

December 15, 2011

HARRIS LEWINVice Chancellor—Research
Office of Research**Re: Davis Division Response: Consortium for Women in Research (CWR) Report**

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate forwarded your request for review to all of divisional standing committees as well as Faculty Executive Committees within each college/professional school. Comments were received from the Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Academic Personnel-Oversight, Faculty Welfare, Research and Graduate Council; as well as the Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Letters and Sciences.

In general, responses reflected support for funding female faculty to pursue their research agendas and professional development. The CWR was seen by some as providing effective outreach to many women researchers on campus. An alternative view was that CWR had not been very helpful to large numbers of women. Some believe the primary reason was that there is little information concerning CWR's accomplishments other than in the report provided. One could assess the pros and cons of the activities CWR has pursued, especially when it has been constrained by diminishing resources. But, in looking forward this discussion would be not very helpful unless we simultaneously examined other efforts at Davis to support the research efforts of female faculty. In fact, some responders indicated that in these tight financial times, efforts should be combined across campus to provide better organized, coordinated and broad based support for female researchers.

Graduate Council opined that "many of the CWR activities have an impact on the education of graduate students; we note only those activities on which the impact is most direct. The Outstanding Mentor Award, for example, encourages with recognition the important role of advisers (to both graduate and undergraduate students) in higher education. The awards to Research Interest Groups brings together faculty (and, presumably graduate students) with common concerns in gender-related studies. Even more immediately, the small but vital graduate student awards provide money for graduate student research, often in areas where faculty financial sponsorship is unavailable. The recipients' participation in the Graduate Research Brown-Bag Series gives them the opportunity to present their research to an interested audience. The CWR also provides Graduate Travel Awards to allow graduate students to go to conferences in areas of interest to them. We note that budget cuts have resulted in a loss of \$10,000 a year to CWR, with the result that CWR will necessarily be unable to fund many commendable graduate student projects."

Additionally some of the committees commented on whether CWR's response to your request was satisfactory. Responses reflected a sense that CWR's response was indeed satisfactory. Professor Grindstaff was commended for her efforts on behalf of the campus. Committee on Research provided a response to specific issues raised as follows:

- 1. Did the report address the specific issues required (i.e. past contributions, current value, and future promise)?**

Yes. While the opening Introduction on the History and Mission, the Justification, and the CWR on Campus were not requested, this section was extremely useful in contextualizing the mission statement and its achievability. COR finds the CWR's contributions laudable in terms of graduate support, acknowledging mentors, the Research Interest Groups, etc. In terms of current value, Professor Grindstaff has established forums for research and dissemination well beyond the expectations of her position. For example, the international nature of the Davis Feminist Film Festival is extremely impressive.

2. Is there a future promise for the CWR?

The CWR manages to do a lot with very little money. COR argues that even the small amounts that the CWR is able to grant to researchers (students and faculty alike) are necessary for promoting interdisciplinary research on campus and making it possible for graduate students and faculty to find and win larger grants.

3. Is the CWR sustainable as it is?

The director is loud and clear on this point: No, it isn't.. The Office of Research should provide money for a full-time member of staff and an overhaul of the website.

In looking forward, the Division sees value in examining all activities targeting support to research efforts of female faculty. A broad based evaluation will be fruitful in determining how to continue providing funding for this worthwhile endeavor in a broad based fashion. However, there is no support for further reducing funding to CWR.

Sincerely,



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