UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly

Research Advisory Committee

2021-2022 Summary of Work

To: Turan Kayaoglu, Chair, Faculty Assembly Leadership

Menaka Abraham, Vice-Chair, Faculty Assembly Leadership

Andrew Seibert, Program Coordinator, Faculty Assembly Leadership

Voting Members:

   John Finke (Chair), Associate Professor, Division of Sciences and Mathematics, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

   Eyhab Al-Masri, Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science and Systems, School of Engineering and Technology

   Yonn Dierwechter, Professor, School of Urban Studies

   Alison Gardell, Assistant Professor, Division of Sciences and Mathematics, School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

   Robin Starr Zape-tah-hol-ah Minthorn, Associate Professor, School of Education

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members:

      Lisa Isozaki (Director, Office of Research),

      Cheryl Greengrove (Associate Vice Chancellor for Research)

This report summarizes the work of the Research Advisory Committee in its third year after creation by the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly.

The Committee's primary efforts were to implement the Catalyst award process. This process included the following stages:

1. Determine 5 themes for catalyst applications.
2. Develop an Application for the Catalyst Funding themes, along with specifics of who can and cannot apply.
3. Develop a Scoring Rubric for Catalyst Applications based on the Application Materials.
4. Send out a Request for Funding Announcement (RFA) with the Application Instructions to the Faculty as well as the Deans.
5. Receive funding applications in the 5 themes, along with external review letters.
6. Individually score and rank proposals in each theme.
7. Meet to collectively decide top proposals in each theme.
8. Secure funding for the 5 awarded Catalyst proposals.

These objectives carry forward the Catalyst award process, which was initiated in the previous year (AY20-21) based on a survey in AY19-20 that highlighted a number of faculty concerns regarding scholarship:

- lack of time and administrative respect/appreciation for research,
- lack of transparency/support in the Office of Advancement with respect to research funding,
- need for humanities support in the Office of Research,
- desire for more collaborations, professional development, and mentorship related to scholarship across campus,
- greater collaboration among faculty, the Office of Advancement, and the Office of Community Partnerships with respect to scholarship initiatives and funding,

The Catalyst awards are the result of a collaboration between the RAC, Office of Research, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Advancement, and the Office of Community Partnership. In Spring 2021, funding of the $100K to support Catalyst Awards was approved by EVCAA Jill Purdy, with $40K provided from institutional funds and $60K provided from community funding secured by the Office of Advancement.

Initiated by early meetings between the Chair John Finke, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Cheryl Greengrove, and Lisa Isozaki from the Office of Research on 8/16 and 8/30, and followed by meetings with the entire RAC on 9/30, 10/14, and 10/18, the 5 catalyst themes were decided: (1) Humanities; (2) Social Justice and Equity; (3) Social Sciences; (4) STEM; and (5) Interdisciplinary. Also, through these meetings, as well as finalization via email communications between RAC members, a complete Request for Funding Announcement, including Application Process, was developed (see Appendix 1 below). Once the application process was developed, a Scoring Rubric for

Applications was developed (see Appendix 2 below).

It should be noted that the Interdisciplinary theme required some additional criteria for applications than the other 4 themes. These were incorporated were appropriate into the Application instructions and Scoring rubric.

The RFA was sent to UWT faculty and Deans on January 7, 2022 with a tentative deadline of 2/22/22 for applications. After this deadline, two issues were identified:

1. We had only received applications in 2 themes: STEM (6 applications) and Social Sciences (3 applications).
2. Many External Reviewer Letters had not been received and reviewers required extra time to complete.

To correct for these issues, the following decisions were made by the RAC via a series of email communications and meeting on 3/2/22:

1. Offer the opportunity for applicants in the STEM and Social Sciences themes to switch to the currently unoccupied themes, with the caveat that they may face different competition and be rated differently based on fit to theme. Some budgetary restrictions for Co-PIs in the Interdiscplinary theme were removed to facilitate switching of applications into this theme. The email was sent to Catalyst applicants on 3/10/22 and the deadline for this transition process was 3/20/22.
2. The deadline for External Letters was extended.

On 3/20/22, it was determined that the process had yielded the following:

Humanities: 0 applications

Social Justice and Equity: 1 application

Social Sciences: 1 application

STEM: 3 applications

Interdisciplinary: 4 applications

After consultation with RAC members and Office of Research via email communication, a second call for Humanities proposals was made to UWT faculty and Deans on 4/4/22, with a deadline of 4/25/22.

On 4/25/22, the process had filled all catalyst themes:

Humanities: 1 application

Sonia De La Cruz, SIAS, "Storytelling Center"

Social Justice and Equity: 1 application

Ruben Casas, SIAS (Co-PI Anaid Yenera, SUS) "Decoding the Anti-Racist City."

Social Sciences: 1 application

Jinlan Ni "Public Participation and Environment Improvement: Evidence from the River Chief System in China."

STEM: 3 applications

Angela Kitali, SET (Co-PI Matthew Ford, SET) "Sustainability and Equity in Transportation: The Role of Micromobility in Tacoma."

Eyhab Al-Masri, SET "A Novel BCI Framework for People with Motor Disabilities"

Hee-Seok Kim, SET "Development of a Versatile Platform of Flexible Electric Power Generation and Management for Wearable Bioelectronics"

Interdisciplinary: 4 applications

Gordon Brobbey, SE (Co-PI Zaher Kmail, SIAS) "Assessing Outcomes for Special Educators in the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) in Washington State."

Zhiquan Shu, SET (Co-PI Dayong Gao, UW Seattle) "A Novel Ice-free Cooling Approach Faciliated by Electromagnetic Waves for the Cryopreservation of Living Cells, Tissues, and Organs".

Yajun An, SIAS (Co-PI Orlando Baiocchi, SET) "Data driven numerical methods for temperature simulation in tree trunks"

Sarah Alaei, SIAS (Co-PIs Jim Gawel and Alison Gardell, SIAS) "Development of an Experimental System to Study the Modulation of Invertebrate Host-Microbe Interactions by Arsenic Exposure"

All catalyst proposals were evaluated and scored. As a Co-PI on an Interdiscplinary proposal, RAC member Alison Gardell recused herself from scoring and discussions of the Interdisciplinary Theme applications. As a PI on a STEM proposal, RAC member Eyhab Al-Masri recused himself from scoring and discussions of the STEM Theme applications. Dr. Al-Masri also recused himself on the Shu application due to a conflict of interest.

Members of the RAC scored the applications and ranked them within each theme. The RAC met on 5/9/22, 5/16/22, and 5/20/22 to discuss and re-score/re-rank applications based on these discussions. After these discussions, the following application rankings were determined, with the top ranked application moved forward for funding:

Humanities:
>> Sonia De La Cruz, SIAS, "Storytelling Center"

Social Justice and Equity:

>> Ruben Casas, SIAS (Co-PI Anaid Yenera, SUS) "Decoding the Anti-Racist City."

Social Sciences:

>> Jinlan Ni "Public Participation and Environment Improvement: Evidence from the River Chief System in China."

STEM:

>> Angela Kitali, SET (Co-PI Matthew Ford, SET) "Sustainability and Equity in Transportation: The Role of Micromobility in Tacoma."

Interdisciplinary: 4 applications

>> Gordon Brobbey, SE (Co-PI Zaher Kmail, SIAS) "Assessing Outcomes for Special Educators in the Teacher and Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP) in Washington State."

Regardless of theme or rank, all proposals were reviewed and scored with the Rubric, along with suggestions for improvement on future funding applications. Funding was secured for all 5 themes and, between 6/6/22-6/8/22, both funded and non-funded applicants were contacted about the outcome of the review process, with budget numbers for project initiation. Constructive feedback was provided to the PI of each proposal.

A final meeting on 5/31/22 discussed priorities for the next year AY22-23. These included:

1. Work to make the RAC an official standing committee of Faculty Assembly.
2. Task remaining RAC members to elect/nominate a Chair.
3. Ensure future RAC members update their Outlook Calendars to facilitate meeting coordination, which was notably challenging this past year.
4. Grant funding would be primarily via smaller ($2,000-3,000) grants via the Founder's Endowment.

5. Dr. Minthorn advocated for an increased focus on community engagement as well as specific support for UWT projects requiring IRB approval.
6. Dr. Greengrove advocated for undergraduate student researcher support.

In addition to this report, an email with suggested members to replace departing members John Finke and Eyhab Al-Masri were provided by the Chair toTuran Kayaoglu, Menaka Abraham, and Andrew Seibert.

Appendix -1: Catalyst RFA

Catalyst Research and Scholarship Support Initiative

OVERVIEW

In spring of 2020, the newly created Research Advisory Committee (RAC) of UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly ran a "Scholarship Needs" survey of faculty. The number one issue raised was the lack of time and support to do scholarship. During the 2020-21 academic year, the RAC focused on developing an initiative in collaboration with the Offices of Research and Advancement to frame an initiative that would begin to address this need called the Catalyst Research and Scholarship Support Initiative.

The initiative will support up to five catalyst awards per year with a maximum budget of $20K/project over a 12-month timeline. Awards this year will be distributed across five themes (see below). The budget may include any allowable costs required to accomplish project goals including, but not limited to, summer salary, a course buyout, fringe benefit costs, hourly pay and benefits for undergraduate student workers, travel, supplies, and contracted services. Allowable project costs are outlined below in the Budget Section.

ELIGIBILITY

For the first year of submissions in Winter 2022, this initiative will be available only to UW Tacoma junior tenure-track faculty (i.e. Assistant Professors) as the primary applicant. It should be noted that all UW Tacoma faculty members are eligible to receive funds as collaborators with the primary applicant.

While the existing proposal can complement ongoing projects, applicants cannot use funds for resources funded by other projects supported by internal or external funding to the primary applicant/PI and any collaborators. For example, if a RRF is funded for the same or similar project during the same solicitation period, this award will be returned and distributed to the next ranked applicant in that Theme.

Principal Investigators have to wait at least 12 months after a successful Catalyst award cycle closes to receive another Catalyst grant. Subsequent applications must be significantly different than the previously funded award. Successful candidates will not be considered for grants in consecutive years.

The applicant, and their affiliated students, must be the primary recipient of funds in the budget. While this percentage of the budget may be less than 50%, no collaborator may receive more funding than the applicant.

Applicants in the Interdisciplinary Theme (see below) must also adhere to the following requirements:

(a) at least one Co-PI in addition to the primary PI/applicant
(b) no more than 60% of the budget to the primary PI/applicant

FUNDING

This initiative is seeded with $40K of institutional funds and $60K in private funds (through UW Tacoma Advancement efforts) for a total of $100K/year. These funds will support up to 5 faculty awardees to pursue their scholarly goals, with a maximum of $20K award per faculty awardee. Funding will support 12-month projects with the general timeline of July-June of a given year.

For this year, one award will be funded in each of the scholarly themes listed below (themes may change in the future). Applicants must select a single theme they wish to apply to and tailor their application to this theme as appropriate.

Humanities & Creative Works - scholarship in the areas of ancient and modern languages, literature, philosophy, religion, and visual and performing arts such as music and theatre.

STEM - scholarship that advances fundamental understanding or practical applications in areas of natural or physical sciences, engineering, computer science, or mathematics.

Social Justice and Equity - scholarship that centers decolonial, antiracist, and social justice research and praxis. These should be community centered and decolonial in their approaches and intersectionally grounded.

Social Sciences - scholarship that uses qualitative and/or quantitative methods to better understand and predict human behavior and learning in the context of individuals, small groups, and/or larger society.

Interdisciplinary - scholarship on non-traditional approaches or application of different methodologies is encouraged. Multi-investigator teams from different Divisions and/or Schools are strongly encouraged. It should be noted that collaborative proposals with multiple PIs/collaborators are not obligated to apply under this theme and may be better suited to one of the other four themes above.

PROPOSAL PROCESS – TIMELINE

Funding Opportunity announced to campus	early January 2022
Full proposals Due By	February 22 2022 midnight
Review Committee meeting	mid-March to April 2022
Funding approval by EVCAA	end of April 2022
Review/Award letters to applicants	May 2022
Project Start Date	July 1 2022

PROPOSAL - REQUIRED SECTIONS TO INCLUDE
Submit the following files by February 22, 2022 at midnight PST: (a) a single PDF document containing Sections 1-8 and Sections 10-15 in order and (b) a budget spreadsheet using the Excel template provided for Section 9 to uwtor@uw.edu with a CC to your Dean.

Sections 1-8 (combined) have a maximum 5 page limit. Section 11 (CV/Biosketch) has a 5 page limit. Section 12 (References) has a 2 page limit. Section 15 (Dean's approval email) has a 1 page limit. Sections 9, 10, 13, 14 can be as long as necessary to provide the needed information. Use 11 point font or greater along with a minimum 0.5 inch page margin.

Contact Lisa Isozaki lisozaki@uw.edu if you have questions.

1. Application Title and Theme
   TITLE: Provide a descriptive title.
   THEME: State which of the 5 Themes you are applying under (please select only one).

2. Project Description
   (a) In general language, without acronyms or field-specific jargon, provide a summary of the project and description of scholarly activities that will occur as a direct result of this award (or that you intend to perform as a result of this award).

   (b) Briefly, describe how your Project fits the selected Theme.

3. Goals/Objectives

   What specific objectives is the scholarly project/effort designed to accomplish?

4. Approach and Methodology
   Summarize the key methodological components used in the scholarship supported by this Catalyst award. Include only field-specific terminology that is necessary and be aware that reviewers are likely outside your field.

   Relevant subsections to consider including (but are not limited to):

   (i) theoretical framework
   (ii) technology/instrumentation utilized
   (iii) procedural order of methods if relevant
   (iv) positionality/intersectionality
   (v) community grounded approaches

5. Outcomes
   (a) What are the expected scholarly outcomes or accomplishments that will occur as a result of this award?
   (b) Provide a timeline/schedule for planned project activities

6. Intellectual Merit & Broader Impacts (Community or Field) of Proposed Scholarship
 (a) Describe the intellectual merit of the project/effort in terms of impact in the specific field(s) of the PI(s) or interdisciplinary benefits.
 (b) Describe broadly the significance of your area of scholarship. Articulate this significance to non-expert reviewers without using field-specific terminology.

7. Enhancement of Scholarship Trajectory.

Assume the scholarly project will succeed as anticipated (i.e. book is published, hypothesis is confirmed, community partnership established, art installation completed, symposium organized, etc). Describe how your future scholarly efforts will benefit from this success by addressing the following:

(a) How does this award help you continue your scholarly trajectory?

(b) What is the next step in your scholarly development?

(c) How would this work allow you to seek more competitive external funding opportunities? (If applicable)

8. Student and Community Engagement

How will your accomplishments under this award benefit the following? List which of the following will be directly impacted by your project/efforts and describe the associated benefits for each category.

 (a) UW Tacoma Students - either as direct participants or indirect beneficiaries.
 (b) Local Community (Tacoma, South Puget Sound)
 (c) Others in your field of scholarship (scholars/professionals outside UW Tacoma)
 (d) Global impacts
 (e) Tribal and Indigenous communities
 (f) Diversity & Inclusion
 (g) Intellectual culture of UW Tacoma campus

9. Budget
 (a) Using the attached template, provide a detailed budget and proposed breakdown of expenses. Include this template with the application.

 (b) In a separate Budget Justification section, please address how the goals of this project will be accomplished with resources from the Catalyst award. Include a justification for each expense in the budget template.

(c) If Co-PIs, collaborators, community partners, etc. will receive funds directly (salary, budget, etc.) or indirectly (supplies, etc.), list each such individual or agency here along with the total funding amount to each.

(d) List any Co-PIs, collaborators, community partners, etc. who are not receiving funds but are providing in-kind support of the scholarly project. This may include access to needed resources/instrumentation, data generated through other funding, mentorship.

Note: Expenses must be consistent with the University of Washington policy on allowable expenses. (No direct purchases of food, alcohol, personal entertainment, etc.)

10. Other Support

In a separate Other Support section, include the following:

(a) Describe why funding via this award is necessary for you to achieve the scholarly goals outlined in the proposal (i.e. inadequate funds,...). If you have current funding from any source, summarize these sources and describe why the Catalyst award is additionally necessary to achieve your scholarly objectives.

(b) List sources, dates, amounts, and titles of all research awards for which you were the PI during the past three years, as well as any pending proposals. State the extent of overlap, if any, with the present application. Include any internal funding, including remaining start-ups funds, remaining at the time of submission. Provide this information for all PIs or faculty recipients of funds.

(c) If there is no other support please state that you have no other support to conduct your research.

11. CV/Biosketch (5 page maximum)

Provide a CV/Biosketch of 5 pages or less highlighting your past accomplishments and capabilities in achieving the objectives set forth in the application.

12. References (2 page maximum)

A list of references/citations used in the proposal text.

13. External Reviewers

Recommend two potential external reviewers (inside or outside the university), with contact information, with expertise in your field that can provide the review committee with additional feedback about your proposal.

14. Letter(s) of Co-PI/Collaborator/Partner Support

Any collaborator or community partner listed in Budget Sections 9(c) and 9(d) for the performance of the project/scholarly effort must provide a letter of support and briefly confirm their role in the project/scholarly effort.

15. Copy of email from Dean approving this application including any proposed course buyouts.

REVIEW CRITERIA

Applications will be reviewed using a rubric based directly on the Proposal Components. In particular, the rubric will weigh applications for projects that are well-defined, fit with the stated Theme, and are from applicants with a clear need for Catalyst funding.

Because reviewers may not be specialists in the applicant's subfield, applicants should craft proposals so that researchers from a wider audience may understand it. Although technical field-specific information will be expected, the major features of the proposal should also be accessible to non-specialists.

REVIEW PROCESS

Applications will be reviewed by the Research Advisory Committee and will use external reviewer feedback as a component of this review process. The committee will evaluate and rank proposals under each Theme using a scoring rubric based on the criteria listed above. The committee will make their final recommendations to the EVCAA or designee based on the quality of the proposals and will indicate the following: rubric scores; prioritized list of those proposals recommended for funding; bulleted list of strengths and weaknesses for each proposal. Regardless of funding, the Office of Research will provide each applicant with a summary of the committee's feedback after the awards are announced.

REQUIREMENTS OF RECEIVING AN AWARD

- 2-page final report that summarizes project accomplishment funded by the award will be due by September 1 in the year that the award cycle is completed; i.e., 60-days after the project end date.

- Campus Presentations - Recipients of the Catalyst Award will present their accomplishments at a meeting organized by the Office of Research.

- If the project includes community partnerships these must be entered into the Office of Community Partnerships database prior to the completion of the project.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

UW Tacoma Catalyst grants are subject to the following terms and conditions:

- All UW grant funding, expenditure and purchasing policies apply.
- If a funded project entails any compliance issues, such as those relating to IRB, EHS, hazardous material, and so forth, the grant recipient must certify that they will make the appropriate UW compliance offices aware of the proposed activities and obtain any necessary approvals before initiating any work. Spending funds for items relating to animal subjects or human subjects are not allowable until approvals are received.
- Treatment of intellectual property will accord with UW policy.
- Awarded funds must be spent by June 30th of the fiscal year in which funds were granted. Any unspent funds as of that date must be returned to the Catalyst parent fund.
- Barring exceptional circumstances, there will be no extensions in the term of a grant.
- The expectation is that the successful applicants will share news of the investment and the results with both the campus community and externally to attract potential sponsors, students and collaborators.
- This program is subject to the availability of funds on an annual basis and the program will be evaluated by the Research Advisory Committee to determine if the overarching goal is met.
- The EVCAA reserves the right to modify aspects of the grant guidelines as needed.

Appendix 2 – Catalyst Rubric

RUBRIC CATEGORY	RUBRIC SCORING	
Elligibility		
No significant overlap with other funding	Assessed upon funding	
Is applicant a Tenure-track Assistant Professor	Disqualify if No	
Was applicant PI on a funded Catalyst award in the prior year?	Disqualify in Yes	
Do resources to any collaborator exceed applicant?	Disqualify if Yes	
Are letters from all Co-PIs/collaborators included?	Disqualify if No	
Is Current and Pending Support provided in Other Support Section?	Disqualify if No	
Did applicant specify one (and only one) of the 5 Themes?	Request Theme from Applicant with penalty below	
Does applicant receive more than 60% of resources? (Interdisciplinary only)	Disqualify if Yes	
Co-PIs or collaborators must be specified along with funding (Interdisclinary only)	Disqualify if No	
Proposal		
1. Application Title and Theme	**20**	
Application Title	5	
Relevance of Title to Project	5	
Theme clearly stated in initial submission	10	(0 if this information needs to be requested)
2. Project Description	**30**	
Summary of project / Description of scholarly activities	10	
Description is informative and offers sufficient details for reviewers	10	
Project relationship to identified theme	10	
3. Goals / Objectives	**20**	
Discrete scholarly objective(s) clearly identified	10	
Are the objectives clearly described/communicated?	10	
4. Approach and Methodology	**20**	
Procedures/approach clearly identified and described	10	
Methods support objectives/goals	10	
5. Outcomes	**25**	
Adequate description of future scholarly outcomes or accomplishments	10	
Are outcomes realistic/feasible?	5	
Timeline/schedule provided.	5	

Reasonable timeline/schedule of planned activities	5

6. Intellectual Merit & Broader Impacts	**20**
Intellectual merit of scholarship	10
Broader significance of scholarship	10

7. Enhancement of Scholarship Trajectory	**20**	
Convincing description of how award benefits applicants scholarhip?	10	
Description of next step after conclusion of catalyst fund?	5	
Is next step logical extension of catalyst project?	5	
Does applicants scholarship require external funding?	If YES, include next item. If NO, skip next item.	
Competitiveness for future funding (OPTIONAL)	Extra factor from -5 to +5	

8. Student and Community Engagement	**21**
UWT students	3
Local Community	3
Scholarly field	3
Global Impacts (international impact, preference for developing nations)	3
Tribal / Indigenous Communities	3
Diversity and Inclusion (on and/or off-campus)	3
Contribution to campus intellectual culture (degree of inclusion of other UWT faculty and/or students)	3

9. Budget	**20**	
Budget provided	10	
Justification of expenses	10	
Co-PIs or collaborators must be specified along with funding in budget justification	-5	(if collaborators AND not Interdisciplinary Theme)
Co-PIs or collaborators must be specified along with funding in budget justification	Disqualify if No	(if Interdisciplinary Theme)
Resources to any collaborator cannot exceed applicant.	Disqualify if No	
No more than 60% of resources for applicant (Interdisciplinary)	Disqualify if No	

10. Other Support	**25**		
Clarification of existing funding, how/why existing funds are insufficient, and why catalyst funds are also needed	25	-2 5	*If applicant has current funding, needs to provide argument why these are insufficient*
Current and Pending Support provided	Disqualify if not provided		

11. CV/Biosketch(5 pages maximum)	**11**
CV Provided	6
General fit/experience of CV/Biosketch to Project	5

12. References	**5**
Reasonable and supportive reference list	5

13. Reviewers   **20**

At least 2 reviewers provided   10

Reviewer support (requires at least 1 reviewer response)   10

14. Letters of Collaboration

Letters from all collaborators/partners listed in the Budget   Disqualify if not included

General   **20**

  Format of proposal (e.g., double-spaced, font size, margins, allow headers, etc.)   10

  Writing style/no grammatical errors, spelling is accurate,   10

Total Points   **277**