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Context

• Challenge
  – 2012/2013: Requests: $1,802,292, Available: $750,000, Funding rate: 42%
  – How do we allocate the sparse resources in a fair, transparent, and effective way?
  – The current (merit-based) system undoubtedly has flaws.

• FDC brainstorming session
  – What can we do to make this important program better? Think outside of the box.
  – Outcome: 4 specific ideas.

• Faculty feedback through survey
  – AAUP bargaining members: 1,259
  – Clicked on survey URL: 436
  – Survey started: 347
  – Completed survey: 316 (25%)
  – Lots of comments!
Respondent Rank/Appointment Distribution

How many times did you apply?

How many times did you get funded?

94% of applicants who applied at least once got funding.
Faculty Enhancement Applications

How many times did you apply?

Mean: 2.43
Median: 2

How many times did you get funded?

Mean: 1.87
Median: 2

90% of applicants who applied at least once got funding.

Idea 1: Lottery System for Travel Program

“The committee is considering a lottery system for the professional travel program. Applicants would enter the lottery by completing a very simple questionnaire (without a narrative). The lottery system might consider factors such as faculty rank, time since previous funding, presentation, panel participation, session organization, student advancement, etc.). The committee sees the main benefit of such a system in a drastically simplified application process and a more uniform distribution of the funds. How supportive would you be of such a system?”

Mean: 3.02
Median: 3

37% Very unsupportive
18% Somewhat unsupportive
45% Neutral
18% Somewhat supportive
37% Very supportive
Idea 2: Faculty Enhancement Waiting Period

"To increase the chances for investigators to obtain faculty enhancement funding, the committee is evaluating the introduction of a waiting period for previously funded investigators. Considering that faculty enhancement grants have an official duration of 2 years and are intended as "seed" money (and not as continuous funding), how many years should investigators be prevented from applying again?"

90% are in favor of waiting period.

Idea 3: Consider PI’s Total Available Funding

"Many investigators have access to other funding resources, e.g., start-up packages or federal funding. The committee is evaluating the possibility of considering the total amount of funding resources an investigator has available when making faculty enhancement grant funding decisions. The committee believes that such a measure would allow the program to support more investigators who have a substantial need for funds. How supportive would you be of such a rule?"
Idea 4: Faculty Enhancement Funding Groups

“To increase support for faculty development, the committee is considering splitting up the faculty enhancement money into separate pots for pre- and post-tenure faculty as well as by appointment type. Because the criteria for professional development are different in each of these categories, the committee thinks that faculty would be treated more fairly and would have a better chance to get funded within their category. How supportive would you be of this change?”

Overall Program Satisfaction

Mean: 3.01
Median: 3