

Faculty Senate Research Committee

Annual Report (2017-2018)

Submitted by Joshua D. Summers, Chair (April 6, 2018)

Research committee members:

	ID	College
Summers, Joshua	jsummer	CECAS
Paul, Kim	kpaul	CS
Zinzow, Heidi	hzinzow	CBSHS
Husson, Scott	shusson	CECAS
Ersoy, Ufuk	uersoy	CAAH
Jesch, Elliot	ejesch	CAFLS
Creager, Steve	screage	CS
Spitler, Hugh	hspitle	CBSHS
Davis, Eric	ericd	CECAS
Long, Nathan	Nlong2	CAFLS

Major Initiatives/Discussions

Two significant efforts were pursued during the 2017-2018 Senate session. First, a benchmarking process was used to understand how other institutions incorporate research faculty into their shared governance structures. The findings were presented to the Senate EAC and sent to the Policy Committee for consideration. Second, the committee sought to understand the current research culture/climate at Clemson University through discussions with research support staff, college associate deans, and the Vice President of Research. The findings from these discussions are summarized below and suggest that there is a disparity between the different colleges in services, expectations, and funding, that the University does not fundamentally have a research culture, and that resources are lacking to help faculty focus on scholarship. It is interesting to note that CECAS was the only college that mentioned explicitly inclusion and equity as a critical focus or goal of the college with respect to research culture. No college considers itself to be a true "R1 College". Further, the faculty were represented on Safety, Conflict of Interest, and Intellectual Property Committees through Research Committee members.

List of Interviewees:

Bettie McGowan-Hudson (CBSHS/CEd research support)
Dianne Myers (CECAS pre-awards)
Terry Rumpf (CECAS pre-awards)
Cheryl Summers (CECAS post-awards)
Jean McKendry (CBSHS/CEd research support)
Eric Muth (CBSHS ADR)
Jim Spencer (CAAH ADR)
Doug Hirt (CECAS ADR)
Tanju Karanfil (VPR)

Benchmarking Summary:

Research Faculty are designated as "special faculty" within the Clemson University Faculty Manual. Under this definition, certain rights and privileges are accorded. Other special faculty, however, have different rights and privileges, such as Lecturers being allowed to serve as non-voting members of the Faculty Senate. The Research Committee has benchmarked the status of Research Faculty at comparable institutions (Carnegie Research Very High, Public, without Medical Schools). The results from the benchmark reports submitted by the committee members

Faculty Senate Research Committee

are summarized below.

School	Title	Definition	Representation on Faculty Senate	Access to Grievance Process	Union Representation	Reviewer
Penn State	Research Professor (w/Rank)	T, A	F	C	E	KP
University of Delaware	(Senior) Research Fellow	T, A, S	L	N	E	EJ
U of Mass. – Amherst	Research Professor (w/Rank)	S	F	P	E	SC
U of Cal. – Berkeley	(Rank) Research (position, e.g., Physicist)	S	N	C	E	SH
U of Cal. – Riverside	Specialist (w/Rank)	T,	N	P	N	UE
University of Arkansas	Research Professor (w/Rank)	T, A	N	P	NA	HZ
U. of Neb. – Lincoln	Research Professor (Associate, Senior)	T, A, S	L	C	NA	HS
Definition Options: (T) = Terminal Degree, (A) = Advising Responsibilities, (S) = Supported on Research Grants Representation on Faculty Senate (or comparable): (F) = Full Representation, (D) = Delegate Status, (L) = Limited by Departmental/College Definitions, (N) = Not represented Access to Grievance Process: (C) = Complete Access, same as Tenure Track Faculty, (P) = Partial Access, Limited, (N) = Not accessible through Faculty Senate Union Representation: (E) = Encouraged, (N) = Not eligible, (NA) = No established union						

It is the recommendation from the Research Committee that the Welfare and/or Policy Committee address the current inequities in our representation of faculty on the Faculty Senate. Specifically, it is recommended that Research Faculty be granted Delegate status in the same way that Lecturers are recognized for their contributions to the mission of the University.

Research Culture

Several staff and administrators were interviewed by the Research Committee to develop an understanding of the research culture and climate that spans the university across the colleges. The interview summaries are included below:

Research Support Staff

- 1) What type of training of Faculty do you do with respect to research responsibilities?
 - a. CHSBS/CEd: Voluntary grant writing workshop (in the 10th year). This is aimed at new career/early faculty, but is open to all faculty. Twenty-two faculty across the two colleges are attending. If they attend and complete activities, then they are given \$400 in their incentive accounts. There are five sessions: how to articulate a good research question, how to form teams, how to articulate specific research aims with examples, how to budget, and how to talk with program managers. Each participant gets a grant writing workbook from relevant funding agency (NIH, NSF, USDA, etc.). There are two parallel offerings offered for each session. Each session is 100 minutes in duration.
 - b. CECAS: Workshops are offered to post-docs currently. Previously, these brownbag sessions were offered to faculty but few were attending. Some topics are discussed in new faculty orientation (~30 minutes). This includes: what are the basics for a budget, what services are available, and what required training and PI certification is needed. Faculty are encouraged to come see the OSP offices.
- 2) What type of interaction do you have with the faculty during the proposal development process?
 - a. CECAS: Since the introduction of the electronic approval process, fewer faculty are coming through the offices for proposal support.
 - b. CHSBS/CEd: Most of the faculty will come to the office prior to proposal development

Faculty Senate Research Committee

and submission. Faculty will meet with the awards coordinator to plan the process together.

- 3) What do you wish the faculty knew about the process?
 - a. Faculty are responsible for financial and technical aspects. This means that faculty are supposed to know when the project closes, when to move students between projects, and what the different budget categories mean (participant support vs. stipend). Financial aspects of the project management are still the responsibility of the faculty member.
 - b. The OSP offices seek to be collaborative team members of the research projects. These are educated professionals who have been trained to provide research support services. To enable this, it would be ideal to spend time with each faculty member at the beginning of the project (post awards) to develop an appropriate plan. Post-awards offices can provide better support if the faculty helps explain the goals and intents of the project.
 - c. The offices are understaffed. If faculty could be more responsive to emails and to read and follow instructions, it would smooth the process.
 - d. It is felt that the post-awards offices are not valued within the college and by the faculty. This is having a chilling effect with respect of office morale.
 - e. Corrections can be avoided, and time and effort saved, if faculty will work with the post-awards offices early in the process. Simple errors that faculty and departmental staff make can be avoided if the post-awards offices are included earlier in the process.
 - f. Faculty are responsible for knowing the guidelines of the proposal processes.
 - g. The professional staff understands and appreciates the demands on faculty time, but at the same time, it is only proper and respectful that faculty reciprocate.
 - h. It is not clear where the responsibilities for different proposal and project management activities lie. For example, who is responsible for uploading documents into Fastlane for the project? Faculty assume that professional staff are responsible for this, but the professional staff often do not have access to all aspects of research.gov.
- 4) What is the research culture at Clemson?
 - a. As research programs grow the regulatory environment will also grow. With this increase, staff and administrators will be added to monitor and respond to new oversight requests. The training and education of the faculty on these new compliance and regulatory management expectations is not clearly supported. The changes need to be communicated to faculty who are both early in their career and to established faculty. Often, the faculty do not seem to respect the professional staff who are tasked with supporting these increasing demands.
 - b. The professional staff do not feel respected. They want to know who we can change this perception. One approach to start to change this is that the CECAS post-awards office is providing presentations to departmental meetings on an annual basis. The faculty are reminded that FBIS provides expenditure tracking directly for faculty so that they can monitor their projects. At the least, these visits provide a face to the emails that faculty receive requesting information. Further, this allows department chairs the opportunity to support the professional staff by demonstrating that they are a valued and integral part of the research teams.
 - c. The professional staff provide varying types of support throughout the different colleges. This inconsistency creates some imbalance in service levels provided. There appears to be little formal cross-talk between colleges and within colleges among the pre- and post-awards offices.
 - d. The communication lines within the University are broken. As an example, it was announced in this meeting that there was a reorganization of the reporting structure for post-awards (moving from VPR to CFO). Few of the faculty in the meeting seemed to have heard of this action. Further, there was little to no notice given to the professional staff

Faculty Senate Research Committee

about this change in leadership and the rationale behind it.

College of BSHS ADR

- 1) How would you rate the research culture in your college?
 - a. CBSHS is not yet an “R1 College” as it is still in a transition from being focused on teaching to research. If 10 is the worst, the college is 4-6 on a rating of research culture. Only four of the eight departments in the college could be considered “research” departments. To address this, a strategic plan has been developed with the college’s research committee that is mostly focused on advocating for faculty to develop a research culture. Currently, the undergraduate students and programs take precedence over research and scholarship. It is important to recognize that CECAS is the exemplar in the University with respect to what it means to be R1. CBSHS accounts for only 5% of the university research portfolio with only a small portion of the CBSHS faculty responsible for this funding. There is not a good culture to develop faculty or support for tenure if the focus is on research.
- 2) What are the strengths and weaknesses?
 - a. Strengths: CBSHS has the potential to bring in more research funding than the current goal, with resources that support faculty in these efforts.
 - b. Weaknesses/Challenges: The colleges that already bring in more funding (e.g., Engineering) continue to get the most support, awards, etc. which adds barriers to CBSHS ability to move forward with resources and research. Teaching obligations can be detracting from faculty research. Grants support services does not report to ADR.
- 3) What are your major challenges in supporting faculty research and scholarship?
 - a. There is not a common approach to how sponsored programs are supported, staffed, managed, or administered throughout the university. The approaches vary across colleges and this is compounded as support is shared across a couple of colleges with different cultures (CBSHS and CEd share support). Some of this is a result of the reorganization of the University that was done without a clear plan in place.
 - b. CBSHS is aiming for \$8 million; but need to go to \$20 million in research expenditures to be consistent with R1 status. The university culture is building two classes; people/colleges that are the “best”/winners who get more and more resources/awards/attention; CBSHS is not in that category. The Research Recognition Awards being developed by the VPR’s office is a good effort to try to create a broader incentive for colleges and faculty.
 - c. Grad student fees are a challenge currently. The Graduate College is seeking to roll this into tuition, which increases the money needed to hire grad students on grants. This, in turn, incentivizes faculty to support post doctoral researchers instead of PHD students. Increasing the cost for supporting a graduate student makes it more difficult to apply for grants that are smaller, such as the typical grants for faculty in CBSHS.
 - d. Other structural or policy changes that can positively impact research in CBSHS would be creating a centralized software repository and shared research space, creating more flexibility in how to pay for study participants, more skill building in grant writing, developing a marketing plan to publicize research in the college, and increased collaboration between the ADRs and the VPR office.
 - e. We’re not going to fund PhD students because it’s more expensive than postdocs
 - f. Adding more to tuition for grad students makes it hard to apply for grants that are smaller and include them (grants for our college tend to be smaller, so this makes a bigger difference for us than for others)
- 4) What could be a silver bullet for your college?
 - a. Invest resources in lecturers for teaching missions
 - b. Give undergrad tuition dollars for lecturers
 - c. Resources, (hire postdocs to support faculty in manuscript prep and grant writing so that they can obtain external funding to fund future postdocs)

Faculty Senate Research Committee

- d. Create permanent lecturing/teaching position to help handle the general education teaching load in the college.
- e. Create a grants management and support team that directly reports to the CBSHS ADR. All grants personnel could be drawn from the OSP pool, but directly managed within the colleges. All rules should be standardized across the colleges, such as the 3-5 day advance submission requirement.

College of AAH ADR

- 1) How would you rate the research culture in your college?
 - a. CAAH would rate fairly low with respect to research culture. CAAH is definitely not an “R1 College”. The academic structures within the college are not research oriented, but the college is seeking to create a balance of teaching and research. The college needs to promote more PHD programs and develop a stronger graduate student culture by encouraging students to contribute to the education system in the college further.
- 2) What are the strengths and weaknesses?
 - a. Strengths: The College’s student outcomes are successful and above standards. Scholars within the college are good at publishing through books as it is a significant promotion tool.
 - b. Weaknesses: The College has a heavy teaching load. Internal funding support for scholarship is limited. Finally, there is a lack of interdisciplinary research programs that could strengthen the collaboration across colleges.
- 3) What are your major challenges in supporting faculty research and scholarship?
 - a. The greatest challenge that CAAH faces is balancing research and teaching tasks. The emphasis of tenure promotion system is still on teaching. Furthermore, the measure of success in terms of teaching remains unclear. An important challenge is to establish a stronger link between teaching and research. Creative inquiry is a good model that can be adapted to graduate education.
 - b. Another challenge within CAAH is in how to develop a discourse that will articulate creativity with research. This aims to eliminate the distance between academicians in arts and science institutes providing research funds.
- 4) What could be a silver bullet for your college?
 - a. STEAM: To play a stronger role in STEAM that will allow Clemson to envision a unique definition of science, technology engineering, arts and math initiatives integrated with humanities and human life. This will not only let CAAH engender alternative questions and technologies but also distinguish Clemson from MIT and other programs with a stronger community impact. The central question for which CAAH can search an answer is “What to produce?” and “Why?”
- 5) What initiatives are being implemented that could benefit (through replication) other colleges?
 - a. CAAH, especially Department of English is very good at Summer teaching. The advantage is that the College and departments keep this revenue to buy courses from other terms to reduce the teaching load.
 - b. As mentioned, CAAH faculty are good at book publishing. This enables scholars to address larger audience and sustains our reputation.
 - c. CAAH Design and Build facilities work well and accessible for students 7/24.
- 6) How does your research office support proposal development, post-awards management, compliance, etc.?
 - a. Diana Thrasher and Brad Elliott are very helpful and productive in Grand Proposal writing. They assist with developing budgets, verifying necessary forms and templates and explaining the requirements for submission. The Office of Research Support negotiate and accept awards on applicants’ behalf. All Pre-award / Grant Proposal process works well. However, CAAH is very under staffed for post-awards management with reference to the low rate of awards received in the past.

Faculty Senate Research Committee

- 7) What would you like to faculty to understand or appreciate about your office?
 - a. Faculty should see CAAH research not as an administration office they have to stop by for signature but more as a hub that brings together people interested in making research. For this purpose, CAAH plans to ask scholars who already achieved significant proposals to share their experiences with others. To invite some experienced scholars from other colleges will also make CAAH faculty aware of ongoing research projects and support the interdisciplinary approach.

College of ECAS ADR

- 1) How would you describe/rate the research culture in your college?
 - a. The CECAS trend over the years has been for increasing level of collaborative research, both within and across colleges. Junior faculty are especially good at seeking out collaborators.
 - b. CECAS still has significant work to do to be like other R1 engineering colleges – primarily due to low faculty/staff numbers compared to other universities which means that the CECAS faculty spend much more time on service and teaching activities at the expense of research.
- 2) What are the strengths and weaknesses?
 - a. Strengths: It is a good thing that the college is trying to provide internal resources for specific initiatives. Examples are Tiger Grant seed funding to develop center type proposals, money to travel to see program managers (often for junior faculty) and recruiting supplements to attract top graduate students. The CECAS pre-awards staff has tons of experience. Departments in the college do a good job with recruiting weekends. Though, the college has limited involvement at this time.
 - b. Weaknesses: One challenge is to make communication between the pre-award and post-award staff more efficient. Another challenge is getting high quality domestic students. Diversity of the faculty and graduate students needs to be improved.
- 3) What are your major challenges in supporting faculty research and scholarship?
 - a. Fundamentally, there is never enough money. There is opportunity for developing new core facilities. Vision is to include space for such facilities as part of new building construction and then support them with staff and resources for instrument maintenance. Finding ways to pay the salaries for the support staff is a big challenge. Providing competitive start-up packages is a challenge that will be compounded by filling openings caused by retirements and also adding 50 new faculty by 2026. Five million dollars per year is the estimate. Space is a challenge to grow the college. Helping faculty to decide when industry support is worth the effort is a challenge. Only 5% of sponsored research is from industry. Disproportionately large amounts of time and effort are expended for these grants.
- 4) What initiatives are being implemented that could benefit (through replication) other colleges?
 - a. CECAS is thinking about developing a diversity program like the MERGE program at University of Illinois to bring in prospective graduate students from underrepresented communities for a recruiting event. Target is next year. Also looking at ERC programs for best practices in faculty and student professional development.
 - b. CECAS has been sending representatives to attend graduate student career fairs and the SWE conference.
 - c. Faculty workshop for CAREER proposals – now university driven.
 - d. There is an opportunity to think about establishing a recruiting program for international students that sends CECAS representatives to specific countries and institutions. This has been done in the past on more of an ad hoc basis.
- 5) How does your research office support proposal development, post-awards management, compliance, etc.?
 - a. Pre-awards office has four persons handling proposals plus one editor. The staff numbers

Faculty Senate Research Committee

are sufficient now but there may be challenges going forward with projected growth (and as less research active faculty retire and more active junior faculty are hired).

- b. Post-awards needs improvement. Part of the effort can be better faculty training to improve awareness of advantageous and disadvantageous actions. An example is a need to reduce the burden of award modifications.
- 6) What would you like to faculty to understand or appreciate about your office?
- a. The most important message is that they are here to help faculty be successful.
 - b. Years have been spent trying to develop policies that ultimately are meant to be for the good of the organization and then adhering to them.
 - c. The office provides services that improve success with proposal submissions. Pre-awards does everything it can to help get proposals accepted, funded, and not rejected on the basis of something done incorrectly in the application. In addition to proposal processing, editing services are available for proposals and manuscripts.
 - d. CECAS requires a 2-day lead for processing proposals. Such a short timeframe is almost unheard of and should be considered a luxury.