 29 disagreed with the idea.

**Table 2b**

<b>Space</b>					
➤ UH or RCUH should lease a building to meet short- and medium-term space needs for sponsored research, training, and other activities and pay for that space out of RTRF or indirect cost return	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>26</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>
	19.5%	31.6%	27.1%	12.8%	9.0%

## UH vs RCUH for Research Administration

One of the most contentious issues discussed by the Task Force was the question of whether contracts and grants should be administered by the Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii or the University of Hawaii itself. There was agreement among Task Force members that it would be better to have one organization provide the support for contracts and grants, but there was disagreement about which organization should be that one entity. Responses show that opinions differ on this question among a broader spectrum of the faculty too.

In response to two general questions about shifting contracts and grants administration to UH or RCUH, more than twice as many people (71) strongly disagreed with shifting all research administration to UH than agreed with the idea (30) and only 26 people had no opinion (see Table 2c). In response to the question of shifting more research administration to RCUH, 60 agreed with the idea and 40 had no opinion. There were 32 people who disagreed with only nine strongly disagreeing. As for maintaining the two systems only 24 were in favor of that while 102 disagreed. It appears, therefore, that no option on the RCUH vs UH contracts and grants management question will please everyone.

**Table 2c**

<b>UH vs RCUH for Research Administration</b>					
➤ Shift All Research Administration to UH and <u>stop</u> using RCUH to administer projects	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>41</b>
	4.7%	18.9%	20.5%	23.6%	32.3%
▪ Move RCUH administrative and fiscal functions and personnel at RCUH currently devoted to UH research support to UH	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>12</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>34</b>
	9.2%	20.8%	26.9%	16.9%	26.2%
▪ Have the RCUH Executive Director (who now reports to an independent board with UH Board of Regents members on the RCUH Board) report to the UH Vice President of Research	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>
	22.1%	27.5%	19.8%	14.5%	16.0%
➤ Shift more Research Administration to RCUH	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>25</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>
	18.9%	26.5%	30.3%	17.4%	6.8%
▪ Have RCUH handle <u>all</u> extramural contract and grants administration	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>25</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>
	18.9%	26.5%	29.8%	12.2%	12.2%
▪ Have RCUH take over the pre-award functions (proposal and contract review) currently handled by ORS	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>
	18.3%	18.3%	32.1%	15.3%	16.0%
➤ Maintain the current systems with UH and RCUH	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>36</b>
	<1%	17.6%	19.1%	35.1%	27.5%

The UH vs RCUH issue is more complicated than the simple question of choosing one organization or the other. It is actually more complicated than any of the questions in the survey show. There are administrative and fiscal functions currently performed by RCUH, which could be handled at UH as they were in the past. These include procurement, accounting of grant funds, and personnel management. There are several contracts and grants functions, including compliance and contract/grant review procedures that are currently the responsibility of the Office of Research Services that could be performed by RCUH. (In fact, RCUH performs these functions for UH Hilo.) RCUH also employs over 1,000 people who work on UH contracts and grants. In theory, they could be employed by UH. Practically, the unique and urgent employment demand of short-term grants and contracts is one of the reasons that RCUH was

created. Discussions are currently underway to revise a relatively new Board of Regents policy (currently suspended until April 2004) that limits employment at RCUH to one year.

There is also the legislatively created autonomy of RCUH as a non-profit organization, which has an agreement with UH to manage contracts and grants on behalf of the University. The relationship between UH and RCUH has been a matter of on-going discussion for many years and it appears that will continue into the foreseeable future.

The survey asked faculty their opinion about several of these issues. The first was moving RCUH administrative and fiscal functions and personnel at RCUH to UH. Thirty-nine (30 percent) agreed with this idea whereas fifty-six respondents (43 percent) disagreed. Almost 27 percent had no opinion. Almost three times as many strongly disagreed as strongly agreed with moving administrative and fiscal functions and personnel from RCUH to UH.

Members of the Task Force discussed the option of having RCUH handle all contracts and grants administration. Sixty of 131 (45.8 percent) survey respondents agreed with this proposal whereas 32 disagreed (24.4 percent). Sixteen strongly disagreed and 39 had no opinion. There were more people with no opinion about moving the contracts and grants review function from UH to RCUH and those in favor only slightly outnumbered those that opposed that suggestion.

Members of the Task Force also discussed linking RCUH more closely to the UH Administration. One suggestion was to have the RCUH Director report to the Vice President for Research at the University of Hawaii. (This would probably require a change in State law and may not be politically feasible.) About half of survey respondents' opinions on this question were in favor of this suggestion whereas 40 (of 131) disagreed. This is not something that could be done by the RCUH Board or the University administration acting alone.

### **Employment of Staff Supported by Contracts and Grants**

The Task Force spent a considerable amount of time discussing RCUH employment. The three issues that were of most concern to the Task Force were: (a) UH salaries and benefits (particularly retirement) were much less attractive than those at RCUH, making it difficult to attract and retain excellent research and training staff; (b) the UH personnel system lacks the level of flexibility needed for research and training; and (c) the fairness of having UH employees with less attractive employment conditions working side-by-side with RCUH employees with more attractive employment conditions.

The Task Force Chair and the Director of the UH Office of Human Resources worked with the Hawaii Government Employees Association on an agreement to

establish a new class of Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) employees at UH that would have terms of employment similar to those provided by RCUH. Under this proposed agreement, salaries could be higher than those currently paid to UH APTs, and these employees would not have the same level of employment stability as is current practice.

In October 2002, the UH Board of Regents promulgated a new policy restricting employment at RCUH on US contracts and grants to one year. The UH Association of Research Investigators has voiced strong opposition to this policy and there is currently a committee meeting to assess the policy options.

Two questions were included in the survey on the RCUH employment issue. The first asked about a proposal to revise the BOR policy on limiting employment to one year. Over 86 percent of survey respondents were in favor or revising the BOR policy to allow multi-year appointments at RCUH. Only 4 respondents disagreed.

The second question asked whether the Memorandum of Agreement to provide more RCUH-like employment conditions at UH should be finalized and implemented. Seventy-six of the 129 people responding to this question were in favor and only six were opposed. Forty-seven had no opinion.

**Table 2d**

<b>Employment of Staff Supported by Contracts and Grants</b>					
➤	Revise the BOR policy that restricts RCUH positions on UH projects to one year to allow for multi-year appointments at RCUH				
	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>71</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
	54.2%	32.1%	10.7%	2.3%	<1%
➤	Finalize and implement MOA with Bargaining Unit 08 of HGEA which would provide employment conditions at UH like those at RCUH.				
	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>No opinion</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
	<b>47</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>
	36.4%	22.5%	36.4%	<1%	3.9%

## Part III

### Who Responded to the Survey

This survey was never intended to provide insights about the characteristics of investigators responding one way or the other to survey questions. However, the UHARI Executive Committee wanted to get some sense of who responded to the survey. Therefore, some *demographic* questions were included as Part III.

Of those who responded, 116 were active PIs on projects and 14 were not. A total of 119 said they usually get their funding through grants, 66 through contracts and 13 from gifts. The sources of funding varied: 121 from federal agencies, 51 from Hawaii State agencies, 11 from county agencies, 42 from private foundations, 6 from other state or territorial governments, 10 from international agencies, 8 from foreign governments, and 11 from other sources. The average number of active projects per investigator was 3.2 and the mean annual value of contracts and grants reported received over the past three years was a little over \$1.1 million per investigator. The average number of years at UH was a little less than 15 years. So, it appears that we got many responses back from fairly senior faculty with multiple awards many of whom bring in relatively large contracts and grants.

In terms of where respondents are located within the UH system, the distribution of those who responded to the question is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Home Units of Survey Respondents**

<b>School/College/Research Unit</b>	<b>Responses</b>
<b>Arts &amp; Sciences</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>College of Business</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CDS/College of Education</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Cancer Research Center of Hawaii</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>College of Natural Science</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>College of Social Sciences</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Languages Linguistics and Literature</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>JAB School of Medicine</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Pacific Biomedical Research Center</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Travel Industry Management</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UH-Hilo</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>WCCHE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Water Resources Research Center</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>US Geological Survey</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>133</b>

How these numbers stack up against all faculty and staff that engage in sponsored activities is difficult to say because statistics on the number of unique investigators appears to be unavailable. Last year, the Office of Research Services reports that 976 new research awards were received by UH and 670 non-research awards. Without

going through the annual report and counting the number of faculty who are PIs (many with multiple awards), it is not possible to determine how representative respondents to the survey are. Some units seem to be under-represented in this survey relative to the number of contract and grant awards they received last year.

## **Comments and Other Concerns**

Several pages of comments and suggestions were made in response to open ended questions. Some of those deal with issues addressed in the questions discussed above while others do not. These are not summarized here but are attached to this report.

## **Conclusions**

There are clearly serious concerns that remain about the research and training infrastructure at the University of Hawaii, and many of the problems addressed by the Task Force are still unresolved. And, as some of the attached comments show, there is considerable frustration among faculty about the current situation; some faculty have given up hope that anything will ever get changed.

There is clearly disagreement about some of the specific solutions suggested by the Task Force. However, there are clearly some things that faculty agree on. We need an electronic research (and training) administration system and approvals need to be delegated to the College or School and Principal Investigator and Fiscal Officer levels. About half of those surveyed thought UH or RCUH should rent space for research and training.

Most people agree that we should have one organization managing contracts and grants, but there is disagreement about whether that should be UH or RCUH. More of those responding to the survey believe that RCUH should continue handling the administrative, fiscal, and personnel functions it handles now and most respondents oppose moving RCUH functions back into UH.

Most people agree that the current UH personnel system cannot accommodate the needs of the research and training enterprise at UH. Most of those surveyed feel that the Board of Regents restriction on RCUH employment should be changed to allow multi-year appoints and that UH should work with the Hawaii Government Employees Association to develop a class of UH employees with more RCUH-like employment conditions.

Some of these issues are currently being discussed by the UH Business Process Council, the RCUH Strategic Planning Committee, as well as the UH System committee established to look at the BOR policy on restricting RCUH employment to one year. Hopefully, the results of this UHARI survey will be inform and guide those groups and the UH and RCUH leadership.

## Attached List 1

### Other issues that need to be addressed:

- Reduce number of levels of approval required for grants and contracts.
- Create separate, simpler.
- Implementation of the Task force recommendations!
- The chancellor makes arbitrary decisions without any knowledge base to support them.
- Research initiatives are driven by political forces not research logic – this will be a disaster in the long run as will start unsustainable initiatives that eliminate funding for credible projects.
- UH refuse to maintain the Bellows air supply facility that it legally is responsible for – How can this arbitrary withdrawal be allowed to stand?
- This questionnaire fails to hit the mark.
- I am a PI (100% funded by my own grants), have been for 6 years, and haven't seen a penny of indirect revenues (admittedly very low rate, or I'd have protested sooner). My dean says he doesn't know of any formula for distribution that affects me. Are others in this situation?
- Too much paperwork that could be online (inventory, timesheets, disposal etc.)
- Reduce paperwork on purchasing and bids etc. Let PI assume responsibility for getting what they felt they need or want.
- Part of RTRF should be returned to PI's.
- The more effective we are at bringing in grants and contracts while research support continues to dwindle, the lower the indirect cost rate will go. In this sense we are our own worst enemies! However, if we reduce productivity we shoot ourselves in the other foot.
- Although many individuals in the fiscal and research administration will do all they can to help us, the overt regulatory climate is that researchers are bandits who need to be regulated to extinction. This "expectation of corruption" is clearly justified at many levels of the state government-just not here!
- Virtually non-existent administrative/clerical support for the preparation of grant proposals.
- Policy of requiring grant personnel to handle clerical tasks such as preparation of purchase orders that ought to be handled by centralized, knowledgeable university of college staff.
- Excessively strict fiscal oversight (e.g., requiring explicit clearance from funding agencies for minor deviations from original budget that are well within the PI's discretion from the agency's perspective) – fiscal officers criteria need to be better aligned with those of the funding agencies.
- RCUH policies are too generous with vacation and sick time. In my experience, research staff take this time because they are entitled, and it substantially reduces their productivity.
- Fraud by PI's.
- Staff training – learn or leave.
- Electronic research administration now!
- Lack of proper power and air-conditioning power for research.
- Lack of flexible entry control system. Long overdue for card keys or other system that allows for audit trails for access control.
- Campus security needs help to provide better physical security.

- We lose out of a decent amount of federal grant money because of our lack of policy on classified research on campus. While there are valid objections, there is a lot of bad information being passed around about peer review publications in the classified arena.
- The wording of items about is needlessly inflammatory and does not recognize the good and helpful attitudes and actions of many individual in the “bureaucracy” – admittedly, they struggle! But I don’t like to sign onto such a hostile-sounding agenda. I think it undercuts our credibility.
- We need a state-of-the-art computer (not paper) based accounting system.
- University facilities (i.e., physical plant) egregiously slow; “can’t do” attitude prevails. Extreme delays in preparing laboratory space hurts careers of new faculty and will play a (negative) role in faculty retention at UH
- Just say no attitude.
- A university facility equipped with the most advanced equipment in life science, nanotechnology, advanced materials and environmental science to support faculty’s research. Such a center is maintained and upgraded by G-fund, extramural fund and a moderate user fee. These advanced facilities are too expensive for individual or small groups to purchase and operate, yet are crucial to do edge-cutting research.
- Bachman Hall continues to ignore faculty.
- Bachman seems bent on destroying successful researchers that do more for the university than any other group. (Reputation and funding)
- Researchers at UH-Hilo are constantly ignored not to mention Manoa continually trying to cut UHH out of funding opportunities. Fewer system resources allocated to UHH. SOEST is particularly bad about this.
- In our case, we do not have administrative support from our College for extramural funded-projects meaning we don’t have any way to handle fiscal matters unless the funder allow us to include admin costs, which many don’t.
- Gender bias for women researchers.
- The # of memos that must be generated to accomplish anything!
- It takes staff or investigator time to jump through all the hoops – However I don’t get RTRF to pay for staff.
- Most important internal lack of support for timelines and resulting problems with travel completions, purchasing, and hiring.
- Facilities infrastructure support provided by UH is miserable, particularly support for specialized instrumentation and wet chemical labs. We can’t count on reliable cool air, power DI water, etc.. or time repair when systems are down.
- UH Manoa focus is not on the needs of Faculty in general, but Research Faculty even less. We can’t even be assured day care for our pre-school children because of limited space in the pre-school and a policy that the children of students have entrance priority over the children of Faculty. Dozens of faculty are turned away each semester. It is pathetic.
- This questionnaire is written from a UHM perspective. It does not consider that UHH research does not use ORS except for billing and assignment of account #'s
- Faculty participation is declining.
- Remove \$36,000 minimum for Fellowship. Let market price dictate, not solving somebody’s social ill. Or let department decide the minimum, not a certain member for all departments.

## Other Recommendations:

- Get ORS completely out of UHH research management; let RCUH assign account numbers and bill.
- UH administration must use RTF to support research, not as a general slush fund. Also, the amount to be returned units should be agreed upon at the time of proposal submission.
- RCUH is clearly much more efficient than ORS, but they are at their limits in what they can handle unless internal staffing and skill issues are addressed. The RCUH HR is almost paralyzed and we cannot hire personnel or do contracts in a timely manner to execute extramural projects. We nearly lost a large project earlier this year because it took 6 months for RCUH to move through the hiring procedure for a part-time research assistant. Need to increase staffing at RCUH so that sufficient coverage is provided (i.e. when one person goes on vacation, everything should not come to a halt). Pay RCUH staff decent salaries so they can attract and keep decent personnel that are capable of thinking, not just robotic paper shuffling.
- I disagree with the recommendation regarding space because Manoa already has much more space, facilities and support than UHH. This entire questionnaire is heavily skewed towards Manoa issues, not systems concerns. If you think space, equipment and support is a problem at Manoa, try doing research at UHH. More sharing would be nice too. I've approached several Manoa researchers about sharing of equipment that we can't afford at UHH and they have generally been less than helpful.
- Build one research administration system under one person (VP or VC) to provide high efficient service to research from pre-award to technology transfer.
- The bottom line is that we need to have a system that is pro-PI or PI-friendly.
- I've had an RCUH employee working on my UH project for 9 years. I don't understand the second question above.
- Junior faculty appointments as RCUH positions.
- Completely restructure the UH pension plan options.
- We need to make the administration more responsive to the needs of all faculty-not just researchers. One way to achieve this would be to set up a faculty lead review system (like COPR) of administration units- I am sure there would be lots of volunteers!
- Dispense with the civil service system entirely.
- Have many RCUH employees become a part of a "UH management project"- remain paid by RCUH but work under UH auspices, allowing flexibility of RCUH but more UH control. Salaries paid by RTRF, but RCUH would then lower management fee since employees paid through UH monies.
- RCUH owes its existence to the inappropriateness of state personnel and purchasing regulations for a research-intensive university. I didn't know how to answer the section 2 questions. If we can escape from state regulations we don't need RCUH and can do better by scrapping it. But, if we are forced to live within the present system of inappropriate rules, then RCUH is the only way to save our sanity! Nevertheless, RCUH remains an expensive albatross and we pay for double administration without this increasing our ICR...
- Give PI's more latitude to specify conditions of employment that meet the needs of their project.

- A larger portion of overhead needs to be allocated for things that directly support the research effort, such as staff to perform administrative tasks now passed on to individual projects.
- Streamline grant administration, for instance reduce number of layers of administrative processing needed to submit a proposal or to carry out important tasks such as hiring within a funded project. And/or, create a single point of interface between the PI and the administration rather than requiring the PI to deal with RCUH, a UH fiscal officer, college administration, ORS, etc.
- Please don't forget that APT's can and have been PI's in the past. Stating only faculty in documents like this tends to disenfranchise those APT's that also do research.
- I would love to see a "welcome aboard" document for new PI's. Too much was left to word of mouth about learning procedures.
- Would love to see someone do a regular mixer for PI's/UHARI types to encourage multidisciplinary interaction for grants and projects.
- Don't understand the question of multiple years of employment at RCUH. We have employees at the Cancer Research Center who have been employed by RCUH for more than 20 years. Maybe you mean a certain level of employee?
- If we begin giving Bargaining Unit 08 the same benefits as at RCUH, maybe the faculty could be next? RCUH confers a significant benefit, especially regarding vesting.
- **Comment:** RCUH used to be less bureaucratic, but is now as bad as UH. Due to excessive bureaucracy, research environment is discouraging research rather than encouraging it.
- Whatever changes are made, dual system MUST be abolished.