May 9, 2005, 1:00 pm., UW2 327

Present: Andrea Kovalesky, Kevin Laverty, Jim Miller, Clark Olson, Bill Seaburg, Jane Van Galen and Linda Watts

The EC approved a modification to its earlier approval of the new criteria for Faculty Honors.

Based upon a recommendation from Hung Dang, Registrar, the new criteria approved on April 25, 2005 were approved to be effective for Autumn quarter 2006.

Policies and structures to support faculty research

Discussion centered on the proposed Office of Research Support (previously called the Office of Sponsored Research) and other possibilities for initiatives to support faculty research and to continue to stimulate and build a "research culture" at UWB. Prior to the meeting, EC members had received a June 2004 report from the Instruction and Research Support Committee entitled "Building a Research Culture at the University of Washington, Bothell." (The EC approved Kevin's sending this to Vice Chancellor Tom Bellamy with a note indicating that it is a committee report for discussion only and has not been approved or endorsed by EC or GFO. This report had previously not been sent to 2004-2005 EC members.)

We noted that in last two academic years there have been three processes addressing faculty research (the first two in 2003-2004 occurred in parallel): 5-for-5, a task force charged by the Vice Chancellor, and the current proposal for the Office of Research Support.

The following points summarize the discussion:

a.   All EC members are strongly and categorically in favor of increasing resources – including permanent budget funding – to support faculty research. We feel this is long overdue.
   b. Our plan for supporting research should recognize and respect that the faculty, as a whole, do and will continue to do both sponsored and non-sponsored research. Some EC members expressed the fear that focusing too much on sponsored research will reinforce a view that non-sponsored research is not as valued or valid. We recognize that many faculty, because of discipline and/or research programs, will not benefit directly from support for sponsored research.
   c. A number of examples were discussed addressing the benefits to faculty (e.g., grant writing workshops, direct support for proposal-generation, availability of funds to seed projects) from a UWB-based office that would support and expand access to sponsored research.
   d. While no one expressed opposition to the *principle* of support for sponsored research, the opinions of EC members vary widely on the specific proposal for an Office of Research Support. We do not have a consensus on this proposal.
      1. Some would endorse the proposal outright.
      2. Some are not prepared to endorse the proposal without modifications and assurances that address concerns for support of non-sponsored research. (One EC member stated that these modifications could not be simply cosmetic.)
      3. Some argued that building a research culture should not start with support for sponsored research.

4. Some would endorse the proposal although recognizing that it would serve only a segment for the faculty, on the principle that any funding for research is a good thing and the sum requested is not excessive.

e. There was much discussion how an Office for Research Support should be managed if one is established. Although there was no call for consensus, there was general support for the items listed as [f] though [k] below

   f. If the Office of Research Support is funded through the budget process, the EC anticipates the continuation of "continuing to refine the proposal" discussions between the Vice Chancellor and the EC for the purpose of meet faculty and campus needs.

   g. An Office for Research Support should recognize and support the different faculty needs. (In other words, this should not just solve the problems of faculty who "bring in the money.")

      1. Some are currently successful in sponsored research and would like to have a local UWB unit continue and improve administrative support.
      2. Some are not involved in sponsored research and need help starting (including even knowing basic things about writing a grant proposal)
      3. Some will not benefit directly from support for sponsored research, and some faculty who are successful in sponsored research also have projects that are non-sponsored. In either case, faculty would benefit from other types of support for research (e.g., course releases, ability to stack courses to create research quarters).

h. After appropriate discussion and approval, the recommendations of the June 2004 Instruction and Research Support Committee should be integrated into the activities of the Office of Research Support.

   i. An Office for Research Support should not be funded without a mechanism for a thorough assessment within 2-3 years and a process that includes a willingness to consider the possibility of disbanding the Office.

   j. The indicators of success should be holistic, including pervasive impact, and should be based upon the principle of inclusion. We would want these indicators to include such items as percentage of faculty supported and percentage supported who are assistant professors. We do not want an Office of Research Support whose sole indicator of success is "how much money did new net last year?"

   k. The initial advisory board should not be limited to faculty who have been successful at and/or are active in sponsored research.

Budget

Kevin described the second budget workshop, held on Friday May 6. He expressed surprise that this workshop had turned out to be "information only" (as was the first -- "budget 101" -- workshop), as he had expected that choices would have been made at this second workshop regarding the competing academic and administrative requests for funding. Kevin will update the EC as to process when he has more information. While none currently are scheduled, additional "special" EC meetings may be necessary.