Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRISS)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Spring 2017 Data Collection and Planning

Dr. Jeni Cross, Department of Sociology
Dr. Kyle Saunders, Department of Political Science
Dr. Ellyn Dickmann, Institute for the Built Environment

Overview

Over the past two decades, several social science researchers on campus have been discussing or proposing the creation of a social science center. At our peer and aspirational peer institutions, there are over 60 social science and survey research centers. Most of those have been in existence for 15-30 years, with a handful that have been in existence for much longer. These centers provide essential social science expertise to universities, businesses, government organizations, and community clients. Based on the previously expressed interest and needs here at CSU, we conducted focus groups, individual interviews (including other center directors), and an online survey which drew responses from over 200 faculty members across all colleges at CSU. Participants have expressed strong interest and need for a social science core. In addition, we have conducted 11 interviews with the directors/staff of centers at other universities and several with community stakeholders.

Key Findings

From the feedback we have gathered this past semester from across campus, three primary needs have been identified. First, social science and humanities faculty have described what can only be called "an extensive deficiency" in infrastructure, resources, and services required for the execution of social science research. Junior faculty, especially, described being surprised that CSU does not provide them with the essential tools and services required for their research and which they were accustomed to using in their graduate program (e.g., software licenses, survey centers, data storage, and grant support). Researchers from diverse fields described diverting research funding from CSU to other institutions to pay for the services (survey software and administration, evaluation plans, post-award support, and sophisticated data analysis) that are not available at CSU. Second, we heard from faculty across the university that they find it very challenging to find on-point research partners from other fields. Researchers from engineering, business, natural sciences, and physical sciences reported that they have projects and grants which would be improved by the addition of a social scientist and they struggle to find well-matched collaborators. Third, we identified a variety of opportunities and needs for social science research services in the community, such as the need for research design consultation, quantitative and qualitative data collection expertise, evaluation research services, and varied data analysis and visualization expertise (see Table below).

Priorities for Social Science Core Facility

Priority #1: Enhancing Social Science Research Capacity
• Software needs assessment (understanding gaps for social scientists)
• Coordination of licenses or VPN to expand access to software
• Working with IT/ACNS/Library to expand storage availability (big data, multi-media of all types, GIS)
• Functional file sharing (#1 current solution on campus is Dropbox, O365 is NOT meeting needs)
• Develop research participant pools (e.g., Psych 100, Qualtrics subject pool)

Priority #2: Improving Grant Competitiveness University Wide
• Increasing ability to find cross-disciplinary collaborators
• Networking events to facilitate matchmaking and collaboration
• Compiling an interactive database of campus faculty expertise
• Website list of campus "consultants" and referral/request for assistance mechanism
• Improving administrative assistance
• Grant writing assistance (seeking, review, writing of specific sections)
• Post-award support (primarily a CLA request)
• Increasing available research technical assistance
• Survey support (personnel, universal Qualtrics license)
• Sampling, research design, data analysis (beyond stats lab expertise, multi-method)
• Evaluation research design and plans (currently outsourced to other institutions)
• Enhancing research capacity
• Short course research methods training for faculty and advanced students
• Developing a pool of trained research assistants who can be deployed quickly
• Data storage and management assistance
• Data management plan templates, for specific fields
• Access to necessary storage
Priority #3: Investment in Social Science Research Facilities
• Survey Lab (dedicated space, phone bank, software, full-time coordinator)
• Experimental and simulation lab (e.g., College of Business has currently)
• Computer stations, break-out room, waiting room, control room
• Meeting space
• Focus group facilitation
• Collaboration spaces
• Interview rooms
Priority #4: Developing a Business Plan
• Identify needs for base funding to support campus needs
• Coordinate with University Advancement
• Consult with leaders of existing centers to develop detailed business plan
• Fee for services on campus
• Fee for services structure for external clients
• Competition for large grants and contracts (local, state, federal agencies and programs)

Recommendations & Summary

The interviews with other center directors focused our attention on what the primary purpose of the center would be. They highlighted the difference between centers that receive base funding support from the university and thus have the ability to address campus/faculty needs and enhance research capacity within the university. In contrast, those centers which are solely self-funded focus on generating revenue at the cost of their focus of serving the university community. These insights, combined with the expressed needs from the CSU community, point towards the need for a center at CSU that enhances research capacity in the social sciences, improves grant competitiveness across campus by providing new services, invests in new social science facilities and builds a business plan suited those three identified campus needs. Such a center will likely be a revenue generator, but it cannot be entirely self-supporting and also focus on enhancing university capacity.

Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRISS)
FINAL REPORT
Spring 2017 Data Collection and Planning

Dr. Jeni Cross, Department of Sociology
Dr. Kyle Saunders, Department of Political Science
Dr. Ellyn Dickmann, Institute for the Built Environment

Overview

Over the past two decades, several social science researchers on campus have been discussing or proposing the creation of a social science center. At our peer and aspirational peer institutions, there are over 60 social science and survey research centers. Most of those have been in existence for 15-30 years, with a handful that have been in existence for much longer. These centers provide essential social science expertise to universities, businesses, government organizations, and community clients. Based on the previously expressed interest and needs here at CSU, we conducted focus groups, individual interviews (including other CSU center directors), and an online survey which drew responses from over 200 faculty members across all colleges at CSU. An overwhelming majority of respondents expressed strong interest and need for a social science core. In addition, we conducted 11 interviews with the directors/staff of centers at other universities and several with community stakeholders.

Funding and Activities

Funding for the activities summarized in this report was received in January 2017 from the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) for the 2017 Spring Semester. The purpose of this research was to identify and formalize interested stakeholders both within the CLA, across the university, and in the greater community with the goal of developing a formal plan that would:

1. Identify the goals of a Social Science Research and Data Center (now named the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences—IRISS);
2. Develop a plan to achieve those goals; and
3. Develop a concrete and actionable business and funding plan moving forward.

Activities included:
1. Hosted focus groups (4 groups, 32 participants)
2. Interviewed potential stakeholders (21 interviews)
3. Developed and conducted a survey (over 200 respondents resulting in 184 valid responses)
4. Interviewed university research center directors and staff from across the nation (11 interviews)
5. Analyzed extant documents from CSU (i.e., Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness college research comparison reports)
6. Submitted a proposal for the CSU Emerging Innovations Core Facility (awarded $150K/2017-2019)

This summary document provides key findings from each of the project's activities with a focus on needs and advice to inform future planning and implementation.

FINDINGS

Stakeholder Interviews

We interviewed center directors and experienced PIs from the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Health and Human Sciences, Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences. In addition, we also interviewed a group of 12 CSU Extension Agents working on community development across the state. These interviews across the university revealed broad interest and needs related to the center.

Key Finding #1. The primary needs identified by these stakeholders included:

- *Support for the many aspects of social science research (research design and implementation, data collection, data analysis, etc.) related to engaging with communities*
- *Space for social science research (rooms to conduct focus groups, computer labs for instruction and experimentation, access to a survey lab, etc.)*
- *Software support, access, and training*
- *Data storage access and support*
- *Training for students and faculty*
- *Matchmaking/connective mechanisms as it is hard to find the right collaborators across departments and colleges*

Focus Groups

We hosted four focus groups, two for the CLA faculty and two for faculty and staff from all colleges and campus administrative units. In total, 32 individuals attended the focus groups (See Table 1). Many attendees were assistant professors. There were several individuals from both the CLA and across campus who were interested in attending a focus group but were unable due to scheduling conflicts. These individuals were encouraged to complete the online survey or set up a time to meet in person or talk via phone to share their needs, interests, and/or concerns. In addition to the focus group participants and survey responses, we received over a dozen emails and or held phone conversations with any faculty, staff, or students who reached out to discuss their thoughts and needs.

Table 1. Focus Group Attendees

Focus Groups 1 & 2	Focus Groups 3 & 4
Attendees: College of Liberal Arts Faculty	Attendees: Open to Campus**
~15*	~ 17*
History, Journalism, Communications, English, Sociology, History, Linguistics, and Languages and Literature and Cultures	Ethnic Studies, Engineering, English, Psychology, Design and Merchandising, Occupational Therapy, BioAg Science and Pesticides, Business Management, and Construction Management

Several individuals attended for limited time to observe but did not sign-in.
**Faculty and Staff, including directors of 92 center and institutes on campus were invited. Note: students were not invited to participate.*

Focus groups questions centered around seven topics: needs, priorities, existing collaborations, possible services for the community, advice/comments, other ideas, and perceived barriers. A list of the needs and priorities is presented in Table 2.

*Key Finding #2. Faculty in the CLA and across campus had very similar needs. The expressed needs include: 1) **administrative support** services such as grant writing and accounting support, 2) need for **new facilities** like a survey lab, a computer/experimental lab like what was created in the College of Business, 3) **research***

expertise from training to consulting to a trained staff of available research assistants, 4) **technological support** from data storage to universal software licenses, and 5) **research support services** from access to subject pool to survey administration support to a pool of trained transcribers.

Table 2. Focus Group Needs and Priorities

Needs	College of Liberal Arts	All Campus
Shared access to software	X	X
Access subject pool	X	X
Physical lab space/for visibility	X	X
Collaboration opportunities between social sciences	X	
Statistic/methodological support	X	X
Data sharing capabilities for large data files	X	X
A survey center that deploys state-wide surveys	X	
A pool of transcribers	X	X
Grant writing support or training/workshops for grant writing	X	X
A unified "face" that emphasizes collaboration between colleges and external bodies	X	
Data set and "web scraping" support	X	
Incentives for participation	X	
Access to research assistants within a center	X	
To become the node of research and training opportunity	X	
Have someone responding to phone calls and email directing research opportunities to the appropriate people	X	
Connection to community/non-profits/businesses/other colleges		X
More server space		X
Data parsing support services		X
Survey distribution support within the center		X
Provide support for working with IRB (currently IRB staff is overburdened)		X
Support regarding data collection and data management ethics		X
Priorities	**College of Liberal Arts**	**All Campus**
Grant writing support	X	X
Universal software licenses/remote desktop	X	X
Data sharing capacity	X	X
Social networking site to find expertise and help with questions	X	X
Physical location for collaboration	X	X
Data management, analysis, training, and support	X	X
Access to research assistants, trained in specific skills on short notice	X	X
Accounting services	X	
Website and conferences for face and legitimacy	X	

University Research Center Interviews/Website Reviews

We interviewed directors and/or staff from 11 university research centers (See Table 3). Five additional university center staff were contacted and we were directed to review their website. In addition, team

members reviewed the Social Science Research Council's (a non-profit, focused on international research, operating out of Brooklyn, New York) website. During face-to-face and phone interviews questions were focused on the following seven areas: center history, structure/oversight, funding structure and rationale, successes, trends and obstacles, metrics, and advice. All interviewees were supportive of CSU's exploration and development of center and provided detailed advice (See Table 4). Most interviewees encourage CSU to join the following professional organizations that are focused on social science research:

American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)
> https://www.aapor.org

Association of Academic Survey Research Organizations (AASRO)
> https://www.aasro.org
> > Note: Mileah Kromer, Director of the Sarah T. Hughes Field Politics Center at Goucher College, provided the team with materials regarding members and the advantages of membership.

Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA)
> http://www.cossa.org
> AAPOR is a member of COSSA

Table 3. University Contacts/Website Reviews

University	Center Name	Contacts	Website
University of North Carolina	The Howard W. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science	Tom Carsey, Director	http://odum.unc.edu
University of Northern Colorado	Social Research Lab	Josh Packard, Executive Director	http://www.unco.edu/social-research-lab/
California State University, Fullerton	Social Science Research Center	Laura Gil-Trejo, Director	http://hss.fullerton.edu/ssrc/
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Survey Center	John Stevenson, Associate Director	https://uwsc.wisc.edu/index.htm
University of Florida	Florida Survey Research Center	Michael J. Scicchitano, Director and Tracy L. Johns, Research Director	http://flsurveyresearch.centers.ufl.edu
Washington State University	Social and Economic Sciences Research Center	Don Dillman, Deputy Director for Research and Development and Lena Le, Director	https://sesrc.wsu.edu
University of Wyoming	Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center	Stephen Bieber, Executive Director	https://wysac.uwyo.edu/wysac/
Penn State	Social Science Research Institute	Susan McHale, Director	http://www.ssri.psu.edu
University of Denver	Unnamed	Unnamed	In process of forming Social Science Research Center, contacted staff member on formation team
University of Colorado, Boulder	American Politics Research Lab	Scott Adler, Director and Anand Sokhey, Faculty	http://www.colorado.edu/lab/aprl/
Goucher, Maryland	Sarah T. Hughes Field Politics Center	Mileah Kromer, Director	http://www.goucher.edu/hughes-center/

University of Minnesota	Liberal Arts Technologies and Innovation Services and Grants	Reviewed website and available documents	http://latis.umn.edu
University of Washington	Center for Computational Science	Reviewed website and available documents	http://julius.csscr.washington.edu
University of Michigan	Survey Research Center	Reviewed website and available documents	http://www.src.isr.umich.edu
Social Science Research Council, Brooklyn, New York	Social Science Research Council, Non-Profit	Reviewed website and available documents	https://www.ssrc.org
Notre Dame	Center for Social Research	Reviewed website and documents	http://csr.nd.edu/about-us/

Table 4. Summary of University Interviews—Advice

Structure and Focus
Need to have flexibility to respond in changes in funding streams and university changes
Determine priority of service to the community vs. the campus
Be aware of and prevent mission shifts/drift
Ensure that the focus of the center is determined (revenue generation—external vs. internal)
Ensure establishment of agreed upon reporting lines, metrics, evaluation
Consider for visibility purposes a steering committee
Ensure positive relationship and support from university business and financial operations
Establish good leadership for the center (do not allow shared- or part-time faculty to be directors, needs to be a full-time position)
Establishing overhead structure(s)
Be aware of consequences for taking business away from other universities
Funding
Ensure that the OVPR funds are provided to ensure credibility
Be cautious about housing the center in a college (impact to funding)
Encourage interdisciplinary teams (more funding is available for this type of team and as a result campus will have greater impact)
Ensure that funding structure is determined in terms of university expectations (internal vs. external project focus)
Establish a focused marketing plan (outreach and communication)
Establish positive relationship with advancement and alumni relations
Operational
Hiring center staff is critical as projects often begin shortly after award is made, therefore it is important to establish a working relationship and protocol with human resources
Ensure access to legal counsel for quick turnaround time on contracts and other legal documents
Establish support from sponsored programs
Get involved with professional organizations
Facility
Ensure that physical facility is appropriate for functions, has flexibility, and parking (depending on primary customers)

Key Finding #3. *The directors of centers across the country were consistently enthusiastic about the efforts at CSU to develop a social science research center. The central insight from these institutions was regarding the business models of these centers. There are two primary business models for such centers:*

1. ***An entirely self-supporting research center.*** *These centers are competing with other large research institutes for funding, like RTI International and PIRE. Since they are competing for large research contracts, they cannot dedicate any of their staff time and resources to providing internal services. There are only a handful of these across the country.*
2. ***A revenue generating center with some base budget support from the university.*** *These centers are able to provide services to faculty and students within the university as well as compete for outside contracts. These centers provide fee for services research for university members, community organizations, as well as seeking external grants and contracts.*

The successful centers have: a clear business model (see above), stay focused on their mission, have support from the university's central administration, have a full-time non-faculty director, and establish strong relationships with various offices across campus to support operations. Other strong advice included: situating the center outside of a department or college, establishing rules for F&A and university funding support as early as possible, and developing a strong marketing plan.

On-Line Survey

A survey was developed and sent to all faculty, staff, and to 92 campus research centers or institute directors. The survey was open from early March through the first week in June. All survey questions were purposefully optional to allow respondents flexibility in answering any or all questions. Survey questions focused on needs, priorities, prior involvement with a research center, collaboration with other departments and programs, perceived barriers and obstacles to planning a center, and advice.

There were over 200 respondents and after cleaning the data there was a total of 184 valid responses. In total, all colleges were represented. Specifically, over 100 departments, programs, and administrative units were represented in the survey (most represented by 1 respondent). The areas that were represented by more than one respondent are provided alphabetically in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Online Survey Respondents

Department, Program, Administrative Unit	
Anthropology	2
Chemistry	3
CIRA (Cooperative Institute in the Atmosphere)	2
Communication Studies	2
Design and Merchandising	3
Economics	4
Education	5
English	10
Food Science and Human Nutrition	2
Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2
Human Development and Family Studies	7
History	3
International Programs	3
Journalism and Media Communications	5
Languages, Literature and Cultures	4
Library	3

Music	2
Occupational Therapy	3
Philosophy	2
Political Science	6
Psychology	10
Social Work	6
Sociology	11
Statistics	2

Table 6. below provides a breakdown of respondent rank/position. The majority of respondents were assistant professors.

Table 6. Respondent Rank/Position*

Rank/Position	Count
Academic Staff	18
Adjunct Staff	17
Assistant Professors	55
Associate Professor	26
Professors	36
Other Title	37

*Several respondents had multiple positions

Need for SSRDC *(as termed in the survey)*

Respondents were asked: "Based on your experiences at CSU and your research/external funding agenda, do you perceive there to be a need for a SSRDC?" Responses are provided in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Respondent Responses to Need Question

Response	Count
Yes	104
No	4
Unsure	10

The most frequently mentioned needs are provided in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Most Frequently Mentioned Need

Need	Count
Interdisciplinary collaboration	63
Research support/funding	17
Recognition of the arts	9
Access to data, data bases, and support	9
Software and hardware support/access	9
Grant support	5

Competitive grant proposal assistance	4
Centralized advocacy and resources	4

Development of Collaborations and Strategic Partnerships

Respondents were asked: "Based on what is being proposed would the SSRDC allow you to develop collaborations or enhance existing collaborations?" See Table 9 below.

Table 9. Respondent Responses to Collaboration Development Question

Response	Count
Yes	61
No	4
Unsure	19

Respondents were asked: "Based on what is being proposed would the SSRDC allow you to develop strategic partnerships?" See Table 10 below.

Table 10. Respondent Responses to Development of Strategic Partnerships Question

Response	Count
Yes	49
No	5
Unsure	2

Reponses by College/Unit

All eight of CSU's colleges were represented in the survey. Table 11 provides a high-level summary of the needs provided by selected respondents from each college as well from the Administration and Extension. The responses from across campus indicate that a Social Science Core would serve faculty and researchers across the CSU campus.

Table 11. Highlights/Comments Regarding Need by College/Unit

College/Unit	Count	Need/Comments
Agricultural Science	9	· Interdisciplinary collaboration · Program assessment · Survey development
Business	63	· Interdisciplinary collaboration (more successful grant proposals) · Need more centralized resources · Important for development of CSU
Health & Human Sciences	27	· Interdisciplinary collaboration · No or poor infrastructure for social scientists · Central services and location · New professors need assistance to build skills · Further CSU's land grant mission · Articulate SSRDC with other CSU centers · Coordinate access and improve storage of data · Statistical support

		Comment: Social sciences always get the "short-end" of resources, need a centralized location for collaboration, there is a trend across campus to devalue social science research.
Liberal Arts	63	· Interdisciplinary collaboration · Centralized resources pool resources · Advocacy and elevation of social sciences (funding and recognition currently come with successful interdisciplinary grants) · Software licensing and access to hardware · Address misinformation about social science · Survey development · Provide opportunities to undergraduate and graduate students · Provide services to the community and non-profits
Natural Sciences	5	· Benefit to entire campus · Learn more about team building which could help with funding and research productivity *Comment: Would be helpful for faculty who tend to "dabble" in education research*
Walter Scott College of Engineering	4	*Comment: Yes. Social sciences linkages are coming up much more frequently within our transdisciplinary activities and teams, and having a centralized resource to enable high quality quantitative approaches to engage this work is overdue. An analog would be the support that many biological programs use from the applied statistics areas, thus social sciences should be viewed in a similar vein I believe. It should also open up more (and hopefully higher quality) opportunities for our work that claims to impact behavioral changes.* *Comment: I believe there is a need for a center like the proposed SSRDC to aid researchers like me (with little background in social sciences) on those aspects related to the domain area of research (such as electrical engineering, in my case). Federal agencies are starting to show increased interest in the societal impacts of engineering research, not just from the "broader impact" perspective but also from the inherent inter-disciplinary relationships between social sciences and the various domain areas. Absent the services such as those proposed by the SSRDC center conveners, future proposals to external agencies such as the NSF, ARPA-E may be deficient compared to the competition.* *Comment: Yes, there is definitely a need for an SSRDC in order to develop teams whose whole exceeds the sum of its parts, to identify and pursue real funding opportunities, and to offer stakeholders with a viable way to quantify the social and economic impacts of scientific research.*
Werner College of Natural Resources	13	· Fundamental to tourism · Potential to bring natural resources together with social scientists · Not helpful—I don't use human subjects · Data support · Team development · Software access · Support for graduate students

		· Survey design for non-social scientists · Data entry support *Comment: Need assistance for conservation organizations, governments, and community groups integrate social science into conservation program design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. There is a growing recognition of the need but there seems to be little in the way of methods, processes, and assistance in doing so. A growing number of agencies and NGO's are hiring social science staff, but the SSRDC could perhaps support that capacity and provide a more direct link between organizations, agencies and the researchers; great resources for students to ensure support.*
Vet Med & Biomedical Sciences	17	· Interdisciplinary collaboration · Assistance with NIH grants, to be more competitive · Needed to help sustain research platforms · Share data across university · Catalyze grant funding · Benefit entire campus and community · Need to document collaboration efforts · Would not be beneficial to campus *Comment: Benefit those who work in isolation of social scientists. This is important for a number of studies involving human subjects, as well as for population studies/community studies. The individuals in this core would be essential to facilitate opportunities not available to bench/preclinical scientists on their own.*
Administrative Units	19	· Interdisciplinary collaboration · Services related to the changes in social media changes · Mentorship and research assistance to faculty
Extension	3	*Comment: Yes, I work external to the university for much of my time. I work with industry, other educational institutions, and communities across Colorado. They have voiced the need to access better information which would provide meaningful insight into their communities. Most of these communities and organizations feel they are "flying blind" in allocating resources, launching initiatives, or developing strategic plans. They need: baseline data to know where they are; someone to do evaluation work or teach them how to determine if they are making progress on their work/grant/initiative/work plan; data points to substantiate need or progress in the pursuit of grants; assurance that their work meets a genuine not perceived need; a research partner with whom they can have an on-going relationship for longitudinal community-based research. Extension dos not have internal research, grant development or evaluation support. We rely on experienced staff and colleagues in colleges. Would appreciate having a go-to unit to work with.*

Summary of Findings

From the feedback we have gathered this past semester from across campus, three primary needs have been identified. First, social science and humanities faculty have described what can only be called "an

extensive deficiency" in infrastructure, resources, and services required for the execution of social science research. Junior faculty, especially, described being surprised that CSU does not provide them with the essential tools and services required for their research and which they were accustomed to using in their graduate program (e.g., software licenses, survey centers, data storage, and grant support). Researchers from diverse fields described diverting research funding from CSU to other institutions to pay for the services (survey software and administration, evaluation plans, post award support, and sophisticated data analysis) that are not available at CSU. Second, we heard from faculty across the university that they find it very challenging to connect with on-point research partners from other fields. Researchers from engineering, business, natural sciences, and physical sciences reported that they have projects and grants which would be improved by the addition of a social scientist and they struggle to find well-matched collaborators. Third, we identified a variety of opportunities and needs for social science research services in the community, such as the need for research design consultation, quantitative/qualitative data collection expertise, evaluation research services, and varied data analysis and visualization expertise.

Table 12 below provides a summary of priorities for the Social Science Core Facility.

Table 12. Priorities for Social Science Core Facility

Priority #1: Enhancing Social Science Research Capacity
• Software needs assessment (understanding gaps for social scientists)
• Coordination of licenses or VPN to expand access to software
• Working with IT/ACNS/Library to expand storage availability (big data, multi-media of all types, GIS)
• Functional file sharing (#1 current solution on campus is Dropbox, O365 is NOT meeting needs)
• Develop research participant pools (e.g., Psych 100, Qualtrics subject pool)
Priority #2: Improving Grant Competitiveness University Wide
• Increasing ability to find cross-disciplinary collaborators
• Networking events to facilitate matchmaking and collaboration
• Compiling an interactive database of campus faculty expertise
• Website list of campus "consultants" and referral/request for assistance mechanism
• Improving administrative assistance
• Grant writing assistance (seeking, review, writing specific sections)
• Post-award support (mostly CLA request)
• Increasing available research technical assistance
• Survey support (personnel, universal Qualtrics license)
• Sampling, research design, data analysis (beyond stats lab expertise, multi-method)
• Evaluation research design and plans (currently outsourced to other institutions)
• Enhancing research capacity
• Short course research methods training for faculty and advanced students
• Developing a pool of trained research assistants who can be deployed quickly
• Data storage and management assistance
• Data management plan templates, for specific fields
• Access to necessary storage
Priority #3: Investment in Social Research Facilities
• Survey Lab (dedicated space, phone bank, software, full-time coordinator)
• Experimental/simulation lab (e.g., College of Business)
• Computer stations, break-out room, waiting room, control room
• Meeting space
• Focus group facilitation

•   Collaboration spaces
•   Interview rooms
Priority #4: Developing a Business Plan
•   Identify needs for base funding to support campus needs
•   Coordinate with University Advancement
•   Consult with leaders of existing center to develop detailed business plan
•   Fee for services on campus
•   Fee for services external
•   Competition for large grants and contracts (local, state, federal agencies and programs)

Recommendations & Summary

The interviews with other center directors focused our attention on what the primary purpose of the center would be. They highlighted the difference between centers that receive base funding support from the university and thus have the ability to address campus needs and enhance research capacity within the university. In contrast, those centers which are solely self-funded cannot generate revenue and also serve the university community. These insights, combined with the expressed needs from the CSU community point towards the need for a center at CSU that enhances research capacity in the social sciences, improves grant competitiveness across campus by providing new services, invests in new social science facilities and builds a business plan suited those three identified campus needs. Such a center can be a revenue generator, but it cannot be entirely self-supporting and also enhance university capacity.

Social Science Research and Data Center Core Facility Request

A request for funds to establish a Social Science Research and Data Center Core Facility was submitted in April of 2017. The draft mission of the center is to: enhance, foster, and promote social science research that addresses critical human and social problems at the local, national, and international levels. We do so by connecting and bringing together researchers from different disciplines around emerging areas of study, and by providing consultation, grant support, a shared and accessible infrastructure, and other services to social scientists at Colorado State University.

The request detailed the demonstrated need and potential for broad use and included the following priorities:

Priority #1: Enhancing Social Science Research Capacity
Priority #2: Improving Grant Competitiveness University Wide
Priority #3: Enhanced Research Methods Training
Priority #4: Investment in Social Science Research Facilities

The $75,000 request was granted in August of 2018 and an additional $75,000 was provided to fund activities for fiscal year 2018 and 2019 (total of $150,000). The primary goal of the funding is to build out internal capacity and to develop plans to improve infrastructure and needed resources. Specific activities during this two-year period include hiring a team to accomplish the following:

1. Website Development: to include a list of affiliated faculty and available resources linked to social science research and establishment of a web-based referral system.
2. Networking and Matchmaking: to include 6 research and networking brown bag events and college specific networking events each year.

3. <u>Business Plan</u>: to include seeking support and funding from university college and units, develop a ROI and fee for service model.
4. <u>Training and Development</u>: to initiate at least two short courses per year and compile a centralized list of university social sciences research methods courses.

During this two-year period the College of Liberal Arts will be providing $20,000 ($10,000 each year to fund travel, technical support, membership dues, and hourly grant writing services). In addition, the Sociology Department has agreed to provide a course release for Jeni Cross for the next two years ($10,800 total, $5,400 per year) and the Political Science Department has agreed to provide a course release for Kyle Saunders for the next two years ($10,800 total, $5,400 per year).