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Pie chart showing the distribution of ranks/titles among survey respondents.
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# 2015 CPI Survey Respondents by Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th># of PIs reported in 2015 census</th>
<th>Survey responses</th>
<th>Response rate%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Human Development</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Engineering Experiment Station</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Biosciences and Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M AgriLife Extension</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M AgriLife Research</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Transportation Institute</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University at Galveston</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University at Qatar</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 CPI Survey Respondents by Unit
**Section 1: Funding**

Q1: Are appropriate methods for identifying appropriate funding sources easily available?  
- Y

Q8: Is there sufficient seed funding available to fund novel concepts or ideas?  
- N

Q9: Is the process for obtaining seed funding transparent?  
- N

Q19: Are sufficient “bridge funds” available to assist Pis to bridge gaps in funding between funded proposals?  
- N

Q20: Is the process for obtaining “bridge” funding transparent?  
- N
Q9: Is the process for obtaining seed funding transparent?

- Top-down system
- Highly bureaucratic
- Decline in transparency in recent years/increased bias
- Increase awareness of opportunities
- Provide more feedback, reviews, communication with PIs
- Increase awards based on merit/less bias
Section 1: Team building, core facilities

Q6: Have you found it straightforward to identify/use appropriate core facilities/services on campus?  
Y

Q7: Are appropriate core facilities available on campus for your work?  
Y

Q4: Are appropriate opportunities for team building/networking to enhance your research program available to you?  
N

Q5: Is assistance in establishing/maintaining productive collaborations within and across colleges or disciplines available to you?  
N

Q16: Are you aware of mechanisms to facilitate interaction between your research program and international collaborators/partners or programs?  
N
Section 1: Proposal prep and pre-award

Q10: Do you receive sufficient and competent administrative support for proposal preparation?

Q14: Sufficient help in preparing multi-investigator proposals?

Q15: Sufficient help in preparing multi-institutional proposals?

Q12: Sufficient support for pre-award budget or subcontracts?

Q19: Promptness/knowledge/consistency of pre-award grant staff sufficient for a smooth process?

Q17: Sufficient assistance with administrative burden for grant submission and award management?

Q21: Have you had a proposal rejected by the sponsor due to an administrative error?
Section 2: Contracts

Q22. Are the general mechanisms for you to engage with industry sufficient?
Q28. Are the resources available to connect with industry partners looking for specific expertise sufficient?
Q23. Sufficient support for non-disclosure agreements?
Q26. Administrative oversight of processing of contracts clear and efficient?
Q24. Timely negotiation/implementation of contracts?
Q25. Timely approval of non-disclosure and IP agreements?
Q27. Reasonable interpretation and implementation of regulatory and reporting requirements?
Section 3: Managing Grants and Contracts

Interim Funding

Q30. Are you aware that interim funding may be available to you after an award has been made but while you are waiting for accounts to be established?

Q31. Is the process for accessing interim funding, while waiting for account set up, transparent to you?
Section 3: Managing Grants and Contracts

Cost Sharing

Q13. Are the mechanisms for obtaining matching funds, or cost sharing obvious?

Q32. Is information for understanding cost sharing easily available to you?

Q33. Is the process for establishing cost sharing clearly outlined and transparent to you?

Q34. Has cost sharing been properly established for you? If no, please explain.
Section 3: Managing Grants and Contracts

Account Management

Q35. Are your grants/contracts consistently handled by the same individual (or by a small consistent group)? If not, please explain.

Q29. Are your new accounts for grant and contract funding set up in a timely way?

Q37. Are your account balances kept up to date?

Q38. Is accurate and timely information provided through the online system Maestro?

Q47. Is the process for closeout of grants and contracts reasonable?

Q36. Are issues related to post-award administration of your grants and contracts handled in a competent and timely way?

Q48. Are the invoicing and collection of contracted funds from industrial partners effective?

Q49. Have you performed contract work for which funds were never collected from the contracting partner? If so, please briefly describe this situation?

Q39. Have you had funds returned to the sponsor for any reason? If so, why?
Section 3: Managing Grants and Contracts

Administrative Burden

Q40. Is the general administrative burden with regard to required training appropriate? If no, please explain.

Q41. Is the general administrative burden with regard to research compliance appropriate? If no, please explain.

Q46. Is the process for grant-related travel and travel reimbursement reasonable?
Section 3: Managing Grants and Contracts

Working With Collaborators

Q45. Is the process of set-up and management of sub-awards or sub-contracts with other institutions straightforward?

- Y = Yes
- N = No
- NA = Not Applicable
Section 4: Workforce: Personnel and Trainees

50. Do you feel that TAMU-based professional development programs for faculty are sufficient? (i.e. professional development leave, cross-disciplinary training opportunities, training to improve laboratory management etc).

- YES: 38%
- NO: 41%
- N/A: 20%

Responses n = 547

Common Comments:
- Lack of TAMU professional development opportunities
- FDL too short & infrequent
- More support needed for junior faculty
Section 4: Workforce: Personnel and Trainees

52. In your view, are sufficient funds available for professional development of faculty?

Common Comments:
- What funds??????
- Limited, if any, funds available.
- No discussion of this topic in departments or colleges.
- Paucity of travel funds for conferences and workshops
- FDL severely underfunded

Responses $n = 545$
Section 4: Workforce: Personnel and Trainees

55. Are resources for professional development of post-doctoral fellows available?

- **YES**: 20%
- **NO**: 41%
- **N/A**: 37%

**Common Comments:**
- Increase funds for postdocs
- Develop TAMU Postdoc Association & Postdoc Office
- Increase visibility of postdocs
- Greater efforts needed to attract new postdocs

Responses $n = 538$
56. Are there adequate financial support mechanisms for graduate students?

Responses $n = 532$

Common Comments:
- Tuition and fees are excessive
- Insufficient GAT/GAR/GANT lines
- Stipends not competitive
- Lack of fellowships for International Students
- More evaluation of funding needs to ensure appropriate and fair funding.
- Lack of support for MS students
58. Are the **graduate students** available highly qualified? How might we attract better students?

- **YES**: 49%
- **NO**: 40%
- **N/A**: 11%

**Common Comments:**
- More competitive funding
- Enhance recruiting efforts
- Increase entrance standards
- Heighten branding of TAMU as institute of academic excellence
- Increase efforts to recruit under represented students

Responses $n = 539$
Section 5. : Compliance

Q61: Do you find the IRIS system user friendly?

- Yes
- No
- N/A
2015 CPI Survey: Compliance Ratings

Animal Care and Use

1 - Turn around (1st)
2 - Turn around (amend)
3 – Timely interact’n
4 – Customer Service
5 – Knowledge level
6 – Clarity of revisions
7 – Billing Accuracy
8 – Staff Competence
9 – Animal ordering
10 – Responsiveness
11 – Facilities
12 – Interactions between offices
13 – Availability
Institutional Biosafety

2015 CPI Survey: Compliance Ratings

1 – Knowledge of officers
2 – Time interaction w/staff
3 – Turnaround (1st)
4 – Turnaround (amendments)
5 – Customer service
6 – Staff knowledge
7 – Turnaround (protocols)
8 – Clarity of revisions
9 – Inspection process
10 – Prof’l handling incidents

Chart showing compliance ratings for Institutional Biosafety with categories 1 to 10 and corresponding descriptions.
2015 CPI Survey: Compliance Ratings

Human Subjects Research

1 – Turnaround (1st)
2 – Turnaround (amend)
3 – Timely interactions
4 – Customer service (staff)
5 – Knowledge (staff)
6 – Clarity of revision
7 – Turnaround (proto)
8 – Timely negotiation
Q83: How would you describe the overall faculty morale on campus?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

45%
Perception of Campus Morale by Unit (% response)
Comments if low morale rating

• Administrative leadership, top down attitude, treatment of faculty
• Extramural funding rates
• Salary / appointment and annual leave changes
• Facilities, compliance, grants admin
Improvements that could be made

- Better leadership, less top down, more faculty involvement in decision-making
- Better recognition of value of all faculty activities that have positive impact for TAMU
- More pilot funding, other funding resources
- Staff support, and grad/teaching support
- Facilities improvements
Services/programs we lack that would make your research program more productive

- Support and staff for grant proposal preparation
- Better shared research resources / instrumentation / repairs / technical staff
- Compliance / pre- and post-award support, accounting support
- Grad program support
Areas where the CPI could be pro-active to improve the research environment at TAMU

• All aspects of proposal preparation support, submission, pre-award & post-award services
• Reduce regulatory and compliance burdens
• Shared research resources and research staff support, and physical infrastructure
• Incentivize faculty research success, respect for faculty input, reduce top down decision making
• Grad student support