Summary:

“Attitudes toward Interdisciplinary Research” faculty survey led by Brenda Zierler, Jonathan Posner, and a group of team science researches from the Institute from the UW Institute for Translational Health Science (ITHS). We partnered with 7 schools/collages (the 6 Health Sciences Schools and the College of Engineering) to address attitudes about promotion and tenure within the context of interdisciplinary research in our most recent survey. We received responses from 118 faculty. We do not have a response rate as the survey was administered via listservs at each school by appointment, promotion and tenure (APT) representatives.

From the survey results, we found that interdisciplinary research collaboration (IRC) is valued and a high percentage of faculty are in support of or already performing IRC; however, there is a lack of infrastructure and no policies supporting it. Also noted was a lack of awareness by school/college APT committees on what constitutes interdisciplinary research and how it was evaluated since most criteria for appointment and promotion focus on an individual’s accomplishments (e.g. numbers of grants, manuscripts, presentations) and not a team’s productivity or discoveries. Faculty perceive a lack of recognition and reward for being an interdisciplinary researcher. For example, one faculty member commented, “Our school values but does not support Team Science”, while another stated, “our APT committee is clueless about Team Science”. We found that best practices are not being identified and/or replicated across schools and colleges at UW. Detailed survey results can be found in the Appendix (pages 4-10).

Acronyms:

- IRC – interdisciplinary research collaboration
- APT – appointment, promotion and tenure
## Themes:

The following categories were identified in response to the two survey questions that prompted an open-ended response.

1. **What feedback have you received (formally & informally) about promotion as it relates to IRC?**

   N=79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Value                                  | A. General support of IRC  
   B. Department or Chair only  
   C. School only  
   D. Promotion/Tenure Committee |
| Recognition and Reward                 | A. Independent research rewarded above IRC  
   B. Need both independent and IRC  
   C. Lead PI or lead author |
| Difficulty in operationalizing IRC     | A. No criteria/exemplars or guidelines  
   B. APT Committee not knowledgeable  
   C. External Reviewers struggle  
   D. Preparation of APT materials (how to describe individual contributions)  
   E. No infrastructure support (policies/procedures) |
| Evaluation of IRC (promotion)          | A. Recognize individual’s contributions  
   B. Use Impact measures besides PI/number of manuscripts |
| Timing                                 | A. Need to establish independent research first  
   B. Wait until “tenured” before doing IRC  
   C. There has been change over time in how IRC is viewed/perceived |
| None                                   |                                                                           |
2. *From your perspective, what are the resources and policies (infrastructure, space, time, money, administrative support, etc.) in place that supports IRC from your department, school or college?*  
N=81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Supports of IRC</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>E. Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Shared facilities (lab, office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Research Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Meeting rooms/conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>D. Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Dept. Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Grants Management Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>F. Shared IDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Recognize co-PIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Co-location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. MOUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Adjunct positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>C. Work load release (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Pilot funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Sub-budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>A. Federally funded IRC grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Private Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>A. Encouragement to conduct IRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Demographics

Graph 1: Age Range (n=117)

Graph 2: Gender (n=118)
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Graph 3: Primary Faculty Appointment (n=117)

Graph 4: Years as Faculty (n=117)
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Graph 5: Faculty Rank (n=117)

- Assistant Professor: 27%
- Associate Professor: 15%
- Lecturer: 10%
- Professor: 43%
- Professor w/out Tenure: 3%
- Research Professor: 2%

Graph 6: APT Service Eligibility (n=118)

- Not applicable: 2%
- Not eligible: 20%
- No, but eligible: 37%
- Yes, currently serving: 28%
- Yes, in the past: 13%
II. Interdisciplinary Research

Graph 1: Are you currently conducting or have you in the past conducted interdisciplinary research?

- Currently conducting IRC: 95%
- No: 3%
- Unsure: 2%
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Graph 2: Experience with Interdisciplinary Research Teams

- How many IRC teams have you worked on?
- What is the size of the largest IRC team you have worked on?
- How many disciplines comprises the largest IRC team you have worked on?
III. Agreement to Statements

Graph 1: Faculty Perceptions of IRC support in Department or School

- My school/college is support of IRC
- My department/division is supportive of IRC
- I have witnessed a negative response to an APT vote due to IRC
- I have witnessed a positive response to an APT vote due to IRC
- My school/college's APT criteria provide examples of IRC
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Graph 2: Faculty Perceptions of IRC support

- Involvement of non-scientists on a publishing team is a valuable outcome of IRC
- APT criteria that supports IRC at the university level should be established and highlighted in the faculty code.
- APT criteria at school/college level should encourage IRC
- UW Faculty Code should encourage IRC
- IRC is important
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