# Research Networking

**(systems that manage rich faculty profiles of interests and accomplishments to support collaboration, business intelligence, and administrative uses)**

By: William Barnett, Indiana University School of Medicine, Juany Jardines, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, the CTSA Research Networking Affinity Group.

## Technology

There are 4 technology components:

- A controlled vocabulary (eg., the VIVO Ontology) for data interoperability
- An architecture for data integration and sharing (Linked Open Data)
- Applications for collaboration, funding, business intelligence, or administration
- Rich faculty profile data of publications, grants, classes, affiliations, interests, etc.

Repositories of profile data need to talk to institutional systems like faculty directories.

## Use Cases

**For Investigators:**
- Discover potential collaborators
- More rapidly and competitively form teams
- Identify targeted grant opportunities
- Create digital vitae

**For Administrators:**
- Better data for Institutional business intelligence
- Better assess performance for annual reviews
- Recruit new faculty and attract students

**For Researchers:**
- Study networks of science teams to improve research effectiveness

## Opportunities / Threats

**Opportunities:**
- Supports innovative team building approaches
- Provides richer data for comparative institutional studies
- Potential for national networks of collaborative research

**Threats:**
- Some desired data are private (eg., award amounts) or restricted (eg., FERPA)
- Requires negotiation between research and administrative efforts
- Efforts threaten established networks of research influence

## Strategic Considerations

**Consider:**
- Leveraging existing institutional efforts for research networking and annual faculty review
- Understanding institutional culture and policy for faculty information sharing
- Making the technology investments to develop the required new capabilities.

**Identifying sources of available high quality profile data (institutional, corporate, federal, Linked Open Data cloud)**

**Can you:**
- Use existing research or administrative initiatives and workflows that manage profile data?
- Overcome institutional cultures that may not prevent data use for research networking?
- Bring together (typically) multiple initiatives that manage faculty profile data in a sustainable institutional strategy?

## Resource Links

- **CTSA Central Recommendations and Best Practices for Research Networking**
- **VIVO**
- **Wikipedia Page:** [Comparison of Research Networking Tools and Research Profiling Systems](http://example.com)
- **Direct2Experts national CTSA research networking pilot**

### Example Implementations

- VIVO at U. Florida, Cornell U., Indiana U., Washington U., Weill Cornell Medical College (and others); **Loki** at U. Iowa;
- Profiles at Harvard U., UCSD, U. of Minnesota, Wake Forest, Health Sciences South Carolina (and others);
- Community Academic Profiles at Stanford U.; **SciVal** at Northwestern U., U. Michigan, MD Anderson Cancer Center, REACH NC (North Carolina), U. Maryland (and others)

Many other tools exist as well (see Wikipedia page at right)

Note: currently only VIVO, Profiles, and Loki fully support standardized public linked open data.

---

Much of the impetus for Research Networking comes from the CTSA Program, particularly the Research Networking Affinity group and the VIVO program, funded by NCRR (now NCATS).