

## **Class C Resolution requesting that the Deans and Elected Faculty Councils assess the extent of faculty effort expended to generate funding proposals to further the missions of the University of Washington.**

### **Overview:**

- I. Fast Facts - Frequently Asked Questions
  - a. What is this resolution about? This resolution seeks to confirm or refute whether there is adequate UW support for employment required faculty effort to write grants.
  - b. Why is this resolution coming forward? This resolution addresses a problem which was identified last spring in a survey of faculty in the SOM and SPH used to identify potential faculty senate issues.
  - c. Wasn't this issue addressed by the "Faculty Effort Task Force Report"? No, that Task Force focused on clarifying rules and processes to discuss and document faculty support. The report specifically excluded addressing the question of whether support was adequate.
  - d. To which schools does this resolution apply: Schools of Medicine and Public Health (because this issue was identified in a survey of those two schools).
  - e. How big an issue is this? Many faculty in the Schools of Medicine and Public health are appointed without tenure (WOT). Their jobs require them to write grants. For full time employees, the University is required to cover the costs of time spent writing grants. The survey which identified this issue had over 600 respondents, 68% of the SOM and 90% of SPH faculty noted this to be an issue. Ensuring adequate support is important for continued employment. In addition, inaccurate federal faculty effort reporting is a potential compliance problem for the faculty member and for the UW.
  - f. Does this resolution propose a specific outcome? Beyond asking that the problem be examined and reporting back to the Senate and Provost, it does not propose a specific outcome or support. It only seeks to confirm or refute the existence of a problem and if the problem exists characterize the magnitude and urge the deans and elected faculty councils to propose a path forward.
- II. Statement of the Problem: The University of Washington is a leading research institution. Faculty play a crucial role in creating knowledge by designing, seeking funding for and implementing research projects. The recent Task Force on Faculty Effort report lays out a constructive approach to effort reporting ( [FEC Task Force Report](#) ). **The Task Force report, however, lays out a process that could result in faculty getting adequate support for writing grants or could also lead to a reduction in the faculty member's FTE.** For this reason, it is important that additional information on the effort to write grants be far better characterized. Because the available data come from a survey of School of Medicine and School of Public Health Faculty the resolution is narrowly tailored to address this issue first in the Schools of Medicine and Public Health.

The Task Force's report had a number of key findings:

- a. Specifically excluded assessing whether there was adequate support for writing proposals (p5);
- b. Was explicit that faculty should be paid for time spend writing proposals (p17);
- c. Noted that lack of funding "could potentially foster underestimates of proposal preparation activity in FEC reports" (p 5);
- d. Noted that one option if there is not sufficient support is to reduce faculty members FTE support; and
- e. Encouraged a "collaborative effort between deans, elected faculty councils and chairs to assess average faculty effort on proposal writing" (p 5).
- f. Made an explicit recommendation for conversations between chairs and unit heads and faculty members.

The proposed Class C Resolution seeks to encourage a systemic approach to creating an evidence base around the extent of effort required for faculty to write proposals.

- III. Goals:

- a. Confirm or refute the Senate Faculty Survey Result identifying a substantial gap between faculty effort to write proposals and support provided.
  - b. Assess faculty effort to write proposals either as PI's or as collaborators.
  - c. Provide, based on evidence, general guidelines for how much time it likely takes faculty to write proposals which can be used as a key element in discussions on faculty support / faculty effort as per Recommendation 7.
- IV. Key Data Needed to Assess Faculty Effort for the School of Medicine and School of Public Health
- a. Analysis of Office of Sponsored Programs Data (e.g. for the prior year): 1) Number of new and continuation proposals submitted by faculty (by faculty rank, grantors, grant type, total direct and indirect funds requested, and grant duration) (These data should specify if the faculty are included as PI or as a collaborator); 2) success rate for new proposals;
  - b. Departmental support for the prior year by faculty member for writing grants or other unsponsored activities (excluding funding received for teaching, advising, clinical or other service);
  - c. Assessment of level of support for each faculty member by number of new grants submitted either as PI or as a collaborator;
  - d. Survey (collected anonymously because of the risks of underestimation (see Task Force Report P 5)) of all faculty members submitting grants through OSP on the faculty members estimates of effort required for each type of grant they have submitted or participated in over the prior year.
  - e. Consider qualitative surveys (e.g. focus groups) to assess level of support and level of effort.
- V. Process
- The Deans of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health are requested to work with their respective Elected Faculty Councils to review the request and the reasons for the request and to provide the above data for consideration by the Dean and the EFC. Deans and EFC's are welcome to modify the study / data collection so long as the results meet the spirit and intent of the request. The Deans and EFC are asked to provide within one year a report on: 1) The results of the above surveys; 2) Address the question of whether there is sufficient support provided; 3) The estimated effort to write common major grant applications (e.g. NIH); and 4) If there is a gap between support and effort, recommend a path forward to address the gap.

## Appendix

### Faculty Effort Task Force Report Recommendation 7.

#### Recommendation 7:

Faculty members and chairs should be explicitly encouraged and supported to regularly engage in discussion of the type and level of support appropriate to fulfill goals and expectations mutually agreed and set for the faculty member's non-sponsored activities. This includes preparation of new or competitive renewal grant proposals.

The process for negotiating support of non-sponsored activities and ensuring clarity of any agreement reached is advised to include the following process steps:

Dean-level RCR distribution policy transparency to facilitate chair budget planning;

Departmental budget transparency between a chair and their faculty to facilitate individual negotiation of non-sponsored activity support;

A first negotiation of non-sponsored activity to occur at the time of a faculty member's initial appointment and with continuing faculty at each annual or multi-year performance review. To ensure clarity of a negotiated agreement between the parties, issuance of a signed written record of the agreement made regarding distribution of the faculty member's effort and funding or other compensation options in support of their non-sponsored activity; and A conciliation process that complies with the Faculty Code in the event agreement between the parties cannot be reached.

**Resolution:**

WHEREAS ensuring the University of Washington (UW) remains competitive as a leading research university requires the ability to generate competitive proposals- particularly for applications to the US Government, and

WHEREAS Provost Baldasty and Senate Chair (2016-2017) Barsness charged a Task Force on Faculty Effort to produce a report (Final Report Task Force on Faculty Effort Certification (TFFEC)) ( [Task Force Report](#) ) addressing clarification of rules for FEC and the process for discussions between chairs and faculty on level of support for faculty to prepare proposals;

Whereas many UW faculty have, as explicit parts of their jobs, the requirement to generate research proposals, and UW Policy requires that the cost of proposal preparation by full time faculty be covered (TFFEC page 17), and

WHEREAS a survey of over 600 School of Medicine (SOM) and School of Public Health (SPH) faculty showed SOM faculty reported spending on average 15% to 28% FTE on non-sponsored activities and receiving on average 9.6% FTE support from their department. SPH faculty reported spending on average 14% to 30% FTE on non-sponsored activities and receiving on average 10.6% FTE support from their department, and

WHEREAS 68% of SOM faculty and 90% of SPH faculty report their departments do not provide them with additional FTE support when their level of effort on non-sponsored activities exceeds the level of non-sponsored effort typically supported by their department, and

WHEREAS the TFFEC made multiple recommendations including explicitly endorsing open discussions between faculty and chairs on type and level of support for non-sponsored activities (Recommendation 7), and

WHEREAS Recommendation 7 of the TFFEC notes that outcomes of the faculty and chair discussions may **include, but are not limited to, provision of adequate support to generate proposals as may be required to fulfill job expectation or reduction in the faculty members full time equivalent (FTE) support** but with full knowledge of the usual costs for proposal preparation, and

WHEREAS the Task Force, as a proactive measure “encourages a collaborative effort between deans, elected faculty councils and chairs to assess average faculty effort on proposal writing within their units,” therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the UW Faculty Senate strongly urges the Deans and Elected Faculty Councils of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health to: 1) assess the effort required by faculty to generate proposals; 2) assess whether there is adequate support go generate proposals; and 3) if the support is not adequate to recommend a path forward.

The specifics of the report which is requested to be provided within one year to the Faculty Senate and Provost should include:

- I. Key Data Needed to Assess Faculty Effort for the School of Medicine and School of Public Health
  - a. Analysis of Office of Sponsored Programs Data (e.g. for the prior year): 1) Number of new and continuation proposals submitted by faculty (by faculty rank, grantors, grant type, total direct and indirect funds requested, and grant duration) (These data should specify if the faculty are included as PI or as a collaborator); 2) success rate for new proposals;
  - b. Extent of departmental salary support for writing grants or other unsponsored activities (excluding funding received for teaching, advising, clinical or other service) for the prior year by faculty member;
  - c. Assessment of level of support for each faculty member by number of new grants submitted either as PI or as a collaborator;

- d. Survey (collected anonymously because of the risks of underestimation (see Task Force Report P 5)) of all faculty members submitting grants through OSP on the faculty members estimates of effort required for each type of grant they have submitted or participated in over the prior year.
- e. Consider qualitative data gathering (e.g. focus groups) to assess level of support and level of effort.

## II. Process

The Deans of the Schools of Medicine and Public Health are requested to work with their respective Elected Faculty Councils to review the request and the reasons for the request and to provide the above data for consideration by the Deans and the EFC. Deans and EFC's are welcome to modify the study / data collection so long as the results meet the spirit and intent of the request. The Deans and EFC are asked to provide within one year a report to the Faculty Senate and Provost on: 1) The results of the above surveys; 2) Address the question of whether faculty receive sufficient support for writing proposals; 3) The estimated effort to write common major grant applications (e.g. NIH); and 4) If there is a gap between support and effort, recommend a path forward to address the gap.

*Approved by:*  
Faculty Senate  
May 17, 2018