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I. REVIEW PROCESS

This review of the Institute of Behavioral Science (IBS) was conducted in accordance with the 2013 review guidelines. The unit prepared a self-study, which was reviewed by an internal review committee (IRC). The IRC found the report accurate and fairly complete but made suggestions for the inclusion of additional information that had not been not elicited by the required questions. The unit then submitted a revised self-study that included the suggested information. An external review committee (ERC) visited the unit in February 2013 and, having reviewed the relevant documents, met with faculty, students, staff, university administrators, and members of ARPAC. The reviewers’ comments and recommendations are cited at appropriate points. This public document reflects the assessment of and recommendations for IBS as approved by ARPAC.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK

The campus’s standardized description of the unit may be found on the website of the Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis (PBA) (http://www.colorado.edu/pba/depts/arp/index.html). PBA updates the profile annually in the fall semester. This report cites the PBA data for IBS posted in November 2012, the most recent update available; these figures reflect the state of the institute in AY 2011-2012. More recent data from the revised IBS self-study (February 2013) are cited where relevant.

The ERC describes IBS as “one of the premier social science and policy institutes in the nation,” one that is distinct from other such institutes nationwide in that it is engaged in “translational research, taking social and behavioral science findings and applying them in various local, state and community contexts in efforts to solve existing social problems.” IBS is organized around the research strengths of its tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty. Over time, faculty have developed five programs within the institute: (1) Environment and Society, which sponsors the Natural Hazards Center; (2) Health and Society; (3) Institutions; (4) Populations, which sponsors the African Population Studies Research and Training Program and the CU Population Center; and (5) Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development, which sponsors the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. An additional center, the Center on the Governance of Natural Resources, is co-sponsored by the Environment and Society and Institutions programs.

One of the five research programs, Health and Society, is relatively new, having been founded just after the previous (2002) program review; another, Institutions, was reorganized and given a new name after the previous review. All five programs are vibrant in terms of research and funding, as detailed below. All five programs benefit the university’s social science departments in helping recruit, retain, and provide research support for associate and affiliated faculty and in supporting graduate student research.
Personnel and governance

According to the self-study, as of February 2013 IBS rostered eight TTT faculty members plus the institute’s director. These numbers remain current as of Fall 2013. Two of those faculty members are 0.5 FTE in IBS, so the total number of FTE positions (faculty + director) is eight. Two additional rostered lines are vacant. One will be filled upon the completion of a successful search for a new director of the Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development Program. A second, vacated by a retiring faculty member, has been left unfilled to help pay for the IBS building. According to the self-study, as of February 2013 IBS also rostered two research professors, one research assistant professor, five senior research associates, 20 postdoctoral research associates, and 24 professional research assistants. Salary support for these researchers comes almost entirely from external grants.

The self-study counts an additional 37 faculty associates who, as of February 2013, were affiliated with IBS through work with one of the five research programs. IBS defines a “faculty associate” as someone who holds a TTT appointment at a university or is a CU emeritus faculty member who is research-active. Of these 37 faculty associates, 31 are TTT faculty at CU Boulder; the others are emeritus CU Boulder faculty members or are employed by CU Denver/Anschutz or by other universities (University of Denver and University of Durham, UK). IBS seems to be unusual among CU Boulder institutes in not using different titles to distinguish among different levels or degrees of faculty association. JILA, for example, distinguishes among “associate,” “member,” and “adjoint” faculty.

Between the nine CU Boulder TTT faculty rostered within IBS and the 31 faculty associates who are CU Boulder TTT faculty members rostered elsewhere, the institute’s 40 TTT CU Boulder faculty have their tenure homes in the following CU Boulder departments, in descending order of representation: Sociology (13, 32.5%), Economics (11, 27.5%), Political Science (9, 22.5%), Geography (6, 15%), and Anthropology (1, 2.5%). The two research professors employed by IBS are emeritus CU Boulder faculty in Sociology and Psychology, and the research assistant professor is affiliated with Environmental Studies. It is thus fair to say that CU Boulder faculty members rostered in or affiliated with IBS represent primarily four disciplines: Sociology, Economics, Political Science, and Geography.

According to PBA data, as of 2011-2012, IBS housed one professional exempt staff member with the position of Research Support Assistant, nine classified staff members (6.75 FTE), and more than two dozen student-hourly employees providing staff support. The self-study reports that staff numbers were reduced and duties consolidated once IBS was able to move to a single building but also notes that increased research activity on the part of IBS programs since that time has led to staff resources once again being stretched thin. Since departmental administrative indirect cost recovery (DA-ICR) from research grants can fund staff positions, it is unclear why increased research activity has not made funds available for more staff if necessary.
The IBS governance structure consists of a director and a board of directors, the latter made up of the directors of the institute’s five research programs. The board meets at least once a month. The unit’s bylaws consist of a brief document that was last revised in 1983. It specifies no standing committees for IBS except for an external Scientific Advisory Committee, which no longer exists. Rather, three projects within IBS currently have their own external advisory boards: the Blueprints Project within the Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development Program; the Natural Hazards Center within the Environment and Society Program; and the Rural Bangladesh Project that crosses the Population Program and the Health and Society Program. No mention is made in the self-study of bylaws that govern the five research programs within IBS or the four centers and one research and training program housed within those five research programs.

**Research and scholarship**

According to PBA data, IBS grant expenditures (direct costs) for the 2012 fiscal year topped $9 million. For the five-year period ending in FY 2012, grant expenditures (direct costs) were $35.3 million. Of this $35.3 million, $17.5 million were grant expenditures (direct costs) by primary investigators (PIs) who were rostered in IBS, and $17.8 million were grant expenditures (direct costs) by PIs who were IBS associates rostered in the various academic departments. These grants feature several marks of distinction. The CU Population Center, for example, is one of a very small number of such centers funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the ERC notes that “competition for center grants [from the NIH] is quite fierce.” Some of IBS’s grant funding is noteworthy for its support of researchers’ applying their scholarship to improvements in the community, such as the school programs designed and disseminated by the Problem Behavior Program’s Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Overall, IBS stands out for the extremely broad range of its funding sources, from the Army Corps of Engineers to the World Bank.

In its snapshot of personnel as of November 2011, PBA lists 28 faculty members as affiliated with IBS based on their Human Resources appointment, PI status, or Faculty Report of Professional Activities (FRPA) release. PBA data related to those 28 faculty show that IBS ranks first among the eleven units under review in this cycle in terms of the number of research-productive faculty members—that is, all 28. PBA data also show that IBS ranks second among the eleven units in the numbers of textbooks, refereed articles and chapters, and conference papers and presentations produced by its faculty in the previous seven-year cycle. Rostered IBS faculty and IBS faculty associates include one Distinguished Professor, two College of Art and Sciences Professors of Distinction, many winners of prestigious national and international research awards, and several presidents of scholarly associations related to behavioral and social science.
Educational mission

The educational focus of IBS is on graduate and postdoctoral training. IBS does not offer standard courses or grant degrees although it does sponsor one graduate certificate program, in Population Studies. According to the self-study, a second graduate certificate in Health and Society is being contemplated although graduate students surveyed by the IRC are skeptical about the need for new graduate certificate programs.

IBS faculty members are extremely active in mentoring graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and IBS is an important source of funding for graduate research assistantships and postdoctoral research positions. The self-study does not consistently account for the placement of graduate students and postdoctoral researchers in the five research programs whose work has been funded by IBS, so it is difficult to assess whether IBS funding and programs as a whole contribute to the successful placement of graduate students and postdoctoral research associates.

IBS also makes an unusual contribution to the campus educational mission: CU Population Center faculty members and advanced graduate students, along with visiting faculty members, regularly teach short (2-3 day) training courses through Continuing Education on topics such as “Introduction to Multilevel Modeling” and “Environmental Demography.” Open to graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior faculty members from any institution, these courses sometimes carry credit (e.g., 1.5 hours) for CU students, and stipends are sometimes offered for some participants.

Space

With its move to its new building in 2010, IBS enjoys some of the best facilities on the CU Boulder campus. The basement of the IBS building, comprising 4000 square feet, is currently occupied by Arts and Sciences, and the self-study indicates that IBS looks forward to expanding into that space in the future. Other than this basement space, IBS does not anticipate needing additional space before the end of the next review cycle. Depending on the success of future applications for certain federal grants, security may need to be upgraded in the relevant research facilities in the building.

Budget

IBS’s budget falls into three main categories, reported in the self-study as follows:

1. IBS’s general operating expense budget is funded primarily by the institute’s share of DA-ICR, which is based on Facilities and Administration (F&A) charges to sponsored research projects. This funding supports the institute’s administrative staff, equipment costs, physical plant projects, and day-to-day needs, as well as a modest fund ($5000/year) that goes to each of the five research programs for conference attendance, colloquia, and the like. The self-study cites the advantages to IBS of having flexibility in the use of its operating budget but also notes the disadvantages of
fluctuations in that budget, especially in light of recent cuts to federal grant programs. In addition, as it did in the 2002 Program Review, IBS notes that certain grants, such as from the State of Colorado, do not allow indirect costs to be charged to the grant; IBS is working on a new model for charging direct costs to such grants.

2. The salaries for the ten faculty lines rostered within the institute, a small operating-budget fund, and support for a computer lab and staff located in the institute’s Computing and Research Services group are funded directly by CU Boulder. The institute also receives some funding from CU Boulder based on the fact that when a faculty member rostered in the Graduate School has a portion of his/her academic year salary charged to a sponsored project, the faculty member’s “salary savings” remain in the institute. Communication from IBS subsequent to the self-study clarified that fewer than 1.25% of academic year faculty months (10/800) over the ten-year period ending in December 2013 have gone into salary savings.

3. The salaries of research faculty and several support staff, as well as summer salary for many of the IBS faculty and faculty associates, are funded through grants. The salaries of some support staff are funded by the institute’s share of DA-ICR distribution.

Along with generally increasing expenses and the difficulty of charging grants that do not allow for ICR, the self-study notes two contributors to a potential budget crisis: the loss of campus support for purchasing computing equipment and software; and upcoming contributions that the institute agreed to make toward the construction cost of the IBS building. IBS requests general fund money to replace computing equipment over the next review cycle. IBS also foresees the need for additional staff and requests general fund support for two staff positions, one of them currently funded through grants and one of them new.

III. HISTORY OF PROGRAM REVIEW

IBS last underwent program review in 2002. The foremost recommendation to the administration from that review, the construction of a new IBS facility, has been achieved. Almost all the other recommendations to the unit and to campus administration from 2002, however, continue to be areas for future action. This circumstance does not indicate the failure of unit or campus leadership, but it does point to ongoing or recurrent difficulties and hurdles. In 2002, IBS was facing the imminent retirement of several of its senior members, and the 2002 report recommended that IBS develop a plan either to replace senior personnel with hires in the same fields or to shift the direction of research programs. In 2013, IBS is wrestling with a version of the same problem, the need to appoint new program leadership to replace recently retired or soon-to-retire faculty. The recommendation from 2002 that IBS engage in more concerted efforts to hire faculty members from underrepresented minorities continues to need attention, as it does across campus.
There are, however, several recommendations from 2002 that may not have received sufficient or sustained attention from the institute and that recur in some form in the current review. These recommendations largely have to do with the need to foster more interdisciplinary ties both within IBS and between IBS and allied departments, ties that could benefit graduate students, research associates, and faculty members. In addition, in 2002 IBS was urged to seek cost-recovery solutions for grants, such as those from the State of Colorado, that do not allow ICR; this problem remains during the current review. All of these problems should be soluble with renewed attention and effort.

IV. IBS IN A CAMPUS CONTEXT

As an interdisciplinary unit, IBS makes important contributions to the campus, especially a subset of the social science departments. As noted earlier in this report, TTT faculty members involved in IBS come primarily from Sociology, Economics, Political Science, and Geography. For these departments and for the individual faculty members who are associated with the institute, IBS is an important attractor for faculty recruiting and retention as well as a significant source of graduate student support. IBS is also a center for cross-disciplinary conversation, both through interdisciplinary research projects undertaken by IBS faculty and research personnel, and through IBS-sponsored talks, colloquia, and similar events.

V. IBS IN A DISCIPLINARY CONTEXT

While it calls IBS “one of the premier social science and policy institutes in the nation,” the ERC also points out that no two such institutes are precisely comparable because they are built around the specific strengths of the faculty and departments of their institutions. As with other institutes at CU Boulder, IBS’s disciplinary reputation is measured not by a national ranking system but by the high regard in which the institute is held. The ERC reiterates the opinion of the external team that reviewed IBS in 2002: IBS is “a central and indispensable component of the high national/international reputation of the social/behavior sciences at the University [of Colorado] and its standing among the major public universities in America.” Believing that IBS has fulfilled the promise for growth and increased prestige that it showed in 2002, the 2013 ERC judges IBS to be “poised to have even greater impact and visibility given its strong programs and its emphasis on translating research into action.” The self-study expresses IBS’s view that the institute continues its upward trajectory. In relation to IBS’s disciplinary reputation, IBS’s evidence for this trajectory includes factors such as grant revenue’s having grown despite recent bad economic times, IBS researchers’ publishing success, and new research collaborations between IBS and other research institutions in the United States and abroad.

VI. ANALYSIS

IBS, a tremendous asset of the CU Boulder campus for decades, has only grown in prominence and productivity since its last program review. Moreover, it now has a
building to match its mission and its national stature. The IRC report sums up these strengths well: “IBS (a) is a highly successful unit with a strong international reputation and record of extramural funding, (b) has a committed core Faculty and a large cohort of invested Faculty Associates, (c) has a wide and diverse set of thriving programs including those that address important societal problems in our state, [in] our country, and across the world, and (d) has been and continues to be transformed by the creation and opening of a building for the Institute two years ago.”

Some of IBS’s challenges for the future are not unusual in that they will require hiring new personnel and funding ongoing and new research initiatives. The self-study gives a cogent analysis of some of IBS’s most urgent needs in this regard, especially new leadership, increased administrative and staff support for research and for grant writing, and new faculty lines. The ERC echoes these concerns but also points toward an overarching challenge that cannot be met by money alone: the need for IBS to define itself as body that is more than merely the sum of its parts. In addition, the ERC sees a need for IBS to become more proactive in involving allied departments in its activities.

ARPAC believes that IBS’s emphasis on different research groups working on separate issues has served it well over the years but that an unfortunate side effect has been the isolation of these research groups, both from each other and from the campus as a whole. Faculty members within IBS find decision-making opaque and non-inclusive, and some of the institute’s five research programs seem more mono- or bi-disciplinary than interdisciplinary. IBS is taking steps, especially among its newer research programs, to increase its commitments to interdisciplinary research, but more remains to be done. The institute could also do more to reach out to potential faculty associates across campus whose research is relevant to the five research programs or whose research might prove to be the foundation of a new research program or center in the future. In particular, the institute should seek to involve faculty who are not part of the institute’s traditional core list of social science departments. ARPAC sees upcoming changes in the leadership of the institute and its programs as an ideal opportunity to make structural changes that would benefit both IBS and the campus as a whole.

**Structure, growth, and planning**

IBS is organized as an umbrella organization for its five research programs, which act as institute-like entities in themselves. IBS does not stress an integrated mission or direction. The IBS web site home page, for example, simply lists those five research programs; finding “about” information for the institute as a whole requires clicking on a separate tab on the page. And even the IBS self-study for this review essentially comprises five separate self-studies.

This modular approach has its advantages. As the self-study frequently stresses, IBS is “nimble” in innovating and supporting new research directions. And the research programs surely benefit from autonomy in determining what their own missions will be and how they will use the resources allocated to them by the institute. On the other
hand, IBS potentially suffers when its research programs do not cross-pollinate. Traditional divisions among the research programs likely were reinforced by the many years IBS spent split up into separate buildings. With its splendid new facility uniting its personnel, however, IBS must consider new ways to encourage community across traditional boundaries both within its own organization and beyond its traditional affiliations with selected social science departments.

The institute’s modular structure also affects how IBS faculty members perceive their research home and its governance. There is no doubt that IBS has been well served in recent years by the excellent leadership of its director and the directors of its research programs. However, the IRC reports that faculty members believe decisions are made solely by the director and program directors, with no mechanisms for consulting the faculty or other bodies such as an external advisory board. “As a result,” reports the IRC, “the faculty [consulted by the IRC] felt that the decision-making of the Institute was rather opaque,” and also felt that “since program directors are usually in place for some [time], . . . decision-making and perspectives can be somewhat insular.” Faculty members also believe that there is no room for the IBS group as a whole to discuss or vote on program leadership. These perceptions may not entirely reflect reality, but they nevertheless cause ARPAC some concern. The occasion of an upcoming changing of the guard in the institute’s leadership should also be an occasion to rethink IBS’s governance structure to welcome faculty input into major decisions. For this and other reasons, IBS’s thirty-year-old bylaws need a thorough overhaul. While the exact nature of that revision must be determined by IBS itself, ARPAC strongly encourages bylaws that promote faculty governance.

The most immediate challenge facing IBS, as the self-study recognizes and as both the IRC and ERC stress, is one of key transitions in leadership. There have been two failed searches for the position of director of the Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development program, and it is imperative that this venerable and successful program find permanent leadership very soon. The ERC believes that a successful search will require an attractive package including both salary and additional support staff, and perhaps also such additional incentives as a new assistant professor line. The CU Population Center will also need a new director when the current one steps down. Happily, the Health and Society program has identified a new director from among IBS faculty ranks, but he will need support as he takes on this new role. Finally and most importantly, the institute as a whole will need a new leader when the current director steps down in 2015. It is essential that the Graduate School and the campus support IBS’s efforts to find, maintain, and retain excellent leadership in all of these positions.

New leadership and new opportunities for faculty input into governance may assist IBS in its efforts to support innovative interdisciplinary research that crosses the boundaries of IBS’s own research programs. These efforts should be extended wherever possible. The ERC cites the relatively new Health and Society program as a model in this regard: along with its four core faculty, it has “a number of associate faculty members whose primary affiliations are in other IBS research programs.” In addition, IBS should continue
and strengthen its efforts to support interdisciplinary research across traditional boundaries dividing the social sciences from one another as well as those dividing the social sciences from the natural sciences. Some work along these lines may be seen in the Institutions program and the Environment and Society program; however, additional work is still needed. The Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development program has been specifically criticized for being insular. More generally, the IRC report cites comments from graduate students and postdoctoral researchers that there are few convenient mechanisms in the institute for them to learn efficiently about how to cross disciplinary divides in their own research. Moving forward, IBS will need to continue to craft opportunities to make interdisciplinary research easy—indeed, second nature—for its community of scholars and scientists.

The 2002 program review referred to bitter divides among and within the social science departments that made interactions between those departments and IBS difficult. This atmosphere has dramatically improved since that time. Noting that relations between IBS and the social sciences departments “are fairly positive,” the ERC makes some specific recommendations to improve these all-important ties: annual meetings between the institute and department chairs; clarifying and improving policies for teaching loads and course buyouts for associate faculty; and clarifying the distribution of DA-ICR in order to ensure positive incentive effects.

As IBS plans for hiring new faculty and possibly growing the faculty, it must not only take into account the needs of the individual research programs. It must also seek to strengthen ties to the social science departments, to make connections to additional units not traditionally represented within IBS, and to strengthen the identity and the interdisciplinary vibrancy of the institute itself. The Problem Behavior and Positive Youth Development program, for example, wisely notes that it ought to have a psychologist among its faculty ranks, creating a bridge to a unit that would have a great deal to contribute to this research program’s mission.

**Faculty mentoring and retention**

IBS is a tremendous resource for attracting and retaining quality faculty, especially in the social sciences. The institute and the allied departments must work together to make sure that their excellent faculty members view the institute-departmental relationship as mutually supportive rather than antagonistic. In particular, the institute should work with departments to help them fully credit publication in interdisciplinary journals for the purposes of annual merit evaluation, comprehensive review, and review for promotion and tenure.

**Graduate student education and support**

The self-study cites graduate student funding and recruitment as important means by which the profile and research activity of IBS may be further improved. The self-study largely implies that the task of improving recruiting falls to the social science
departments. Nonetheless, the results of a survey undertaken by the IRC of almost all IBS graduate students (92% response rate) indicate ways in which IBS should take the reins in improving graduate recruitment and mentoring. More than half of survey respondents reported that IBS did not factor into their decisions to apply to CU Boulder; clearly IBS and the departments need to work together to advertise this jewel of a research opportunity to prospective graduate students. Only 56% of survey respondents reported applying for independent funding during the course of their graduate program, indicating that IBS faculty members need to do a better job, either formally or informally, of mentoring their students on how to apply for grants.

The graduate student survey was also helpful in articulating problems pertaining to IBS’s intended focus on interdisciplinary research and training. Graduate students report interest in gaining expertise across different fields but say they have difficulty attending trainings and colloquia at the times they are offered. Graduate students were also skeptical about the prospect of new certificate programs, indicating that they are too busy to take on any more program requirements. IBS might find it helpful to establish a graduate student organization and/or graduate student representation in order to consult the students on the best way to implement interdisciplinary initiatives such as trainings and certificates.

Communication and self-presentation

IBS could do much on its own and much in connection with its allied departments to increase awareness of the programs and opportunities it offers. For example, among a list of institute “quick facts,” the IBS web site’s “about” tab lists the departments represented by its associated faculty, but the list does not link to those departments. Equally, the allied departments could do much more to advertise opportunities within IBS. A check of the web sites of several departments with close ties to IBS shows that those ties are buried in mentions of faculty research and are not mentioned in connection with, say, graduate study. A concerted joint effort to publicize mutual interests could help both IBS and the allied departments in recruiting both faculty and graduate students.

Diversity

The self-study reports that IBS has improved the diversity of its personnel and research programs on a number of dimensions since the last program review: “especially in terms of gender representation but also with respect to nationalities represented among its faculty, researchers and graduate students, the range of methodological and theoretical orientations in its research and training activities, and the composition of its research populations given the focus on problems of societal concern.” ARPAC lauds IBS for these advances, especially for the fact that research focused on diverse populations has become a mainstay of all five IBS research programs. Regarding diversity in hiring, IBS vows to redouble its efforts to recruit diverse personnel for positions over which it has control. The self-study also notes, however, that responsibility for hiring
underrepresented minorities into faculty positions generally rests with the allied departments from which the pool of IBS faculty members is drawn. While recognizing that IBS cannot govern how departments hire their faculty, ARPAC believes that IBS could assist those units by helping to identify, among disciplines especially related to IBS’s research programs, which CU departments lag among their peers in percentages of faculty members from underrepresented minority populations. Those disciplines might prove especially fruitful for IBS’s assistance in identifying and recruiting diverse faculty applicants.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

To the unit:

1. Develop and implement a strategic plan that addresses not only the separate needs of the separate research programs but also the plans and ambitions of IBS as a whole. This plan should, of course, recognize the significant autonomy of separate research programs but should also address the vision of IBS as a collective entity. Capitalizing upon the opportunities that have arisen and will arise from occupancy of the new IBS building and from upcoming changes in institute and director leadership, the development of that strategic plan should include the following steps.

   a. IBS should craft a specific plan to restructure current practices to break down the barriers that remain among the five research programs and to avoid developing new barriers.

   b. IBS should craft a specific plan to recruit a broader range of campus faculty members into the institute’s research programs, faculty members who may, in time, also help develop new IBS research programs. This plan should include processes for identifying faculty members outside the disciplines and subdisciplines from which IBS faculty associates have traditionally been drawn, including faculty members from outside the social science departments and outside the College of Arts and Sciences. An incentive for developing this plan is the broader grant base that would obtain if IBS were to accomplish a broader faculty base.

   c. IBS should articulate specific performance goals that it intends to accomplish in the period before the next program review. These goals may be set at the institute level, the research program level, or some combination of the two, and should include a comparison between IBS and what IBS considers to be peer U.S.-based social science policy institutes in terms of research productivity and grant activity. Following the campus’s increased emphasis on performance goals, and given that strategic plans generally include requests for resources whose impact must then be
measured, ARPAC is now encouraging units to articulate measures of performance goals as part of their strategic planning.

2. Articulate in writing the criteria by which a CU Boulder faculty member is considered an appropriate candidate to be a faculty associate of the institute. Explain how such determinations are made. Consider whether to differentiate discrete levels of associate status; if different levels seem appropriate, spell out their distinctions.

3. In consultation with the Graduate School and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, rewrite the antiquated IBS bylaws and evaluate the need to write bylaws for the individual research programs. Within the context of rewriting bylaws or by other new mechanisms, increase the opportunities for faculty input into the decision-making of the institute and of its research programs.

4. Working with the dean of the Graduate School, plan for the replacement of faculty members in leadership positions in the institute and its research programs. Evaluate whether outside hires are essential or whether faculty members currently associated with the institute may be recruited for these positions. Make a case for reasonable incentivized packages to recruit new leadership, perhaps including new faculty lines.

5. Emphasize and facilitate ways for faculty members, postdoctoral researchers, and graduate students to explore and undertake interdisciplinary research, both across the institute’s research programs and across the allied departments.

6. Arrange, at a minimum, annual meetings of the institute’s director (and appropriate program directors) and the institute’s allied departments. These meetings should address matters of mutual concern, including communication between IBS and the departments and coordination of web site and other advertisement of IBS research opportunities for the departments’ faculty members and graduate students.

7. Update the institute’s web site to feature ties to the allied departments and work with the allied departments to make IBS research and educational opportunities a prominent feature of and/or link to their web pages. Consider consulting with ASSETT for assistance in this project.

8. Assist the allied departments in clarifying the role of publication in interdisciplinary journals in evaluations of faculty members for annual merit, comprehensive review, and promotion and tenure review.
9. Establish a mechanism for getting graduate-student and postdoctoral-associate input into institute and program initiatives and operations that affect graduate and postdoctoral research and graduate education.

10. Create formal or informal mechanisms to mentor graduate students and postdoctoral researchers in applying for external funding.

11. Evaluate the need for and desirability of creating graduate certificate programs along the lines of the program in Population Studies in all the research programs. Before finalizing a new graduate certificate program in Health and Society or other fields, consult with current IBS graduate students about their interest in such programs and their need to streamline degree requirements. Consideration of new graduate certificate programs should also include the evaluation of feedback from a broader range of graduate students than those currently involved with IBS to hear new ideas about what certificate programs pertaining to the institute’s research programs might be useful. Consult with the United Government of Graduate Students for ways that such feedback might be gathered.

12. Formulate ways of increasing the diversity of applicant pools for faculty and postdoctoral-research positions within IBS and assisting allied departments with increasing the diversity of applicant pools for faculty positions that are likely to include ties with IBS. Among disciplines especially related to IBS’s research programs, identify (or, in the case of hires in allied departments, help the department identify) which CU disciplines lag among their peers in percentages of faculty members from underrepresented minority populations. Those disciplines might prove especially fruitful for identifying and recruiting a diverse pool of applicants for faculty positions.

To the dean of the Graduate School:

13. Working with the unit, plan for the replacement of faculty members in leadership positions in the institute and its research programs. Evaluate whether outside hires are essential or whether faculty members currently associated with the institute may be recruited for these positions. Assist the unit in putting together incentivized packages to recruit new leadership, perhaps including new faculty lines.

14. Explore and support efforts to create and sustain new graduate-student support in social science departments whose faculty members are associated with IBS.

15. Enforce campus norms for institute-department relations, including norms for DA-ICR distribution, teaching loads, course buyouts, and so on.
16. Assist the unit in its efforts to increase the diversity of the pools of applicants for faculty and postdoctoral-research positions.

The director of the Institute of Behavioral Sciences shall report annually on the first of April for a period of three years following the year of the receipt of this report (i.e., April 1st of 2015, 2016, and 2017) to the dean of the Graduate School and to the provost on the implementation of these recommendations. Likewise, the dean shall report annually on the first of May to the provost on the implementation of recommendations addressed to the college. The provost, as part of the review reforms, has agreed to respond annually to all outstanding matters under her/his purview arising from this review year. All official responses will be posted online.