

UAF-UAMS Research Collaborative




WINTHROP
ROCKEFELLER
INSTITUTE



In 1969, Winthrop Rockefeller would address the presidents and trustees of colleges and universities in Arkansas and reflect on the need for cooperation, not competition:

“ I will add the hope that we may all be wise enough to see that every institution benefits most when together we consider the needs of all... the converse to be equally true-- that if we turn to competition...among each other, we shall all surely lose...It may be vain and futile to believe that every one of us will fight as hard for the needs of another college as we should for the one we may be associated with. Yet clearly, both principle and practicality dictate that we should.”

-Winthrop Rockefeller

Introduction

The University of Arkansas-Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences have a deep history of working together. Despite meaningful attempts to strengthen collaboration between the two institutions there is yet to be widespread research collaboration between the two campuses. Recent reports commissioned by the Northwest Arkansas Council, “**Northwest Arkansas Healthcare**” and “**Greater Northwest Arkansas Development Strategy**,” examine the correlation between the health care sector and regional economic success and assert that the current economic impact of the health care sector in northwest Arkansas underperforms its peers in similar sized populations. The Northwest Arkansas Council report lays out recommendations to add \$2 billion to the Northwest Arkansas economy by 2040, including an imperative for UAF and UAMS to form a research collaborative.

Leadership at both campuses feel as though the timing is right to create energy and plan around intentional research collaboration efforts. To that end, Stacy Leeds, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Vice Chancellor for Economic Development, and Dr. Stephanie Gardner, Provost and Chief Strategy Officer, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, approached the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute about convening the two institutions for a one-day session in Fayetteville on October 28, 2019. The convening partners recognized the challenge of securing input from the right stakeholders to formalize and communicate the scope of the work they hope to do together and requested the Institute assist in this effort.

The Institute convenes stakeholders and employs the “Rockefeller Ethic” to engage participants in respectful dialogue that values diversity of opinion and encourages collaborative problem solving. This convening was designed to consider how the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences envision a collaborative research partnership, examine key questions in service to creating a successful research collaboration, discover ideas, uncover barriers to success, document shared commitment between the two institutions and outline next steps moving forward.



The Rockefeller Ethic

Collaborative Problem Solving + Respectful Dialogue + Diversity of Opinion = Transformational Change

Process

The Institute, partnering with trained facilitator, Barry Goldberg of IBG, worked with leaders from both institutions to design a meeting that would achieve three goals. The first, to inform the research collaborative planning process based on robust and clearly articulated understanding of the various challenges and opportunities associated with such an initiative; second, to produce engaged, informed, and committed participants; third, to identify next steps for a project moving forward.

To assist in designing the meeting, participants were requested to take a brief, anonymous survey prior to the meeting. Twenty-five responses were submitted out of the sixty-two attendees. From the survey results and conversations with leadership the Institute designed a meeting to create a collaborative space for participants to learn about each other and their work, share ideas and concerns on collaboration, and leave with clear ideas of next steps and their role moving forward with the research collaborative.

In the first session participants articulated the barriers and circumstances that would cause a research collaborative initiative to fail and reasons why it is important for it to succeed. This set the stage for participants to consider what is necessary for a successful research collaborative and generated six main topics to explore further. Each person selected which topic they were most interested in or could contribute to the most. The topic groups had a robust discussion and identified at least three ideas that they could readily accomplish to build momentum for this initiative. The process included time for attendees to build relationships with each other and make connections that could lead to research collaboration.

The outcomes from the program were clearly identified barriers and risks, articulation of why a research collaborative must succeed, better knowledge and understanding of the other's institution and research, and stronger connections with fellow participants.



Outcomes

Barriers & Risks

Four main themes emerged on the barriers and risks associated with creating a research collaborative between the institution. These were:

↪ **Logistics** ↪ **Leadership** ↪ **Incentives** ↪ **Conflicts**

↪ **Logistics**

The physical distance between the two institutions leads to challenges for collaboration. Researchers do not see each other regularly nor can they easily set up an in person meeting. This leads to researchers not knowing each other and thereby not having the trust required to build meaningful collaborations. Both campuses brought up telecommunication equipment not always being compatible and limited access to the technology needed for virtual meetings.

↪ **Leadership**

Turnover in leadership positions makes it difficult to maintain momentum for collaboration. The perception is that not all campus leaders place a high value on collaboration and thereby resources are not allocated to collaborative efforts and communication between the institutions is not encouraged. The culture of the institutions has not fostered collaboration in the past and has not created a shared vision for collaboration in the future. There is no system in place to hold the institutions accountable for collaborative failures or successes.

↪ **Incentives**

Both institutions lack incentives for researchers to collaborate. There are not adequate financial incentives to encourage collaboration nor does collaborating result in any credit towards promotions and tenure. The institutions do not make it easy for collaboration between the two campuses; in some cases it is more challenging to collaborate with other University of Arkansas institutions than an institution in another system or state.

↪ **Conflicts**

There are conflicts between the institutions on accounting processes, paperwork, and terms and conditions. Each institution has a unique system for communication and data sharing and these systems are not always conducive for collaboration.



Why Must It Succeed?

To build a successful collaboration, participants agree that the benefits must outweigh the risks. Participants articulated reasons why a research collaborative must succeed. The main reasons were to improve health outcomes, to create positive economic impact for the region, and to make Arkansas a leader in the health care field.

Participants considered what needs to happen to build a collaborative research partnership. Funneled largely from barriers that had been articulated, participants identified six topics to be addressed. Everyone had an opportunity to make initial contributions to each of these six topics and then commit to work more deeply on one topic. Each topic group discussed the work that needs to be done in that area and developed at least three actions they could take immediately or that could be “early wins.” Early wins were defined as initiatives that the two institutions can make headway on in the next 90 days. The topics, individuals committed, and the “early wins” are in the following chart.

Stacy Leeds and Stephanie Gardner will review the makeup of each topic committee, assign chairs, and appoint an administrative liaison to each committee. The whole group along with any additional people who can contribute to building a research collaborative will hold another meeting in Spring 2020 to assess the progress they have made on the early wins and consider next steps in the project. The dates of April 13-14, 2020 are on hold for a meeting at the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute atop Petit Jean Mountain.



- ↪ **Improve health outcomes**
- ↪ **Create positive economic impact for the region**
- ↪ **Make Arkansas more competitive and a leader in the health care field**

Topic 1: Smooth Funding Infrastructure

Individuals Committed

Kevin Sexton

Erin Howie

Judy Weber

Hanna Jensen

Pearl McElfish

Bob Beitle

Identified Early Wins

- 1.** Assign/ID grants office personnel at both UAF & UAMS to facilitate interinstitutional grant applications.
- 2.** Create an MOU that allows flow of funds between institutions without a subaward.
- 3.** Increase flexibility in interinstitutional policies including use of common forms, material use agreements, no-cost extensions, refresh IRB/IACUC agreement structure.

Next Meeting

April 13-14, 2020

*at the Winthrop
Rockefeller Institute*

Topic 2: Logistics - Policy & Process

Individuals Committed

Fred Prior

Julie Stenken

Jay Gandy

Jim Coleman

Stephanie Gardner

Carol Cornell

Identified Early Wins

1. Transportation between campuses.
(Already being worked on with a wifi-enabled shuttle bus.)
2. Seminars through use of telecommunication.
3. Shared MOU for IRP process.
4. Shared library resources.
5. Shared network for hosting researchers.

Topic 3: Organizational Super Structure & Research Infrastructure

Individuals Committed

David Snow

Mike Thomsen

Larry Cornett

Sean Adams

Walt Bottje

Jeannine Durdik

Dorothy Graves

Reza Hakkak

Nancy Gray

Mick Tilford

Identified Early Wins

1. Inventory material transfer agreements, IP ownership and data sharing policies and communicate them.
2. Develop communications site plan.
3. Cross-training programs do exist, need to inventory and communicate them.
4. Provide information and access to core facilities in seamless fashion.

Topic 4: Seeing what is out there now

Collaborations, resources, other institutions

Individuals Committed

Jamie Baum

Lindsay Ham

Linda Williams

Michelle Gray

Patty Cowan

Identified Early Wins

1. Map the current collaborations at UAMS/ UAF and celebrate those through print and digital channels at both institutions. Identify and share the current research projects, publications, and funding. Identify and share the current barriers and the successes.
2. Identify and share current resources including seed money that is available and core facilities that are shared or could be.
3. Disseminate what we are already doing for other campuses (*e.g. seminars*). Continue to do a better job with outreach.

Topic 5: Personnel & Talent

Individuals Committed

Jan Shorey

Matt Ganio

Gwen Childs

Shengfan Zhang

Paula Rao

Nalin Payakachat

Charles O'Brien

Identified Early Wins

1. Appropriate academic appointments across campuses and both campuses supporting joint appointments.
2. Catalogue research and researchers from each institution into one electronic database such as LinkedIn, Researchgate, etc.
3. Aligning missions on both campuses.
4. Build a plan for a cross-campus mentoring program and a seminar exchange.
5. Assure promotion and tenure credit for team science and collaboration at both UAMS and UAF.

Topic 6: Incentives

Individuals Committed

Mark Williams

Kevin Raney

Barry Brady

Laura James

David Hinton

Don Catanzaro

Laura Hutchins

Woodrow Shew

Di Fang

Narashimhan Rajaram

Kyle Quinn

Shipla Iyer

Identified Early Wins

1. Form a committee to outline the process for a paid sabbatical opportunity after 3rd year of appointment. The plan should be ready for review and budget approvals for fiscal year 2021.
2. Same process as above for a paid summer fellowship for faculty.
3. Establish a collaborative plan for a shared pilot grant program to share with provosts at respective campuses.
4. Establish a pathway for cross-institutional fellowship and paid graduate pilot programs e.g. stipends, grants, and scholarships.



Appendix

Contents

- I. List of recommendations of who should be at the meeting that was not
- II. Transcript of charts from the day

I. Who Should Be Here Who Is Not Here?

- ↪ **UAF-VCRI**
- ↪ **Pre/post Personnel**
- ↪ **Procurement/Contract personnel**
- ↪ **Library personnel**
- ↪ **Core Facility Manager**
- ↪ **UAF Research and Innovation Staff**
- ↪ **Sumi Dridi (UAF)**
- ↪ **Byung Whi Kong (UAF)**
- ↪ **Jingyi Chun (UAF)**
- ↪ **Rob Griffen (UAMS)**
- ↪ **Hassan Beyzavi (UAF)**

II. Transcript of Charts from the Day

The one-day meeting was divided into sessions. Most of the sessions included facilitators charting contributions from attendees or attendees charting their own contributions. Below is a transcription of all the charting from the day.

Why will this fail?/What will kill this?

- ⊕ Too far away
- ⊕ Culture, have to teach M/W/F
- ⊕ UAF/UAMS have different goals for collaboration that don't mesh
- ⊕ No incentive to cooperate
- ⊕ No trust, no knowing each other
- ⊕ Dis-incentives, people oriented to their own dept.
- ⊕ Entrenched paperwork methods
- ⊕ Lack of clarity on intellect prop
- ⊕ Resources, no money, not enough resources
- ⊕ In-fighting over resources, not used to sharing then dividing back up
- ⊕ External sponsors are sometimes suspicious of collaborative research
- ⊕ Weeds that exist in different units to get lost in
- ⊕ We are one university, but act like separate planets. No incentive to work here rather than New York
- ⊕ Just as easy to collaborate with Cali than between two schools
- ⊕ Promotion and Tenure, expectations for bringing in outside grants is diff at each campus for PIs
- ⊕ Co-PIs are sometimes a hindrance to grants, deciding who gets credit
- ⊕ Lack opportunity to know each other, need more workshops like this valuable one
- ⊕ Poor communication and low engagement of stakeholders, need deeper understanding of cultures for folks not in the room
- ⊕ Catch 22 practically, as main incentive is external funding and for preliminary data gathering, which funders look for, the distance is hard
- ⊕ Different accounting groups and accounts payable process, different terms and conditions
- ⊕ True community engagement, very little question that collaborating with each other is like other colleges. Being in the same state and focusing on the same communities could join us, but we don't know what's going on there and how we can work there.
- ⊕ Working with clinicians is great, but the clinicians need release time and funds. This is a barrier on both campuses
- ⊕ External funding, hyper-competitive. Need world-class collaborators across the world for funding, one campus has to give up a slot and possibly lose external funding.
- ⊕ Extramural research to fund some of these collaborations, resulting in a battle for ownership of grants and recognition
- ⊕ Enthusiasm needs to be sustained, which is hard, especially from leadership on both campuses
- ⊕ Need different mindset from "Me" to "We" as a core issue
- ⊕ Lack of primary ownership
- ⊕ No shared student body, hard to develop new degree initiative, where most innovation happens
- ⊕ Almost been dissuaded from recruiting from Fayetteville for UAMS, unspoken rules.
- ⊕ Sharing a grad student is a challenge, not set up at UAMS

- ⊕ Need exemptions for hiring grad students for UAMS, sharing w/UAF. Too much red tape currently. (First joint program is in development, however. Working to cut all the red tape. Occupational Therapy joint program starts in January.)
- ⊕ Big problem not having the medical school on the Fayetteville campus for learning. Cultural mindsets to overcome with lots of bio-somethings programs trying to fill the gap.
- ⊕ Lack of clear, constant communication. Non-returned emails, etc. No cultural push to respond.
- ⊕ Fear of change. Any different propositions or changes can be an 18-month process
- ⊕ Can collaborate with people in Europe on the regular. But very little telecommunication between our two campuses. The ones that do, the tech is lagging behind, seems tied to the past.
- ⊕ Fear of the unknown, not a lot of collaborations between campuses. Why make the jump when I can invest locally? Few wins to point to.
- ⊕ Not all working on the same communication software or systems
- ⊕ Sharing data is also a large issues. SharePoints don't talk to each other, HIPPA guidelines, etc.
- ⊕ Need clear guidelines, policies and procedures for all to work from
- ⊕ Lack of creativity or effort to solve problems. Locked into school year for certain opportunity which was inflexible
- ⊕ No-one to blame if this fails, no-one is accountable (Barry counters that this room is part of accountability)
- ⊕ Lack of vision
- ⊕ Lack of true dual appointments, need someone accountable to both campuses. Need bus or train with Wi-Fi, some sort of shuttle. Student housing on both sides. (A prototype bus program is in the works)
- ⊕ Accountable to collaboration, but also to own campus. Those will sometimes collide. Upper leadership needs to clear that issue up
- ⊕ Junior investigators need to be protected as they are the agents of change
- ⊕ Egos can stand in the way.
- ⊕ Trying to match make a relationship, but individually it might not work out. Might not be essential to collaborate between both campuses
- ⊕ Lack of incentives, not something that has been ID'd as "must have". Need long term commitment and shared mission
- ⊕ University of Pittsburgh and University of Pittsburgh Medical Center had similar problems. With being neighbors and sharing deans and fundraising, still couldn't collaborate. Need to get down to a shared vision, ego challenges, etc. These are common problems we are addressing. From the Pittsburgh situation: Prevention vs. treatment is a major hurdle, the view was different at both campuses.
- ⊕ Individual perspective: When filling out a grant from both schools, you have twice the bureaucracy and red tape, for failed and winning grants alike. This is a major drain on potential collaborations
- ⊕ Tenure track and non-tenure track differences and research push on faculty. No personal incentive on individual level to increase research capacity. Environ for non-tenure track on Fayetteville is horrendous.
- ⊕ Senior leadership turnover, provost, DCRs, not able to build a long term plan.
- ⊕ Promotion and tenure: collaborative research isn't valued

Why must this succeed?

- ⌚ Assuming the research can be translated, AR is no longer in the bottom of health outcomes
- ⌚ Impact on health and education
- ⌚ Bigger issues in health needs interdisciplinary approaches. Can be more competitive
- ⌚ Could stop brain drain
- ⌚ Allow us to recruit top scientists for group research
- ⌚ Greater capacity to work together to solve community problems
- ⌚ Small enough to make it happen. Concise population, smart as anyone else
- ⌚ Combine strengths from both institutions
- ⌚ Major positive economic impact
- ⌚ We become leaders in the nation on research
- ⌚ We will retain more researchers and have more fun
- ⌚ Show our worth in the state to continue the flow of state funds
- ⌚ Catch missing opportunities that we don't know about and could be missing out on
- ⌚ More efficient
- ⌚ Have lots more leverage
- ⌚ Measurable impact and world changing research
- ⌚ People's lives are at stake
- ⌚ Change public perception of what we are doing
- ⌚ Justify our existence. Need to support our growth and existence
- ⌚ If not within the system, might happen outside the system
- ⌚ Better education for student body with exposure to multidisciplinary
- ⌚ National Cancer Inst. designation, for example. Access to better resources and recognition, lifesaving treatments
- ⌚ People of AR know what their return on investment is
- ⌚ Cooperative Extension Service needs to be plugged in (Parking lot item)
- ⌚ Strong policy advising front through collaboration
- ⌚ Will be eligible for more funding resources if we are working together
- ⌚ Wellness and prevention to reduce risk
- ⌚ There may be a UAMS 4 year medical school in Fayetteville that includes research

Ideas recommended for what needs to happen to build a research collaborative:

- ⌚ Streamline research infrastructure
- ⌚ True dual or concurrent appointments
- ⌚ Technology infrastructure
- ⌚ Incentives
- ⌚ Incentives and funding mechanisms match at both
- ⌚ UAMS/UAF Lecture fellowship
- ⌚ Grand rounds
- ⌚ Mechanisms to promote interaction/collaborations
- ⌚ Funding both institutions
- ⌚ Sustaining shared knowledge across both institutions
- ⌚ Smoothing of financial flow between organizations
- ⌚ Leveraging existing synergies/collaborations
- ⌚ Tackling the distance issue
- ⌚ Organizational superstructure
- ⌚ Leverage other in-state institutions (ie NCTR)
- ⌚ Create opportunities for start-ups
- ⌚ ID current successful collaborations and learn from them

These ideas were condensed by Dr. Gardner and Ms. Leeds to the following list:

- ⌚ Topic 1: Smooth Funding Infrastructure
- ⌚ Topic 2: Logistics – Policy and Process (*Technology Infrastructure/ Tackling the Distance Issues*)
- ⌚ Topic 3: Organizational Superstructure/ Research Infrastructure
- ⌚ Topic 4: Seeing what is out there now – Collaborations, resources, other institutions
- ⌚ Topic 5: Personnel and Talent
- ⌚ Topic 6: Incentives

Each of the six topics were written on charts and participants charted their ideas:

Topic 1: Smooth Funding Infrastructure

- ⊕ Joint grants office
 - > Pre-award
 - > Post-award
 - > Assign or identify an existing specialist at each institution to take responsibility for this
 - *Or an interinstitutional specialist in both places*
- ⊕ No subawards - MOU agreements
- ⊕ Flow of indirects reduced/streamlined
- ⊕ Joint IRB/IACUC/BSL
- ⊕ No cost extensions ---> allow interinstitutional
- ⊕ Invoice in a timely manner: how do we move money between institutions smoothly?
- ⊕ Flexibility when institutional policies differ
- ⊕ UAF-UAMS Pilot Grants
- ⊕ WorkDay platform no in both institutions (this is good)
- ⊕ Transfer of Materials Agreements
- ⊕ “Bank” of grant writers/editors
- ⊕ Specific support for collaborative grant applications of junior faculty (asst. professors)
- ⊕ Equip grant specialists to identify collaborative grant opportunities

Topic 2: Logistics – Policy and Process (Technology Infrastructure/Tackling the Distance Issues)

- ⊕ Transport (train, drones, bus)
- ⊕ Housing (students & faculty)
- ⊕ Promotion and Tenure policy
- ⊕ Policies for joint appointments (salaries)
- ⊕ Shared IP
- ⊕ Shared IRD, IACUC, etc.
- ⊕ Common ERP
- ⊕ Joint Training/Education program (T32 mechanisms)
- ⊕ Course Credits/Transfer Credits
- ⊕ Seminars jointly and broadcasted
- ⊕ Funded summer scholar programs for (junior) faculty
- ⊕ Better and more frequent communication transfer of important information
- ⊕ Joint appointments
- ⊕ Dealing with policies
- ⊕ Mutual acceptance of registration for students ---> make it fluid for transfer classes-enrollment credit
- ⊕ Mechanism for sharing protected data
- ⊕ Improve library access both ways
- ⊕ Modern teleconferencing widely available
- ⊕ Training for faculty/students on policies/procedures
- ⊕ Shared IRB and email address
- ⊕ Streamline conflict of interest and management
- ⊕ Communication newswire
- ⊕ Determining impacts on collaboration
 - > How successful?

Topic 3: Organizational Superstructure/Research Infrastructure

- ⊕ MTA/IP/Data Policy
- ⊕ Funds to support infrastructure and efforts to start collaborating
- ⊕ Communications site plan (web chat)
- ⊕ Funds for joint events (not now)
- ⊕ Indirect cost allocation
- ⊕ Authority to make change
- ⊕ Combine core facilities/labs
- ⊕ Combine support infrastructure (grants, IRB, etc.)
- ⊕ Dedicated pool of money to incentivize at a meaningful amount
- ⊕ Make accountability for joint research at all levels
- ⊕ Postdoc office
- ⊕ Collaborative grad student entity
- ⊕ Cross Training programs
- ⊕ Inventory and communicate
- ⊕ Central data reporting capture/data share
- ⊕ VC at both inst. or 1 to have oversight and authority of joint research
- ⊕ Metrics to measure success
- ⊕ Access to cores seamlessly
- ⊕ Pilot funds
- ⊕ Dedicated joint research space
- ⊕ Project accounting system

Topic 4: Seeing what is out there now – Collaborations, resources, other institutions

- ⊕ Map common site
- ⊕ Priorities
 - > Institutional
 - > Personal
- ⊕ Quality/Quantity
- ⊕ In-person meetings/ thematic
- ⊕ Assessment
 - > Organizations
 - *Schools*
 - *UAMS*
 - *UAF*
 - *ABI*
 - *Hospitals*
- ⊕ People/interests
 - *New data*
- ⊕ Qualitative and Quantitative
- ⊕ Display/Communicate /Visual Map
- ⊕ Sustain
 - *FTE*
 - *Resources*
- ⊕ Meetings
- ⊕ Collaboration
 - *Change*

Topic 5: Personnel and Talent

- ⊕ ½ academic appointment vs. concurrent appointments
- ⊕ UAMS/IU/UNC (grant subcontracts) vs. northwestern (biological science & medical school)
- ⊕ How is each kind of appointment defined? What do the words mean? Obligations to policies of each institutions?
- ⊕ How/who participates in annual faculty review?
- ⊕ Serving multiple masters
- ⊕ “Who is doing what?” in research
- ⊕ Catalog of projects but fear of being scooped
- ⊕ Central office aware of research projects across UAF-UAMS
- ⊕ Assure promotion and tenure credit for team science and collaboration on both UAMS and UAF
- ⊕ Profiles(UAMS)/Digital measures (UAF)- CSA/ TRI database- insist that all faculty complete their profile page on UAMS &UAF (and “keyword search” capacity of overviews
- ⊕ Support dept. Chairs on joint recruitments (salary & startup money)
- ⊕ Requires alignment of departments missions e.g. endowed chairs across campuses
 - > Perhaps improve the health of Arkansans & health care
- ⊕ E.g. mentoring across campuses
- ⊕ Joint “search” efforts consider “package” consider spouse/partner hire
- ⊕ Catalogue research projects
- ⊕ One electronic mechanism used by all researchers UAF & UAMS
 - > LinkedIn key search word
 - > Researchgate
 - > Google scholar
 - > Profiles at UAMS - could this be expanded to UAF?
- ⊕ Action items - What to implement?
- ⊕ Must be mandated participation (or is it a good option for those who want to collaborate?)
- ⊕ Build plan for cross-campus mentoring program
- ⊕ Build plan for cross-campus seminar exchange program
- ⊕ Academic appointments across UAF-UAMS
 - > Jan will query AAMC group on Faculty affairs
- ⊕ Define 1/2 appointments
- ⊕ Define concurrent appointments

Topic 6: Incentives

- ⊕ Institutional (multi) Program to fund personnel increases “dedicated” to interinstitutional projects
- ⊕ Start with IO (\$7.5M over 3 years)
- ⊕ Success: publication, other proposals submitted/ funded (endow program? Market to somebody)
- ⊕ “Different” RIF return for a I2 (interinstitutional) project
- ⊕ Discount access to facilities
- ⊕ PAID Sabbatical at other institutions/ “swap”
- ⊕ Joint pilot program (small starts seed funding)
- ⊕ Startup would be increased for crossing institutions
- ⊕ Postdoctoral fellowships and grad students
- ⊕ Protected research time for UAMS clinicians; funds to address difference between salary and NIH cap, teaching buyout at UAF+UAMS
- ⊕ PIVOT funds for mid-career shifts in R&D
- ⊕ Not limited to 7 year cycle and pre-tenure toll of clock



Reach Out

Petit Jean Mountain
1 Rockefeller Drive
Morrilton, AR 72110

 (501) 727-5435
 rockefellerinstitute.org

Be Social

 [rockefeller.institute](https://www.facebook.com/rockefeller.institute)
 [rockefellerinstitute](https://www.instagram.com/rockefellerinstitute)
 [rockefeller](https://twitter.com/rockefeller)
 [rockefellerinstitute](https://www.linkedin.com/company/rockefellerinstitute)

