

# **Research Questionnaire**

## **Responses of the Members of the Research Advisory Council (RAC)**

**October, 2010**

1. Would it be better or worse to move from our current system of competitive internal grants to a system of guaranteed research budgets for everyone? (The issue is already under study by my office, but your feedback is valued. It also remains unclear whether this plan will be financially viable.)

**“An element of competition is definitely good. But I also think fixed budgets for all can be unfair and possibly wasteful. My simple input here would be to have a hybrid of the above.”**

**“I would recommend competitive internal grants for existing faculty and guaranteed research grants (seed money) for newly hired faculty (funded once).”**

**“It would be better to have guaranteed research budgets because it can ensure continuity of research. Renewal can be tied to output, say, after two years.”**

**“A guaranteed budget could be helpful in several ways. (a) it would save time for the faculty and grant review committees (b) people could initiate their research immediately (or following IRB approval where required) (c) it might encourage new faculty and faculty with little previous research to begin their research sooner because they are guaranteed the money (d) it sends a message of research support.”**

**“I think there could be both. A minimal/nominal amount for each faculty, particularly those who do not have a good research output record, in order to stimulate and encourage them. There should then be a competitive system of grants. Part of the problem may be that those with a good record of previous research and who are research-oriented usually get the grants (this needs to be checked empirically), partly because they are good at writing applications.”**

**“A guaranteed budget would be so much better. Removing the element of uncertainty is definitely conducive to a better research climate. It would allow for more sober planning, and enhance the faculty members’ responsiveness to emerging opportunities. For conference grants, uncertainty implies higher stakes and thus greater anxiety if one is a panel organizer. A guaranteed budget could perhaps encourage more faculty members to organize panels in international conferences, and thus enhance AUC’s standing and visibility internationally. If this change is to take place, the system of reporting and accountability would have to change as well. As it stands, reporting on grants is routine and formulaic and not really useful to anyone. One idea is to have the reporting requirements, or at least part thereof, geared towards communicating the activity to other faculty or to AUC community at large; e.g. to demand a paragraph that would go directly to the Faculty Bulletin and thus enhance research visibility within AUC (Question 9)”**

**“I am in favor of the system whereby each new faculty member is given funds for moving or initiating their research program. The amount is typically different depending on the discipline and needs for equipment, etc. After that initial infusion, I think it is fair to ask faculty to apply and compete with their peers. I am not intimately familiar with the vetting process but have heard about some anomalies that work against creative or cutting edge work (not fully understood by department peers.)”**

**“Having a competitive internal grant system would be preferable. However; the current evaluation mechanism should be modified to allow a real competitive process. Research proposals need to be peer reviewed and ranked according to their quality and impact on the development of AUC as a world-class institute.”**

**“I suggest that each department will get an allocation to ensure at least a conference grant for each faculty member to present a paper and attend at least one conference each year. However, we should still ask each faculty to apply for it based on their plans and also based on the validity of the faculty member’s research work to be presented. So, each faculty member would know that the minimum norm for research output is one conference presentation. For those who are more productive in research they can get the share of those who are not productive.”**

**“I believe that we should keep our current system based on competitive grants. Our faculty need to know that writing grant applications to compete with other proposals is part and parcel of academic life. Having our own internal competitive system is a good way to train and acquaint our faculty of proposal writing. If we want to improve our current system is should not be by scrapping the principle of competition. Rather, it can be by a. increasing the funds allocated to research grants and b. offering better advice and training in the process of grant writing. This can be done in collaboration with Mouna Shaker’s office.”**

**“Current system will lead to better utilization of the resources and better research output than a guaranteed research budget. Making it a competitive should enhance the quality of the research.”**

2. It has been suggested by some that the shift toward becoming more of a research university will require changes in faculty hiring practices. Do you agree? And if so, how might we change our current practices in order to hire better researchers?

**“First, what are our research priorities? If we are just interested in seeing more publications/papers without any focus or certain emphasis then we should seek faculty who are highly productive in publications regardless of the focus or emphasis. However, if we have certain priorities in each school/department then we should recruit accordingly. Second, we should recruit faculty who are interested and who are active in research in addition of course to their excellence in teaching. Third, we should also specify to the new hires the benchmark (maybe number and quality of publication) expected from them and how would AUC support and encourage their research activities.”**

**“Until the teaching requirements are changed, attracting promising recent graduates might be the best solution.”**

**“AUC must hire good researchers (with proven academic output) but they must also be good teachers. They must go together and do not always. It is easier to check applicants for their research output through publications, but not always their teaching skills....”**

**“The hiring practices at the moment give enough weight to research record. The problem is that, even if good researchers are hired, they become less active with AUC’s teaching load. So, there is nothing that should be done on that front until AUC has done something about its teaching load. Once this happens, then the job ads should reflect that research is a priority, and this should be taken into account in the selection and interviewing process.”**

**“We will never be a research university if we continue with the current teaching load. This feeds into hiring because potential faculty interested in doing research run away when they become aware of the teaching load. I have seen this first hand. On the other hand, I would not argue to reduce load for new comers, it would be unfair to those already in place and who have had to suffer through the system. It is not good for faculty morale and that is important. To get better researchers without compromising fairness we should reduce the teaching load to everyone.”**

**“I agree. But I don’t think I would be best to comment on change of ‘current practices’ as I am not fully aware of the current. I can however infer suggestions from my experience as a former student and experience from a technology transfer proponent scouting for technology to commercialize. Part time professor positions should be used more as an entry point for high energy/enthusiastic professors/researchers to gain access to AUC’s facilities and add ideas, momentum and diversity. The recruitment can focus on the younger candidates as opposed to established (undergrad) professors from other universities. And try to seek out the research oriented, preferably from high caliber research institutes.”**

**“Reduce teaching load of new incoming faculty to a 2/2 load for the first 2 years. This can be renewed if the faculty’s research output is good. Also, provide summer stipend to work on research. Minimal administration load to new faculty. Also, if we want to move to being a truly international institution, we have to reduce the teaching load. Top universities reach the top of the list mainly because of the research output of the faculty. This will obviously require resources in terms of hiring new faculty.”**

**“To a certain extent. We need to provide research space as needed per the hired professor. Also, we need to provide enough seed funds (higher than our internal grants for high caliber scientists). We also need to consider research professors who do not get any or minimal teaching loads. On the other hand, current salaries and other benefits including travel grants are OK in my opinion.”**

**“Yes. More emphasis should be paid to hiring faculty with a good publication record. For junior faculty, the emphasis should be placed during the tenure review process. Again, the emphasis should be on proving a good publication record or clear indication that the faculty in question is not a ‘one-project’ person, and that s/he will proceed to publish more.”**

**“As our collective memo to the Provost suggests, we feel strongly that interdisciplinary research will be increasingly important in the future, and restricting all faculty hires to departments will make it very difficult to recruit those hybrid and interesting individuals to AUC. We should have a small number of faculty appointments directly to Centers, as well as several mechanisms to allow more fluidity of movement between teaching and research, and departments and research centers.”**

**“Yes, we need to change faculty hiring practice. There should be an incentive for newly hired faculty to conduct their research at AUC the same way they were used to in their home institutes. We can: 1. Offer them a start up research package through which they can establish their own research group and research facility at AUC. 2. Relieve them from the typical teaching load (3/3). 3. Establish a tenured faculty research track.”**

3. This question concerns the possibility of stealing selected “star” faculty from other universities. What are your thoughts about the value of luring established prominent faculty members to AUC from other institutions (keeping in mind that they will not come as cheaply as entry-level faculty)? Should this be more of a priority than it has been?

**“In general, I am not in favor of hiring ‘stars’. From experience, many of these stars prove to be more valuable outside campus than on campus. With the minimal links that I think AUC has with the wider Egyptian academic and intellectual environment, ‘off campus’ here will mean ‘abroad’, which is all the more reason why stars will prove to be less valuable to AUC.”**

**“It is better to hire young faculty members who demonstrated potential, outstanding, achievements during their early career stages. Those will give more to AUC than a well-established faculty member. However, we can invite prominent faculty as DVPs for a relatively long period.”**

**“Yes. We should definitely think about this. Having these prominent faculty even just for a year, should help a lot in terms of the visibility of the school and will encourage research with other faculty. This will improve the visibility of the university as one with an international image.”**

**“This can be pursued on a case-by-case basis. First, we need to prepare our research priority list. On the other hand, young investigators can excel if provided again with enough lab space, seeding funds, and paid labor (graduate students and technicians).”**

**“YES”**

**“As there is no transparency with salary levels, this might be a good idea.”**

**“No, unless the ‘star’ quality is directly related to enhancing research; e.g. a track record in fund raising for major projects AND for collaborative and team research. “**

**“I stand by my position that any new hiring should not compromise fairness to current faculty. The net effect is loss in welfare as a result of negative effects on the overall faculty morale. Our own faculty can be stars if we give them a little bit of breathing space.”**

**“I think there’s higher value in trying to seek out fresh talent as opposed to established. As the old and established may (very likely) will come with baggage (or experience with dealing with typical hindrances in the region, if we address this from the full half of the cup).”**

**“I am not sure this is the way to go as far as enhancing AUCs research activities. Typically, these ‘stars’ are not productive without having the right environment. Besides, they would not be as motivated to produce since they already came with a well-established record. It could also be divisive since they will have to come at a special scale. One more problem similar to that between locally and foreign hired. In addition, most of these**

**stars may not accept AUC current working conditions including the teaching load as well as other administrative/service load.”**

**“Paying more for established researchers seems reasonable. However, a focus on the varied needs of the department should be a priority over ‘star’ quality. If they are a ‘star’ and a good fit, this could be a very good use of resources, particularly if they will attract graduate students and come with grants.”**

4. For those of you who receive external grant money, how big a problem is AUC's current overhead policy?

**"At the moment there are confusing and inconsistent policies. Since I receive little funding from central budgets we are sometimes allowed to 'retrieve' some overhead by reducing the percent allocated for AUC. SRC has an old agreement whereby it gets all overhead back in a special SRC fund. But if I had to apply the full AUC overhead it would discourage most if not all of my donors, and certainly be a disincentive to the senior staff who currently assist with fund-raising for their programs. We need more rational overhead policies that recognize the real usage of institutional services by categories of grants and contracts. This will not affect the big donor negotiated rates like USAID or EU, but make life a lot easier for those of us raising money in the region or from private foundations."**

**"Have not gone through this before."**

**"It can be restrictive."**

**"I cannot answer this question as I have not received external grant money."**

**"I have been told that the overhead is exorbitant and diminishes motivation to apply for external funding."**

**"I understand ITIDA who should be a strong source for funds for the computer science and electronics departments at least do not accept our policy, but I don't have much input towards this as of yet."**

**"AUC needs to be flexible regarding overheads, as most other universities are. Applicants can usually find out how the donors feel about overheads. Some do not want to provide any overheads. When this is the case, AUC should accept the grant, rather than not, in the interests of the research and the faculty conducting the research. When all is said and done, the 'overheads' have already been budgeted for internally. Where departments, such as OSP and the grant sections of finance are purely funded by grant overheads, then it might be different. And when these grant support departments are working efficiently, then resentment towards overheads might not be so great."**

**"It is a problem. And although the University is often flexible in the way it applies the policy, the official figure is too high and remains a hanging sword. Even if the figure is comparable to other world institutions, the availability of research money in Egypt is not. In fact, donors, who are more often interested in development not research, are sometimes reluctant to fund AUC projects on the assumption that it is a rich institution. The exorbitant overhead figure does not help."**

**"Based on my experience, for all grants that I received, AUC overhead is considered too high and we had to negotiate with the administration a lot to get it down to ~ 30%. In addition, it is highly recommended that a**



**portion of the overhead be dedicated to the department or center that brought in the fund.”**

**“Even though I am working on a grant and I do not currently have one, I know (even from US experience) that the AUC’s overhead policy is not helping and it would seem prohibitive to many potential sponsors in the area.”**

**“I believe that we should have a flexible overhead policy. For grants that do not allow overhead, we should go with that. For industry interested in one of our hot products we can use as high overhead as 50%. I do not recommend exceeding this limit for the near future.”**

5. Do you find the current Library resources adequate for your research needs? Do you find them adequate for an ambitious program of increasing AUC's prominence as a research university? In what areas is the Library still lacking?

**"I have not had any problems there."**

**"The library is excellent. Where there are gaps, it is up to faculty to correct it."**

**"Current library resources and services are sufficient in my opinion. We may need to subscribe to high rank journals and databases to allow direct access to research articles."**

**"So far, it seems that the existing Library resources are sufficient. However, it could be further enhanced by subscribing to well known scientific research data bases."**

**"In my field, the library is still lacking several important journals and texts. However, they are responsive to requests. Also, they do not have a subscription to a journal ranking database, which could be helpful."**

**"I have always had good experiences using the library, ordering materials, or interacting with its staff."**

**"I like to believe that my taste and requirements are the culprit but I have struggled to find high profile business/marketing books. Not that I think my individual experience is a good indicator of the library's quality, but I would like to learn more about how the library's program for adding books."**

**"In general the library resources are reasonable. There is a need to increase subscription in electronic journals, especially in sciences and engineering."**

**"The library has made great advances with electronic resources, which practically deals with the academic articles issue. This is less so regarding books. Given the limitations of resources and space, there is no quick fix. Perhaps new book acquisition should be tied more closely to departmental research plans."**

**"Library resources are adequate. Many sources are online nowadays and the library has adequate online sources and databases and they are constantly evolving. Yet, we still to make subscribe to some databases. However, what we lack is adequate software license. I have personally gone through a blocked situation where I cannot download SPSS on my personal laptop because we do not have the license for that. This hinders our research productivity."**

**"No. I don't think our library collection can properly sustain advanced research. I believe the library's periodical collection is very good. Its online resources are also very strong. The special collections in books on Islamic Art and architecture and 19<sup>th</sup> century Egyptian history as well as private**

**papers are also a good and powerful nucleus. Library facilities (photocopying, electronic resources, internet access, catalogues, etc) are also very good. However, the Arabic language collection, even on Egypt, the Middle East and Arabic literature is very weak. Our American and European history, let alone non-western history is dismally weak.”**

6. Does AUC currently allow for interdisciplinary research to a sufficient degree?

**“Not really. We should encourage more of this as most good research are interdisciplinary and will encourage faculty to work together on research.”**

**“Yes. AUC encourages interdisciplinary research at all levels (among departments of the same school, among schools, etc). However, it is up to the individual professors to make this trend flourish.”**

**“Yes”**

**“I have little experience so far and I don’t think I can answer this question properly.”**

**“There is very little interaction among different disciplines and therefore it is hard or faculty with different background to interact and define interdisciplinary research. I do not think that AUC has any limitation on such research.”**

**“Within and among research centers, yes, but beyond that, no. Obstacles to interdisciplinary research are not related to the compartmentalization of disciplines as much as to the segregation between research centers and teaching departments. The full potential for interdisciplinary research cannot be realized until clear and easy mechanisms are established to facilitate working together. (Question 8)”**

**“I think it has done, particularly with the Centers, but the past arrangements in some instances have broken down due to inter-faculty disagreements. The principle of multidisciplinary should be actively encouraged more from above. It should not, however, be imposed.”**

**“I don’t think the hindrances is that great as much as there have not been many precedents. I think there is some activity but there’s room for much more. A more focused study of what’s possibly in the way and how to get more of it should be pursued.”**

**“NO. As before, the incentives are not there. In fact, the hiring and differential pay scales act as disincentives. Needs a very careful review so that we do not tie our hands moving forward by adopting policies that are too rigid or allow for too little flexibility to respond to our existing or imagined future programs.”**

**“I am aware of a few interdisciplinary projects, and have not heard of any difficulties. However more opportunities for cross-pollination would always be good.”**

**“Yes I would say so, although more can be done.”**

7. Do you support the creation of a system of post-tenure review? (Note: no one would lose tenure under such a system.)

**“Not really.”**

**“Yes”**

**“Absolutely.”**

**“YES, everyone should be evaluated from presidents on down.”**

**“Yes. Most importantly we need to create a suitable exit system for faculty members who want to (or should) leave the university.”**

**“In principle, yes. But I’m not one to comment much on this.”**

**“What would be the purpose and potential outcomes of the review? Unless the outcomes are meaningful, it could be a waste of resources.”**

**“I guess so, but do not know. There are annual faculty reports, etc. as you have mentioned, so perhaps that should suffice.”**

**“I am not sure. And if such a system is to be created it should not employ the exact criteria as the pre-tenure reviews. Free from pre-tenure anxieties, some faculty members become excellent mentors and invest a lot in activities that are personally rewarding but may not score much in a classical review. These non-glamorous activities are invaluable for both students and junior faculty, and I would not want to see a review system that would penalize this type of generosity.”**

**“I am not sure I understand what this means, or what the purpose of this is. Tenure review remains the best way in place to guarantee that a. the university only retains the best faculty and b. protect the hired faculty and provide her/him with the proper teaching and research environment to excel in her/his work. To add another layer of post-tenure review will immediately raise questions about the intent for doing so and will raise doubts that this is a way for the university to monitor, control or oversee what tenured faculty teach or write. Of course all universities have other ways to reward tenured faculty who excel and punish those who don’t. This mostly takes the form of promotion and salary increases. And I think the measures already in place are enough. If there is a concern about the inadequate record of tenured faculty, then the solution should be to make the process of tenure review may be made more stringent. This of course will affect only the record for the future, and will not have an impact of those who are already tenured now. But I need to know where this concern is coming from to be able to answer the question more adequately.”**

**“Yes, we should have such system at regular intervals (maybe once every 2-3 years).”**

8. Since we have numerous Center Directors on the RAC, I am curious as to how they think the Centers could be better integrated in the life of AUC as a whole. (Everyone is welcome to answer this question, of course, but I expect it to be an issue of especial concern among the Center Directors.)

**“Not involved in directing a center.”**

**“Plan an annual seminar about the activities of each center (by its director) and identify where they can be of use to members of the AUC community.”**

**“Please refer to our joint memo on this subject. [i.e., a memo sent by the Center Directors to Provost Anderson]”**

**“I think a better integration of centers in the life of AUC will depend on better cooperation among schools. A center which is based in one particular school but whose faculty are housed in other schools will necessarily have its activities adversely impacted.”**

**“The mission of the Center and its administration should be made clear to other units.”**

**“Mine is relatively recent, but perhaps we could have a rotating university wide event where each center would be encouraged to share their work with the university community.”**

**“The Centers are already integrated. In the past, they were deliberately shut out. They do many things to attract faculty and students from other disciplines through conferences, seminars and the like. The teaching Centers are also multidisciplinary and so are intimately linked with those disciplines that contribute to their programs.”**

**“The university should provide more support for research centers. The following issues need to be considered seriously: (a) Research centers should be placed on the priority list of the development office to help them get sufficient funds for establishing advanced lab, expanding their space, getting fellowships, etc. (b) Having a division in the purchase department dedicated for the research centers will result in a more efficient operation. Currently the lead-time for ordering research related equipment or supplies might reach six months. (c) Getting more support for identifying funding agencies and writing proposals.”**

**“Teaching centers are more integrated than research centers. The most important issue here is the security of faculty positions. Also, there has to be a clear mechanism for joint appointments. Research centers have the potential for being the main research engine of the university. Teaching faculty should be made more aware of the opportunities at research centers. They have the ‘infrastructure’ in terms of administrative support, accounting, field support and a research climate. They are especially suited to house major interdisciplinary projects.”**

**“I believe there is not enough visibility given to the research centers and knowledge of how they could facilitate research.”**

**“I will try to summarize/condense my input on this one as I can get carried away. (a) Engaging AUC alumni to expose students and researchers to alumni’s current experiences in the market through their participating in certain TTO functions (advisory/judging panels/talks/business plan/crowd-sourcing). This would be a great way to enrich the AUC community with its own success stories (and the TTO would get good exposure, help, support input as a byproduct). (b) An IPR campaign to inform and instill best practices regarding IP issues. This would clarify the university policy, explain the implications of certain actions that would endanger IP protection, set examples of good and bad results of IP practices, help the TTO get inputs that need less effort to start the protection process, and clarify the path to commercialization so as not to discourage researchers due to ambiguity. (c) Get opportunities to present in front of students (grad/undergrad) in side classrooms to talk about the TTO, IP awareness, and opportunities to pursue technology based ventures. (d) Have the office (eventually) physically situated in a location that has high footfall (for our “customers”) and that’s perceived as not too far or strenuous to engage. (e) Somehow get all the university schools and departments (or at least those with highest relevance to TTO) in very regular, high quality contact with the TTO. Possibly through invention evaluation/brainstorming sessions, judging panels for contests, etc...”**

9. What could AUC do to enhance the visibility of your own research?

**“My research gets visibility through publication. If the university wants to show off the research output of its faculty, it has plenty of opportunities. If the annual reports and centralized, the university can draw on them to publicize them in a more effective way than the annual report – eg. A special website section.”**

**“Publish list of publications. I see we have started on this. Publish articles published by faculty and working papers in major issues such as AUC News, AUC Today. Also, have a section in school’s website about faculty’s recent publications and insert link to paper.”**

**“Currently, there does not seem to be enough support to attend more than one or two conferences in a year. Other opportunities to present research abroad would be beneficial.”**

**“The following are suggestions I have that are not based on my own particular needs: (a) Help me travel to conferences to present papers and meet my peers in my field; (b) help me meet some of the costs publishers may ask for producing my books (e.g. getting copyrights for illustrations, advertising, etc.); (c) help me meet the cost of translating my books into Arabic so that my research becomes visible in Egypt.”**

**“I like the new bookstore shelf idea, and also the increase in faculty lectures to peers. A research-in-progress newsletter might be a good way to alert our colleagues at early phases of proposal selection and study start-up.”**

**“First, AUC should encourage research topics and areas that are relevant to Egypt and to the area. This way the local media might be interested in seeking and reporting our research findings. Second, AUC should encourage productive faculty to present their work in major international, regional as well as local scientific conferences. Third, hold research outcome seminar series in the Tahrir campus and make special invitations to local and regional universities/organizations to attend. Fourth, issue a regular quarterly review for AUCs research outcomes and its impact.”**

**“I believe that good research will attract enough visibility on its own. However, I believe that AUC should streamline purchase of chemicals and biologicals necessary for research. A transparent ordering system should be established.”**

**“I don’t have any particular thoughts there.”**

**“(a) Host international conferences in areas of excellence at AUC. (b) Increasing media awareness of the research conducted in various areas, and demonstrate how AUC can help and interact with the Egyptian society. (c) Support AUC faculty to attend important conferences in their fields even if they don't have a paper to present. (d) Support faculty to visit highly ranked universities and institutes and present their research.”**



**“I don’t have my own research to promote, but do have a vested interest in getting AUC research publicized. One element I feel is strongly lacking and that gets poor attention is broad media attention (that matters, and that’s outside the very directed strictly academic sphere). As for specific answers, if I had to, I’d recommend engaging an eclectic range of media (the regular TV social talk shows, news channels, technology blogs and v-blogs, inspirational talk platforms (TEDx, Geekfest, Wamda, etc...), etc.... I am not very familiar with the PR office’s activity and they very well may be on top of this, but I would then recommend looking into better integration and bridging between the researchers and the PR office. If that really is the case, the TTO could be the right entity to gap that bridge. But, a better strategy, would be to identify the benefit of visibility and find out who our target audience is and then zero in on how best to reach them.”**

**“There could be a greater interface between reporting and communication. (See Q1). It is good news that there will be a single database and that faculty will be asked to report only once. One thing that could be asked of faculty while preparing their annual report is, for example, to select three activities, publications or achievements that they wish to communicate to AUC community or other faculty members. These could be published, in installments, in the Faculty Bulletin. I find work-in-progress seminars particularly useful and conducive to collegiality. Some departments run them but they tend to be in-house. Perhaps departments should be encouraged to publicise them and encourage faculty from other departments to attend. That would enhance the research visibility in an ‘organic’ and smooth way.”**

10. This final question is an open call for your thoughts on any research-related issues not raised in the preceding questions.

**“Developing more doctoral programs would do a lot to increase the amount of research at the university.”**

**“(a) The University should encourage faculty to apply for major interdisciplinary, and often multi-country, projects. But such applications are usually major undertakings that cannot be carried out alongside the existing teaching load. Until this is fixed, some thought could be given to granting release time or remunerating vacation time for faculty who are ready to embark on such a task. It is worthwhile. Support may also be needed in terms of hiring specialized consultants. (b) Social research faces a huge obstacle in terms of the need for a research permit from CAPMAS. The University should engage, at the highest level, in negotiations to ease this problem. (c) Departments’ administrative staff should get some training in grant administration. And/or departments should be provided such support in some way. This may encourage departments to fundraise for research projects at the departmental level.**

**“More time and resources should be given to new and junior faculty that have recently received their Ph.D. to work on research. They should be given some release from teaching and administrative work. This is their prime time to work on research. Many end up overloaded with teaching and administrative work and they barely have time to work on research. We should think about partnering with universities internationally and in the region on research. This will enable us to tap on external funds and also enhance our visibility. We should think about a mechanism where we partner with the industry to work on research. Introduce the ‘Provost/President’s scholars of the Year’ – where faculty apply for being the ‘Provost/President Scholar of the Year.’ Faculty receive a financial budget for research and teach only 2 courses/year with a summer stipend – 4 professors per year. Offering a doctoral program in other schools will definitely boost research output. Provide incentives for AUC faculty to work together on research, e.g. course release. Need to offer sessions on writing academic research, statistical analysis for faculty and graduate students. We should provide training to professors and research assistants on research methods. Encourage faculty to attend seminars on research.”**

**“(a) Through one of the office’s scouting meeting, the following proposition was conveyed: to carry out a major fund raising campaign to create a huge research endowment, something on par with the campaign to fund building the campus. (b) IP policy needs some tweaking. Particularly the process of getting inventions approved for patenting (committee, acceptance criteria, timelines, etc...) as well as putting in clauses to manage public disclosure. Many more issues need to be addressed. A draft IP policy document with my notes will better flesh out all my suggestions there. (c) Publishing Theses (in the library or elsewhere) need to be controlled for public disclosure from an IPR point of view. This can simply be done by having an option to bar publication if a patent is to be pursued in the case of theses.**

**(d) Change in the evaluation system of professor's achievements to add more weight to commercially viable research (difficult), and/or patents (easiest). This would signal the university's seriousness and support for technology transfer and would (hopefully) sway researchers towards commercially attractive research areas."**

**"In addition for the need to reduce the heavy teaching load, research at AUC would not flourish without greater emphasis on providing, supporting resources including staff and facilities. For example, in addition to a heavy teaching load, several faculty members are occupied with a multitude of administrative and service activities. There is considerable red tape and long administrative and budgeting procedures in order to acquire software/equipment. Some lab assistants would close the lab and leave by 3:30 PM making it infeasible for someone to pursue any research beyond these hours. We freed Tuesdays so that we can dedicate a block of time to research. Instead it became the meeting day with extended administrative and service load. We should provide research rooms in the library to allow faculty a peaceful place to work without interruptions. Research output could drastically increase with the help of Research Assistants (RA). Currently, we do not have a viable mechanism to attract, hire, train and retain RAs. In fact, AUC is highly uncompetitive even in hiring TAs forcing faculty to spend more of their time doing work that should have been pursued by TAs and RAs. With the existing prohibitive graduate students fees we are unable to attract excellent students (who could also be good RAs or TAs). The availability of excellent support graduate assistants could drastically multiply the research output at AUC."**

**"OSP is in general a helpful and professional unit at AUC. However, we could streamline and improve their working relations with grant-writers, PIs and especially help them become sensitized to the wider diversity of donors we now interact with, including those residing in the global south. I would love to see one or two staff in their shop who have conducted and understand the research endeavor. AUC will not be able to reach its research goals without taking an proactive institutional stance regarding permissions to conduct social science and human subject research in Egypt. The current system of 'each one is on their own' is not working, and it does not signal to faculty that AUC takes this large problem seriously. We have weight and connections that could ease this situation, but it will take attention from our most senior officers, trustees, and Egyptian alumni."**

**"I think one key factor in deciding how AUC could be turned into a research institution has to do with post-graduate degrees, especially on the PhD level. Real research in the social as well as the physical sciences happens as a result of interaction with PhD students. After all, it is PhD students who are doing the cutting edge research, and by being engaged in such research (either as dissertation advisors or as members of the dissertation committee) faculty help in producing knowledge and in shaping research agendas in their fields. This, naturally, leads to the question of how AUC can proceed to that level, i.e. offering PhD degrees. In addition to the questions of the teaching load, research facilities, library strength, etc, that have been**

raised above, one key question that is central has to do with financial aid. I don't think AUC can progress to a proper research university that offers solid PhD programs without having in place a system that guarantees attracting only the best students out there, and not only those who can afford to pay for (or to put it bluntly, buy) a PhD degree. This, in turn, should be connected with how the undergraduate and graduate programs should be connected, e.g. whether one should take priority over the other, or even whether one should, effectively, subsidize the other. I am thinking here of elite US universities where undergraduate students pay very high fees, whereas graduate students are not only exempt from fees but receive a stipend as well. The idea being that undergraduate education, where knowledge is effectively recycled, i.e. is passed from one generation to another, should subsidize graduate education, where the production of knowledge takes place."

"You may want to consider the following: (a) Building more research laboratories, we need more space. (b) Provide specialized budgets to modify existing laboratory spaces to accommodate certain experimental requirements. (c) Provide grants to purchase specialized. (d) Allow researchers to create their own funding. For example, we can use several instruments that are currently underutilized to run samples for other research institutions for a fee. This will also expand our technical expertise and research networks."

"The university should work with the ministry of high education to resolve the issue of being excluded from all governmental funds. This places AUC in a situation where it is very difficult to get any research fund. Also, we should work on being eligible to NSF funds."

"I have raised the issue with you before. I hope that AUC can register with an international Ethics certification program. All researchers should have access to this as a number of donors require it (perhaps that will increase, but I don't know)."

"I have always found it unfair that AUC faculty get judged by standards (or at least the system) of promotion and tenure followed at Universities in North America, at a time when our teaching load is much higher (and I am not even bringing up compensation or having to endure the commute). I have been at Yale for over two weeks now, and the intellectual energy is amazing. Every Monday there is a workshop lunch where one faculty member presents his/her research and gets feedback. Everyone comes ready, energetic and useful. The faculty dining room offers free lunch. Faculty members daily and gather around the table discussing their research, potential collaboration, and/or some other intellectual matter. But then, faculty members teach one or two courses per semester, with ample time for thinking, for research and for knowledge sharing. I wish we could have that spirit at AUC, but frankly (realistically and sadly) I find it hard to imagine. AUC faculty members are overburdened with teaching loads and service (not to mention the commute). People are in a hurry to finish their day and have no time or energy to think creatively. I wish we

**could do something about that. Additional Thought on Research at AUC: To conduct research, we need three basic things: people, time and funds. In my responses I focused on faculty time. But one additional challenge to AUC faculty, and where we could help is working to implement a system of full time resident fellows and research assistants who are properly compensated and will not go seek full time jobs outside the university. Full time graduate students make a difference. We could use (part of?) the grant funds towards this end. In particular, a missing link for faculty is full time research assistance where fellows are available and contribute to the intellectual life at AUC. Indeed, such assistance could help take many of faculty project a step further towards publication. This, however, does not replace easing the faculty teaching load, which is a must to encourage research at AUC.”**