

## **Miami University Strategic Planning**

### **Excellence in Research and Scholarship Subcommittee Report (April 1, 2019)**

#### **Members of Subcommittee**

Katy Abbott (SOC/GTY)  
Naz Bautista (EDT)  
Devon Delvecchio (MKT)  
Bill Even (ECO), Co-chair  
Annika Fowler (ASG, Student representative)  
Jeff Kuznekoff (CLAAS)  
Amanda McVety (HIS)  
John Millard (Library Rep)  
Rick Page (CHM/BIOCHM)  
Vaishali Raval (PSY), Co-chair  
Kumar Singh (MME)  
Pepper Stetler (ART)

#### ***Aspirational Statement***

In his annual address on October 4, 2018, President Crawford stated, “Last year, our faculty and staff won \$24 million in research funding, the most in a decade and one-third more than the year before. More than 2,000 Miami students conducted groundbreaking research with our faculty.” In the meeting with the strategic planning steering committee, the president indicated his vision to increase external funding and partnerships by building the necessary infrastructure that will make Miami’s faculty, staff and students sought-after partners for research initiatives. Consistent with this vision, Miami University should build a culture of research in which diverse forms of research and scholarship are valued and expected and where there is significant financial investment in faculty research that provides great value and experience to our students, enhancing our reputation as a national leader in undergraduate education. An undergraduate research experience has become increasingly important for students interested in a wide range of careers, and recognizing this need, institutions of higher education are offering their undergraduate students increased opportunities to engage in research. To stay competitive in this environment, strengthening undergraduate research at Miami is vital – in particular, enhancing opportunities in select areas of specialization to contribute to the transformative student experience that Miami is known to provide its students. Excellence in select graduate programs is vital to establishing and maintaining a strong culture of research and providing peer mentoring opportunities to undergraduate students. It is important to recognize that teaching, research and scholarship are highly interdependent and that faculty excellence in research and scholarship contributes to enhanced learning experiences within and outside the classroom. Establishing a strong research culture is critical to attracting and retaining faculty who are talented researchers and scholars, who contribute to developing a future generation of engaged citizens that are committed to using their knowledge and skills to improve our global future.

#### ***Current State of Research and Scholarship at Miami***

Faculty at Miami engage in diverse forms of research, scholarship and creative output with some forms of research that are externally fundable and other forms of research and scholarship that are not typically funded. In terms of funded research, in 2018, total external funds brought in through grants and contracts at Miami University were \$24.1 million, which was a 35 percent increase from 2017 levels (OARS annual report, 2018).<sup>1</sup> When compared to 13 other Ohio universities (see Appendix Table A1), Miami ranked 11th in terms of its external funding in 2015 (universities with much greater external funding included Ohio State University at \$817 million, the University of Cincinnati at \$436 million and Ohio University at \$61 million).

In addition to external funds, another metric used to evaluate the research profile for universities is research expenditure, which forms the basis for Carnegie classification system. In 2017, based on the results of National Science Foundation's Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) Survey, Miami's total research expenditure was about \$17 million (National Science Foundation, 2018), whereas 150 top research universities typically have an average of \$40 million in research expenditure. Our current research expenditure is even less than peer institutions like the College of William & Mary with \$33 million in research expenditure.

One of the core beyond-the-classroom experiences we offer to our undergraduate students is the opportunity to participate in research. The 2017 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which included responses from 2,422 Miami University undergraduates, reported 7 percent of first year students and 40 percent of seniors have worked on a research project with a faculty member. That 40 percent number for seniors was 17 points higher than the average number for seniors at all NSSE participants in the US and 16 points higher than the average number for seniors of participating in Carnegie R-2 Peers. That is encouraging data, but there is clearly a lot of room left for expanding undergraduate research opportunities. Forty-four percent of first-year Miami students responding in the 2017 NSSE said that they planned to work with a faculty member on a research project in the future and 32 percent said that they had not yet decided if they would or not. Miami should work to capture more of the undecided students with additional research opportunities.

### ***Strengths and Weaknesses of Research and Scholarship***

Our major strength at Miami is a vibrant undergraduate student body that is talented and highly motivated to engage in research, along with highly capable graduate students in our select doctoral programs. Across divisions, we have faculty who are at the forefront of cutting-edge research in their fields, including those who engage in diverse forms of research and creative output, enhancing the possible avenues for interdisciplinary collaborations.

Despite these strengths, there are roadblocks that make it challenging to engage in research. Our major area of weakness is limited resources devoted to research, and despite having select faculty highly engaged in research, we lack an institutional “culture of research” that is ingrained across divisions and levels of faculty. Across conversations, faculty members have expressed that substantially more institutional resources are devoted towards the “teacher” in the teacher-scholar model, incentivizing teaching over research. Further, substantial teaching, advising and service responsibilities make it challenging for research-active faculty to devote time to research and scholarship. With respect to externally funded research, our current infrastructure with limited staffing for proposal submission and

---

<sup>1</sup> The report on external funding is available at  
[https://miamiohrs.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/final\\_detail\\_spreads.pdf](https://miamiohrs.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/final_detail_spreads.pdf).

post-award support, limited PhD programs in STEM fields, and lack of centralization and integration of research and funding related activities make it challenging to submit proposals for external funding and to administer successful grants. Despite multiple possible avenues for interdisciplinary research given faculty expertise in diverse forms of research at Miami, specialization in specific fields has resulted in silos that militate against interdisciplinary research. Furthermore, there are few systematic efforts for faculty members across the university to learn about each other's expertise and develop collaborative research ideas to build synergy.

We also want to emphasize that research and scholarship without external grant support is vital to the university's reputation and its ability to attract and retain high-quality faculty in areas where access to external funding is limited. In fact, the majority of departments at Miami University reported no external funding in OARS' most recent report. This does not imply that these departments are not doing important research that is valuable to the university. Nevertheless, the university would benefit if more researchers would seek and receive external funding when it is available. Below we make several recommendations on how to enhance the research profile at Miami and, in particular, the level of externally funded research.

### ***Primary Areas and Strategies***

To build on our strengths and address areas of weakness, we propose three primary strategies and present our recommendations in these three areas.

**Area 1:** Increase institutional investment and restructuring to enhance research and scholarship-- develop targeted initiatives to strengthen a “culture of research,” including research infrastructure.

**Area 2:** Develop areas of specialization and interdisciplinary collaboration-- Utilizing our strength of diverse forms of research, develop areas of specialization that cross disciplinary boundaries and promote collaboration.

**Area 3:** Increase external visibility of research and reputation-- Focusing on our strength of cutting-edge research that Miami faculty and students engage in, develop strategies to enhance Miami's reputation and external visibility as an institution where meaningful research takes place.

### ***Recommendations and Metrics for Assessing Outcomes***

#### ***Area 1: Increased Institutional Investment and Restructuring to Enhance Research and Scholarship***

Miami should strengthen support for the diverse research and creative output conducted in all divisions. Across much of the university, a culture of research that simultaneously advances faculty scholarship and engages students in meaningful research must be nurtured and ingrained into our ethos. While research is conducted across the enterprise, structural roadblocks must be addressed to help balance rigorous, internationally recognized research with meaningful undergraduate research experiences. A major roadblock to increasing external funding at Miami is the scarce resources allocated for proposal submission (e.g., budget development), post-award support (e.g., administering subcontracts). We recommend several steps that can be taken to increase the capacity for MU to increase external funding below.

#### **Centralization of research activities and reorganization of OARS**

The Office for Advancement of Research and Scholarship (OARS) can provide more efficient services with centralization.

- Currently, Dr. James Oris serves as the dean of the Graduate School and associate provost for Research. Given the separate functions of these two roles, it is important to have separate personnel for each role.
- Consistent with other Ohio universities, consider a change in the title from associate provost for Research to vice president of Research, which allows interdisciplinary centers to report directly to one individual, centralizing the process and operation of research.
- To increase efficiency, consider moving pre- and post-award functions to the same unit under OARS.

#### Increased financial investment

In order to increase external funding, an increased financial investment is needed.

- Increase the size of OARS and the administrative support (e.g., budget development) provided by OARS commensurate with the university's target for increased research expenditures. Specifically, hire additional personnel to support faculty with grant submission (e.g., budgets, form pages), implementation and execution of grants.
- Investigate supplemental mechanisms to incentivize external grant submission in addition to continuing the return of a percentage of indirects to the PI.
- Review and revise internal funding mechanisms (e.g. Committee on Faculty Research grants) to be used for preliminary studies for well-conceptualized externally funded grant proposals. The current system does not generate a high return in terms of increasing external grant applications; the system could be modified to improve the return. The funds can be considered as seed money or bridge funding to support submission of grant applications and sustaining research programs during short gaps in funding.
- Evaluate and continue programs (i.e., grant proposal support program) that provide support and mentoring to pre-tenure faculty by external grant consultants in grant writing

#### Faculty composition and workload

In order to strengthen a culture of research, it is critical that Miami consider faculty composition and workloads to allow faculty to engage in activities that represent their strengths. Consideration of the "teacher-scholar" model with flexibility that allows some faculty to devote greater effort towards teaching and other faculty to devote greater effort and time towards research would allow us to strengthen research productivity without compromising the excellence in teaching. This could be accomplished in two ways. First, consideration of faculty composition may include discussion of optimal ratios of TTL faculty to LCPL faculty to ensure strengths in both research and teaching. Currently, there are ongoing conversations in University Senate about faculty composition, specifically the ratio of tenure-track faculty to teaching, clinical and professionally licensed (TCPL) faculty. Perhaps those conversations can be informed by and inform faculty engagement in research. Further, our subcommittee discussed the merits of adding lines for "research faculty" who engage exclusively in research and whose salaries are paid by grant funding. Many medical centers and Carnegie-classified R1 universities successfully use this model, and it may be viable in specific disciplines at Miami (e.g. structural biology, biomedical research, social science).

Our subcommittee also reviewed teaching loads of faculty across departments and campuses and noted that there is significant variation across departments, but relatively little variation among tenure/tenure track faculty within a department. The university currently requires all departments to have workload policies that allow for variation in the division of a faculty member's time based on their strengths. The university should consider ways to improve the differentiation of workload across faculty in recognition of differences in research productivity, and also allow for significant variation in the mix of faculty across

departments (e.g. TCPL versus TTL) based on the types of courses taught (e.g. introductory versus upper level, undergraduate versus graduate, majors versus non-majors), accreditation requirements and the research productivity of the faculty. We recommend that:

- Departments or divisions develop clear criteria for measuring research productivity within departments/divisions in the allocation of workload.
- The review process should occur on a regularly scheduled basis and the person or persons performing the review would be clearly defined.
- Faculty who are research productive have lower teaching loads and faculty who are not research productive have higher teaching loads across departments.
- Give departments/units more power to determine staffing needs (TT, TCPL, Research Faculty) within a budget to allow for teaching reductions (buy-outs) for research productive faculty.
- Evaluate performance of the provost, deans and department chairs not only on standard metrics, but also on upholding workload and P&T policies and for initiatives/actions to increase external funding.

#### **Area 2: Develop areas of specialization and interdisciplinary collaboration to enhance external funding.**

A key step in strengthening Miami's research profile is to develop specific areas of specialization that reflect the expertise of Miami faculty, are conducive to involvement of undergraduate students and are feasible to develop given the limitations such as having no medical school that universities with significant external funding (i.e., UC, OSU) typically have. The development of these niche areas can utilize existing centers and institutes, opportunities created by Boldly Creative initiatives, and new initiatives that support interdisciplinary research in the niche areas.

##### Centers and Institutes

Currently, Miami University has 41 centers and institutes, of which 23 are designated as "Research," 26 as "Consultation and Services," and four as "Program Evaluation" (some are double-listed), with three identified as Ohio Centers of Excellence.<sup>2</sup> Centers serve as important opportunities for interdisciplinary research and horizontal integration across the university.<sup>3</sup> A strength of Miami is the opportunity for faculty and students to focus on and explore a niche through research.<sup>4</sup> According to a 2017 report based on the National Survey of Student Engagement, 40 percent of seniors at Miami worked on a research project during their time at Miami University. This is 16 percentage points higher than Carnegie R2 peers and clearly one of Miami's distinguishing characteristics. However, a major roadblock to such interdisciplinary research is that specialization of research activity has resulted in silos. Furthermore, there is no systematic effort for faculty members across the university to learn about each other's expertise and develop collaborative research ideas to build synergy. Miami should invest in and grow opportunities for increased interdisciplinary research within and across colleges. Great examples of these efforts are the ones from the Humanities Center and the Scripps Gerontology Center, which bring

---

<sup>2</sup> For a list of Centers and Institutes, see <http://miamioh.edu/research/partnering/centers-institutes/>. The Ohio Centers of Excellence at Miami University are the Gerontology Center and Scripps Foundation, Center for Structural Biology and Metabonomics, and the Institute for Entrepreneurship. The first two are identified as research centers and the Institute for Entrepreneurship is listed as supporting consultation and services.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://miamioh.edu/research/partnering/centers-institutes/> for a list of centers and institutes at Miami University.

<sup>4</sup> The NSSE report is available at [https://miamioh.edu/\\_files/documents/oir/surveys/nsse/17-hip-o.pdf](https://miamioh.edu/_files/documents/oir/surveys/nsse/17-hip-o.pdf).

together faculty members with similar interests from different departments or groups to tackle a particular idea/problem or challenge and invests in their efforts.

**Specific recommendations for promoting collaboration include:**

- Have centers report to OARS, specifically the vice president for Research, to promote interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Develop university standards for allocation of overhead across divisions and departments when a grant or contract includes researchers from different divisions.
- Dedicate additional financial resources for efforts by centers and affiliated faculty to develop programs for improving teaching (scholarship of teaching), advancing research and generating new revenue.
- Ask centers to set meeting times devoted to internal peer review of publications or grants prior to seeking support from an external OARS consultant for a review (e.g., Burr Zimmerman).
- Develop a mechanism similar to program review to regularly evaluate centers and institutes to ensure that they remain active and are continuously improving, ensuring that university resources expended by or for those centers are efficiently used and provide measurable, positive outcomes.

**New Initiatives to support niche areas**

Investments in new research activities centered around niche areas should be prioritized to maximize the return on expenditures. This may include review and reorganization of internal grants and funding mechanisms (see Area 1 recommendations) to support interdisciplinary teams, as well as review of graduate programs and consideration of new doctoral programs that support niche areas. Doctoral programs are vital to attracting and retaining research-active faculty given the role of doctoral students in supporting faculty research. Federal funding agencies view the presence of doctoral programs as an essential aspect of research infrastructure at an institution. Doctoral students also provide peer-mentoring opportunities to undergraduate students and contribute to undergraduate student engagement in research, facilitating their interest in pursuing graduate studies. The impact of a small number of high quality PhD programs on external funding and research reputation can be significant. Between 2016 and 2018, 46 percent of external funding at Miami was generated by faculty in five PhD programs.<sup>5</sup> Miami should consider developing new PhD programs if there is a clear opportunity for external funding in a cost-effective way. While external funding should be an important consideration, approval of a new program should also be based on evidence of a rising demand for the degree and the existence of a faculty group that has a strong reputation in the area to develop the program and attract others.

**Specific recommendations to facilitate expansion of research in new areas include:**

- Invest in an Office of Innovation to replace Technology Transfer to increase business development activities.
- Consider small grants or other mechanisms to support temporary groups of faculty organized around a central issue with the goal of producing a deliverable such as acquisition of data or grant writing.
- Evaluate existing graduate programs and consider reallocation of existing assistantships. In the evaluation process, we recommend that the following criteria be considered:
  - Is the program a niche interdisciplinary programs in emerging areas (unique to Ohio)?

---

<sup>5</sup> This is based on information provided by the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship (OARS) available at <https://miamioh.edu/research/communications/annual-reports/index.html>.

- What is the net cost of the program, its reputation and the placement of graduate students?
  - Does the existence of the program improve the undergraduate program (e.g. do graduate students assist with undergraduate research)? Do high performing undergraduates enroll in some of the graduate courses?
  - What is the effect of the graduate program on faculty research productivity (external funding and/or publications)?
- Consider development of new PhD programs that support niche areas and have high potential for increasing external funding. For example, consider a PhD program that would combine engineering and sciences (e.g., Engineering Science or Engineering Physics). To make development of such a program cost effective, the departments involved should consider several options.
  - Consider converting existing GA lines for MS students into GA lines for PhD students.
  - Incorporate portions of departments into existing PhD programs such as the Cellular, Molecular, and Structural Biology (CMSB) graduate program.
  - Create a core curriculum across physics and multiple engineering departments that results in a net decrease in the number of graduate courses offered.
  - Base participation of faculty in the new PhD program upon fit of their research into the focus and mission of the new program. Membership in a particular department should not automatically garner participation in the new PhD program.

#### Build Synergy with Boldly Creative Initiatives

As the Boldly Creative initiatives take shape, we encourage the implementation team to consider possibilities for building research synergies to enhance opportunities for external funding and student engagement in research and scholarship. For example, consider how the growth of data analytics program faculty and computing resources might be structured to enhance research productivity in other areas in the collection and analysis of new data.

Where possible, leverage the growth of new or existing programs to improve research productivity and/or external funding. To the extent that the Boldly Creative programs include additional faculty, consider how these new faculty might be used to create “clusters” of expertise that could improve research productivity or external funding; potential clusters could be within a discipline or interdisciplinary.

In the case of the data analytics program, there is clear opportunity to enhance research across a wide range of disciplines. These new programs could be structured in a way that would improve faculty access to data and hopefully assist in the acquisition of new data. The university should consider the possibility of creating a data acquisition center where faculty and/or students in the program can serve as “contractors” who can acquire data for other faculty or external constituencies for a negotiated price. These experiences could serve as experiential learning opportunities for undergraduates.

#### **Area 3: External research visibility and reputation**

Miami University’s ability to attract and retain high-quality faculty and students is partly based upon its research reputation within the academic and broader community. This reputation is built in numerous ways – first and foremost, the research and scholarship that Miami produces and the impact it has on the research community. Also vitally important is the communication of this research to other constituents – prospective students, potential faculty and the public at large. Positive press coverage of

Miami University research activity makes the university a stronger magnet for external funding and private donations. To help improve the visibility of Miami's research, we recommend the following.

The university should identify and support new niches of expertise (see Area 2 recommendations) to increase the university's reputation and visibility in specific areas of research. Where possible, an emphasis should be placed on the role that undergraduates played in the research. Miami should improve its efforts to publicize the research activity of interdisciplinary centers organized around niches of expertise, so Miami can be well-known for particular areas. This could be facilitated by asking each division and center to provide a brief synopsis of some research that University Communications and Marketing could use to generate press releases on a quarterly or semi-annual basis. Also, a University News and Communications person should be identified to work with specific areas and generate press releases describing the results of new research for dissemination to national news outlets. To identify especially strong areas, OARS should develop a series of metrics and create support infrastructure to enhance external visibility (centers, funding, etc.). Some metrics that should be considered for identifying areas of expertise include the following: the level of external funding; undergraduate involvement in research, citations and scholarly output; creative achievements; department and program rankings; community impact; and engagement.

**Specific recommendations for improving visibility include:**

- Establish a "Research" tab on Miami's home webpage (not embedded within the current "Academics" tab) that allows a viewer to identify different areas of research strengths and some sense of the kinds of research activity at Miami.
- Standardize the layout and information included on faculty profiles within university webpages to make it simpler for external groups to identify experts.
- Revamp and leverage social media accounts (e.g. Twitter, Facebook) to improve communication of new research results.
- Track visibility to the public via Google and Twitter Analytics as well as a press clipping service.
- Track and highlight undergraduate research accomplishments (e.g. Undergraduate Summer Scholars, First Year Research Experience) at the department and divisional level via the Office of Research for Undergraduates.
- Submit press releases advertising significant research/grant awards.

## **Appendix**

In addition to meeting with faculty members in a wide variety of disciplines and considering input received from the steering committee's listening sessions, the subcommittee met with the following stakeholders for input throughout the drafting process:

*Jerome Conley, Dean and University Librarian*

*Michael Dantley, Dean, College of Education, Health, and Society*

*Marek Dollár, Dean, College of Engineering and Computing*

*Christopher Makaroff, Dean, College of Arts and Science*

*Liz Mullenix, Dean, College of Creative Arts*

*Jim Oris, Dean, Graduate School*

*Marc Rubin, Dean, Farmer School of Business*

*Daryl Baldwin, Director, Myaamia Center*

*Suzanne Kunkel, Director, Scripps Gerontology Center*

*Timothy Melley, Director, Miami University Humanities Center*

*Jennifer Green, Associate Clinical Professor of Psychology, co-chair of the ad hoc committee on faculty composition*

The subcommittee consulted the following documents and data:

Hanover Research. (2014). Building a culture of research: recommended practices. Retrieved from <https://www.hanoverresearch.com/media/Building-a-Culture-of-Research-Recommended-Practices.pdf>

Huenneke, L. F., Stearns, D. M., Martinez, J. D., & Laurila, K. (2017). Key strategies for building research capacity of university faculty members. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42(5-6), 421-435.

National Science Foundation (2018). Higher Education Research and Development Survey : Fiscal Year 2017. Retrieved from [https://ncsesdata.nsf.gov/herd/2017/html/herd2017\\_dst\\_05.html](https://ncsesdata.nsf.gov/herd/2017/html/herd2017_dst_05.html)

Office for Advancement for Research and Scholarship (2018). Annual report 2018 fiscal year.

Miami University, Oxford, OH

Office for Advancement for Research and Scholarship (2017). Action plan- Increase external funding.  
Miami University, Oxford, OH.

**Appendix Table A1.**

<b>R&amp;D Expenditures Reported to NSF by Fiscal Year</b>										
Institution	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Med School?	#PhD Pgms	PhD Engineer	PhD Physics	NoEng NoPhys
<b>Ohio Schools:</b>										
Ohio State U.	832,126	766,513	793,373	815,075	817,881	Y	81	13	3	
U. Cincinnati	448,936	433,668	438,642	422,873	436,028	Y	45	8	1	
Case Western Reserve U.	429,206	431,090	425,788	419,011	401,527	Y	67	11	1	
U. Dayton	90,557	81,030	84,252	86,881	98,182	N	7	4	1	
Ohio U.	57,643	57,203	59,734	60,800	61,078	Y	27	4	1	
U. Akron	60,352	66,413	69,640	69,528	58,512	N	20	10	0	
Cleveland State U.	55,502	61,111	67,378	61,783	57,662	N	15	4	0	
Wright State U.	48,501	46,213	50,489	54,985	54,289	Y	8	3	0	
U. Toledo	74,149	68,228	69,072	61,900	52,354	N	30	5	1	
Kent State U.	27,455	26,507	23,149	25,666	38,069	N	23	0	1	
Miami U.	26,093	26,311	23,924	21,216	16,108	N	12	0	0	X
Bowling Green State U.	8,999	8,566	13,157	8,861	7,995	N	17	0	0	X
Youngstown State U.	4,732	3,598	3,785	3,464	3,348	N	1	1	0	
Central State U.	3,821	3,591	2,771	2,025	1,508	N	0	0	0	X
<b>Other Benchmarks:</b>										
Brown U.	344,090	365,120	361,010	341,531	342,040	Y	44	2	1	
U. Notre Dame	134,410	157,691	175,220	182,228	190,954	N/Y*	26	6	1	
Portland State U.	58,975	58,489	55,435	54,787	53,872	N	20	5	1	
U. Southern Mississippi	46,591	60,079	51,962	51,938	51,840	N	23	1	0	
Boston C.	52,253	51,442	50,702	49,724	47,761	N	14	0	1	
Texas State U.	33,487	36,664	37,053	39,265	47,694	N	10	1	0	
U. Memphis	48,321	51,194	48,141	55,566	46,675	N	19	2	0	
Florida A&M U.	53,326	52,263	51,149	46,367	46,522	N	10	6	0	
San Jose State U.	40,149	34,727	38,326	43,509	45,037	N	0	0	0	X
U. North Texas, Denton	42,475	46,943	49,518	44,180	43,628	N	39	4	1	

R&D Expenditures Reported to NSF by Fiscal Year										
Institution	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Med School?	#PhD Pgms	PhD Engineer	PhD Physics	NoEng NoPhys
Brigham Young U., Provo	37,142	33,843	36,562	38,051	39,126	N	22	4	2	
Lehigh U.	32,086	31,992	35,220	37,066	36,788	N	30	14	1	
Northern Arizona U.	30,785	28,100	30,516	31,590	35,206	N	12	2	1	
Boise State U.	24,204	27,920	25,690	26,568	31,341	N	6	2	1	
U. West Florida	21,710	16,221	19,332	19,579	31,232	N	0	0	0	X
U. California, Merced	21,328	22,656	22,909	23,916	29,688	N	13	3	1	
Southern Methodist U.	24,453	24,397	22,544	32,401	29,282	N	33	4	2	
U. Massachusetts, Dartmouth	25,644	22,732	27,326	28,219	26,776	N	9	3	0	
U. Missouri, Kansas City	32,769	29,227	28,829	29,164	26,595	N	10	0	1	
San Francisco State U.	26,198	30,291	33,885	29,457	26,345	N	1	0	0	X
U. Tulsa	19,489	20,270	21,757	27,077	25,066	N	14	3	1	
U. North Carolina, Charlotte	27,533	25,141	24,764	23,342	24,870	N	18	3	1	
Rutgers, State U. New Jersey, Newark	35,774	34,797	37,134	28,083	24,387	N	21	1	0	
Catholic U. of America	25,397	24,971	23,235	22,331	24,265	N	14	0	1	
U. North Carolina, Greensboro	26,121	19,080	16,590	20,723	23,026	N	17	0	0	X
Florida Atlantic U.	62,024	65,377	23,967	22,997	21,214	N	19	5	1	
Fordham U.	18,350	19,311	18,822	17,961	20,939	N	10	0	0	X
Tennessee State U.	13,468	15,439	16,177	20,068	19,955	N	4	1	0	
Illinois State U.	17,833	17,760	17,589	19,159	18,742	N	13	0	0	X
Idaho State U.	21,450	21,179	22,147	20,610	17,866	N	13	1	1	
Northern Illinoi U.	21,748	21,823	23,027	16,427	17,722	N	23	0	1	
Georgia Southern U.	3,912	5,719	18,069	20,245	17,152	N	2	0	0	X
Oakland U.	15,868	18,194	16,767	15,196	17,108	N	14	3	1	
Duquesne U.	16,814	15,547	15,661	15,025	16,159	N	12	0	0	X
U. Denver	17,004	15,237	19,262	18,183	16,116	N	24	6	1	
Ball State U.	18,765	11,740	10,357	9,209	10,548	N	12	0	0	X

\*Med School = joint program w/ IUSM-SB