HARRIS LEWIN  
Vice Chancellor – Research  
Office of Research  

RE: Davis Division Response: Interdisciplinary Frontiers in Humanities and Arts  

Due to receipt late spring quarter and the short turn around requested, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate was only able to forward the Interdisciplinary Frontiers in Humanities and Arts program proposal to the Committees on Planning and Budget (CPB) and Research (COR) for comment. With adequate time, the Division would have been able to commence a more thorough review which would have included the Faculty Executive Committee in the College of Letters and Science.

- For future programs like IFHA, COR would like to better understand how the interaction between the arts and sciences will be encouraged. Careful thought should be given to the reality that faculty in the humanities and arts do not traditionally think of their research in terms of collaborative projects. In addition, some COR members felt that the IFHA program was better suited for faculty in the humanities and arts and not faculty in the Social Sciences.

- CPB recommends sending out the RFP in early October with a due date in early December. A proposal due date of November 12 with a release date in October is unrealistic if generation of carefully planned projects is the desired outcome. Almost all humanities and arts faculty have 9 month appointments so it does not make sense to send anything out over the summer, unless it is an early notice of what is coming.

- The document needs to reflect the comments made by Vice Chancellor Lewin at the CPB meeting, that is, that sustainability beyond the three years does not necessarily mean raising matching or ongoing funds. To imply that it does will discourage lots of potential applications from those with no prospects for fund raising. Page 4 viii might then read as follows: “If sustainability beyond the grant period requires more funding, indicate where such funds might come from. If sustainability is cost-free, e.g. if a long-term collaboration, outreach or ongoing programmatic impact is envisaged, describe how the project will likely evolve in these directions after the initial grant period. Alternatively, if the project will fulfill its aims within three years, describe its potential impact upon completion”. This could just replace section viii in the current version.

- In the future, these types of new ventures should include formal COR representation on the committees that select target areas for similar proposals, design the review criteria for similar proposals, and select external proposal review committees given the high degree of Academic Senate involvement in the activities that generated the IFHA funds and the IFHA ventures that move forward. It would have been appropriate for the Academic Senate to be involved formally in the strategic discussions about how the funds would be allocated from the beginning of the process. The drafting committee included several Academic Senate members from HARCS and Social Sciences; however, it did not include any members from COR.

The Academic Senate should be viewed as a resource of information rather than a barrier to overcome. Meaningful collaboration early will result in a better outcome for the campus.

Sincerely,

Linda F. Bisson, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Viticulture and Enology  

c: Provost/EVC Hexter