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Professor Maury Klein  
Faculty Senate  
E. Roosevelt Hall  
Campus  

Dear Maury:  

I am returning herewith, disapproved, Faculty Senate bill 72-73-60, titled "Research Policy Committee Recommendation for Graduate Research Budget."

While I take no issue with the principle of the recommendation, namely that departments supporting graduate student research should have budgetary support from the University, I do not see how I can approve this recommendation without further clarification.

In a sense, my disapproval may be meaningless. The legislation states that allocation would be made "in conformity with a formula to be approved by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate." Clearly, then, a lot of work would have to be done before the Bill could be implemented in any case.

As enacted, the Bill appears to overlook several factors:

1) Departmental budgets, as presently established, do take into account the department's responsibilities in graduate education, although there is no specific line item allocation for this purpose.

2) The proposal does not take into account the fact that many departments now have assigned to them state-supported graduate assistantships, which are used for research purposes only.

3) Many graduate students are appointed as research assistants and are supported by grant funds, because their research is not only for degree requirements but also for meeting specified objectives for the granting agency. It is difficult to see why these students should receive additional support from state budget funds.
4) The Bill completely by-passes the academic dean who is administratively responsible over the budget of the department concerned. Dual budget mechanisms, creating significant coordination problems, would be generated.

5) I do have reservations about the direct allocation of funds to a student or his faculty advisor. The intent of this particular recommendation is not quite clear to me, but it seems possible that it would open the door to un-coordinated expenditures even within departments.

It seems to me that more in-depth discussion of this matter is necessary before clear-cut legislation possible of implementation can be drawn.

Cordially,

Werner A. Baum
President

hgo

cc: Vice President Ferrante

Enclosure
TO: President Werner A. Baum
FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

1. The Attached BILL, titled RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR GRADUATE RESEARCH BUDGET, is forwarded for your consideration.

2. The original and two copies for your use are included.

3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on 5/31/73 (date).

4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Regents, completing the appropriate endorsement below.

5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate’s By-Laws, this bill will become effective on 6/21/73 (date), three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Regents for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Regents, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

endorsement 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: President of the University

1. Returned.

2. Approved ___________. Disapproved ___________.

3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Regents is not necessary.

s/ President

June 1, 1973

Chairman of the Faculty Senate

Form Revised 6/71
ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Regents.
FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

(date) /s/ President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Chairman of the Board of Regents, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

(date) /s/ (Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate
FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Regents.

(date) /s/ President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

(date) /s/ Chairman of the Faculty Senate
Item 4

Recommendation: Each department sponsoring a graduate degree shall be given a graduate research budget over and above that normally allotted to a department. A specific sum of money shall be allocated to the department for each graduate student actively pursuing independent research as an integral part of a degree program. The amount allotted to each graduate program would be determined by the academic vice president in consultation with the graduate dean in conformity with a formula to be approved by the Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate. This sum would be based upon the needs of each program varying considerably among departments. The department chairman in consultation with the department shall allocate these funds either to the student or to his faculty advisor to be used solely for research support functions which would best benefit that student's research.

Item 6

Recommendation: The following statement be approved in principle by the Faculty Senate and forwarded as a recommendation to the Joint Board-Association Workload Study Committee.

STATEMENT ON RESEARCH IN A UNIVERSITY FACULTY WORKLOAD

The conduct of original investigative study, usually termed research, is not only a desirable but an essential activity of a university faculty. In formulating a workload statement for the university faculty, provision must be made for time devoted to research.

The faculty of all academic departments should be involved in some research activity. Wise allocation of university resources to research requires that areas of excellence be identified and supported consistent with a coordinated program of graduate education for the Northeast region and the needs of the state of Rhode Island.

A SUGGESTED MODE OF OPERATION

Within each department, the faculty will determine the distribution of research time among its members. The contract of each faculty member should specify the portion of his time, if any, to be devoted to research. In this way, the university, each department, and the faculty concerned will know how much and where resources for research are being allotted.