

RO SWOTs V. 5.19.21.2016

Strengths of the Research Office

- 1) **RO leadership** – New leadership has the energy and motivation to reconsider how research business is done.
- 2) **RO staff** – Committed and professional staff solves complex problems with speed and authority.
- 3) **Service to community** – Service-focused perspective is evolving throughout the Research Office.
- 4) **Ethos** – Office environment fosters transparency, innovation and collaboration.

Strengths of the Research Community

- 1) **Expertise** – Broad and deep research expertise.
- 2) **Collaboration** – Collaboration across disciplines distinguishes the OSU research environment.
- 3) **Research Ethic** – The OSU research community has been productive despite a seriously under-resourced research environment.
- 4) **Research Ethos** – OSU scientists and engineers are known for their research integrity and trustworthiness.
- 5) **Natural Resources** – OSU researchers have ready access to abundant natural resources.

Weaknesses of the Research Office

- 1) **Morale** – Morale among RO staff is varied.
- 2) **Communication** – Research news and RO-led initiatives is communicated effectively to neither internally nor to the research community.
- 3) **Leadership** – The RO has struggled to manage internal conflict.
- 4) **Resources** – Resources dedicated to the RO are limited and structures are dated.
- 5) **Staff and Staffing** – Staff turnover and heavy workload prevent office from responding to evolving needs of faculty researchers.
- 6) **Administration of Centers, Institutes and Core Facilities** – Administration of CIPS is unstructured.
- 7) **Research leadership** – Lack of a coordinated research agenda.
- 8) **Leadership succession** – Internally, there is limited planning for leadership succession.

Weaknesses of the Research Community

- 1) **University administration** – Strong governance from the colleges creates barriers to transdisciplinary research and threatens sustainability of university-wide CIPs.
- 2) **Advocacy from central administration** – The value of research is rarely communicated by university leadership.
- 3) **Reputation** – There is limited awareness nationally of OSU or OSU research.
- 4) **Infrastructure** – Research facilities are insufficient and labs are under-resourced to support growth of the research enterprise.
- 5) **Faculty retention** – OSU faces an ongoing threat of losing key faculty.
- 6) **Infrastructure** – Further investments in research space must incorporate ongoing O&M support.
- 7) **Perceived or relative lack of support for research by faculty**. Often cited are heterogeneous support for proposal development, inadequate infrastructure, expensive graduate student and post-doc costs, etc. Faculty do not believe that the university and the public that supports it care much about research.

Opportunities for the Research Office

- 1) **Leadership** – New leadership centrally and within colleges brings new perspective and vision to OSU research.

- 2) **RO process** – Electronic research administration tools and greater partnership with Business Centers promise improvements in RO process and procedures.
- 3) **New Revenue** – Upcoming capital campaign and F&A negotiation could generate new revenue for OSU research.
- 4) **Communications** – Collaboration with URM offers the ability for effective and focused internal and external communications.

Opportunities for the Research Community

- 1) **Leadership** – Emergence of new leaders represents an opportunity to raise the profile of research within the university.
- 2) **Faculty** – Cluster hires may drive industry partnerships.
- 3) **New areas of research/funding** – OSU is diversifying its research portfolio by growing research support from NIH, DOE, and DoD; in partnership with foundations, industry, and national labs; and through international engagement.
- 4) **Innovation and commercialization** – An innovation campus is an essential part of a modern campus and is in development.
- 5) **The Boulder project** – Corvallis may one day be hip.

Threats to the Research Office

- 1) **Strategy** – Current gaps in the funding and innovation portfolios results in lower research productivity across campus.
- 2) **Staffing** – It is difficult to recruit experienced staff to a small, rural community.
- 3) **Funding** - Current RO funding model is not sustainable There is currently no mechanism to increase the budget as demands of research administration grow with research revenue
- 4) **Reputation** – RO has reputation of providing declining and insufficient financial and infrastructure support for research; parts of RO have reputation, possibly undeserved, for being obstructionist.

Threats to the Research Community

- 1) **Funding/cost of research** – Sustaining a competitive research program is challenging in an uncertain fiscal environment.
- 2) **Infrastructure** – Research infrastructure depreciates further as replacement, renovation and operational costs rise.
- 3) **Compliance** – The federal regulatory environment and costs of compliance are significant threats to continued operations.
- 4) **Natural disasters** – Climate change and seismic upgrades impose significant added costs to research operations.
- 5) **Changing nature of funded research** – Federal agencies, most notably NSF, are shifting funding priorities to “outcome –based” research, reducing the amount of funding available for foundational research.
- 6) **Leadership succession** – National leadership changes could have significant impacts on research.
- 7) **Staffing** – It is difficult to recruit experienced staff to a small, rural community.