
2015-2016 SENATE FACULTY ACADEMIC RENEWAL FUND

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Established in 2014 and promised through 2024 by Chancellor Hawgood, the Faculty Academic Renewal (FAR) Funds are intended to support faculty through providing small awards focused on: development and learning not covered by grants or departmental funds, travel to conferences, the use of educational technology, and the purchase of small items or services for professional purposes. It also supports through donation to pre-existing mechanisms, campus endeavors around diversity and outreach, child and elder care, library technology and open access. In part due to recent changes in the research funding climate in the country at large, and increasing pressures in the clinical and teaching arenas, UCSF faculty have increasingly taken on more responsibility in addressing local faculty concerns. For those reasons, the Academic Senate and the faculty it represents appreciate the generous gift of \$500,000.

This year, the volume of small fund application request decreased, while group applications for larger amounts, which would benefit entire divisions or departments, increased. The average award in 2014-2015 was \$1,929, whereas in 2015-2016, it was approximately \$2,800. However the Senate had roughly \$60,500 remaining at the end of the award period. These funds were carried over to 2016-2017, and remain reserved for specific projects (see Appendix 1).

The Board of Regents of the University of California has delegated to the faculty authority and responsibility for key components of the University enterprise. Through the agency of the Academic Senate, [Regents Bylaw 40.2](#) (formerly Standing Order 105.2) delegates the responsibility for determining for condition of admission for degree and certificate programs, authorizing and supervising all courses and curricula, and has the right to form committees to advise the Chancellor and/or President on the budget, as well as other issues pertaining to the governance of the University. In practice, this means that the governance of the University is in fact shared between the Academic Senate and the University administration, which acts through authorities specifically delegated to the President of the University and the Chancellors. At UCSF, this structure allows faculty to participate in the planning stages of initiatives with campus leadership, as well as raising issues of concern that can be heard by fellow faculty and administration, thereby adding value to the dialogue between the Administration and the faculty.

As noted above, UC Regents Bylaw 40.2 established the Academic Senate in order to engage in shared governance at each campus (known as “Senate Divisions”), as well as at the systemwide level. The respective Divisional Academic Senates share governance responsibilities with their respective campus leadership and administration, and partner with the UC Office of the

President on systemwide issues. Academic Senate business is processed through standing committees and councils that are focused on key subject matters.

BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

In summer 2014, Chancellor Hawgood provided \$500,000 to the UCSF Academic Senate (“Senate”) to use toward faculty life, which is generally known as the “Chancellor’s Fund.” These funds were termed Faculty Academic Renewal (“FAR”) funds by Accounting and Senate Faculty Academic Renewal (“SFAR”) funds by the Senate office. SFAR funds were derived from the Campus Core Fund and generated from a portion of assessments on gifts and endowments. They were intended to be renewed annually for the next decade and expended within the fiscal year in which they were awarded. The 2015-2016 Chancellor’s Fund remained divided between funding into pre-existing funding units (CTSI, Library, Campus Life Services, and the Schools) and individual faculty funding. However, this year the latter was kept in a central pool rather than released to individual Senate standing committees. This allowed for greater flexibility in case one mechanism had an overage of applications and another had less than full volume of applications.

There were four exceptions to this, with these committees receiving one-time funding to develop new projects: one committee, Academic Personnel (CAP), received \$50K to support the creation of an online module to educate faculty in advancement and promotion criteria (known as ‘PMAP’); another, the School of Pharmacy Faculty Council, received \$15K to develop a Volunteer Clinical Faculty Preceptorship Program; and Rules & Jurisdiction (R&J) received \$15K to explore the creation of an online faculty-centric portal. Finally, the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) received \$2K to develop a “Help” function within its online course review system.

Of the pre-existing mechanisms, Campus Life Services and the School of Pharmacy funded child/elder care and supplemental bridge funding, respectively; the Library received funding for Open Access and a one-year trial of the Embase electronic system; and CTSI received funding to supplement under-represented faculty & senior fellows in clinical/translational research awards. The Senate also supported two outside group diversity events at UCSF: an interactive Diversity Theatre and the online NCFDD Bootcamp for under-represented faculty; the Senate partnered with the Office of Diversity Outreach (ODO) for the first event and three other UCSF Offices (VPAA, ODO, and Graduate Division) for the second.

There were four Senate pathways – Educational Technology, Faculty Enrichment, Faculty Learning and Development, and Travel Grants within the Chancellor’s Fund. The latter fund supported Education, Research, and Sustainability-focused travel to conferences, as well as Visiting Scholars with stipends. The primary goal of the Educational Technology Fund was to defray faculty costs for using technology and/or visual media in classroom, conferences or meetings. The Faculty Enrichment Fund supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. Working with the Schools (and receiving matching grants from three of the Schools), the Faculty Learning and Development Fund covered faculty costs for participating in a broad range of development activities.

ALLOCATING FUNDING / DETERMINING USES

At the fall 2015 Leadership Retreat, UCSF Academic Senate Chair Ruth Greenblatt discussed the results of the pre-retreat survey. Survey questions had focused on narrowing the faculty resources the Senate should fund, as well as a general inquiry as to the method by which funds were released (individual awards to faculty, or maintaining the split between pre-existing and individual awards). Retreat attendees supported the retention of the broad guiding principles for 2015-16:

- Use of these funds should benefit as many faculty members as possible, and in as many different series as possible, including Senate and non-Senate faculty, as well as those faculty in the basic, clinical, social/behavioral, and translational sciences;
- Maintaining parity;
- Inclusion of all Senate committee input in the decision-making process.

After additional discussion at a committee level, Senate leadership determined that funding could be split into two models:

- Funding pre-established mechanisms;
- Funding that addressed faculty needs through several application pathways.

Role of the Coordinating Committee

The Coordinating Committee served as the subcommittee charged with approving funding decisions across Senate standing committees and faculty councils, as its members are either the chairs or vice chairs of different standing committees or faculty councils, or are ex-officio members by virtue of administrative positions within a School or campus office. Combined, their opinions were deemed representative of the San Francisco Senate as a whole.

During fall 2015, the committees and faculty councils presented their respective funding priorities. After a couple of months of discussion, Coordinating Committee members determined a final budget breakdown in December 2015. (Appendix 1)

Four committees—Academic Freedom (CAF), Committee on Committees (CoC), Graduate Council (GC) and Privilege & Tenure (P&T) chose not to be included in the original budget breakdown, nor was the Coordinating Committee itself.

Key Ideas

The following ideas (listed in alphabetical order) consistently appeared as the top topics to fund regardless of Senate standing committee or councils bylaws or overall charge:

- Child/Elder Care
- Diversity Efforts
- Educational Technology

- Faculty Engagement
- Faculty Needs (varied by faculty)
- Mentoring Efforts
- Open Access
- Supplementing Bridge Funding
- Travel Grants (including of educational, research, and sustainability interest)

Established Funding Pathways

There were four pre-established pathways that received lump-sum funds to use as previously determined by their offices. For more detailed breakdown of this process, please see the *Administering Awards* section on page 8.

- *Child/Elder Care*: \$16,538 was given to Campus Life Services, to put towards expanding the number of slots for faculty with children at a Bright Horizons Childcare Center.
- *Diversity Efforts*:
 1. \$40,000 was set aside to partner with the Research Allocation Program (RAP) with Clinical & Translational Science Institute (CTSI) using the Under-represented Faculty & Senior Fellows in Clinical and Translational Research Awards. No faculty applications received fundable scores in 2015-2016, so funds were set aside for the 2016-2017 academic year.
 2. The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) subsidized participation (\$9,600) with other UCSF groups to support faculty participation in the online National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity Faculty Success “Boot Camp.” Other groups who partnered with EQOP included Academic Affairs, Office of Diversity & Outreach (ODO), Graduate Division, and the UC Office of the President.
 3. EQOP also partnered with ODO to host an interactive Diversity Theatre presentation and discussion with faculty (\$7,000).
- *Open Access & Embase Trial*: \$45,800 was given to the University Library to bolster faculty open access funds; an additional \$36,000 was allocated for a one year trial of the Embase, which is a biomedical and pharmacological database of published literature designed to support information managers and pharmacovigilance in complying with the regulatory requirements of a licensed drug.
- *Supplementing Bridge Funding*: The School of Pharmacy requested \$25,000 to be put towards bridge funding for faculty within their School.

Newly-established Funding Pathways

The Academic Senate maintained four pathways this year:

The primary goal of the **Educational Technology Fund** was to defray faculty costs for using technology and/or visual media in classroom, conferences or meetings. Potential uses included license fees to download materials, hiring actors to portray medical situations, and annual subscription costs of tracking software to assist the Schools in insuring students progressing through the various education modules.

The **Faculty Enrichment Fund** supported work activities and services that enhance work-life or well-being. It supports activities or needs not financially covered by pre-existing grant or School mechanisms. Examples included training in public speaking, or hiring a biostatistician to train a faculty member who does not regularly use such quantitative metrics in their research, or participation in a new training program.

Working with the Schools (along with the matching grants from each of the Schools), the **Faculty Learning and Development Fund** covered faculty costs for participating in a broad range of development activities. By combining both Senate and School funds, it meant faculty from each School had upwards of \$40K to devote towards requested faculty needs. The School of Pharmacy declined to participate, due to a lack of faculty interest during 2014-2015.

Finally, the **Travel Grant Fund** defrayed costs for attending education-, research-, or sustainability-related conferences. In the FAR Funds inaugural year, this pathway was focused on sustainability-related conferences. However broad faculty interest in travel grants convinced the Senate that the prior fund should be expanded to include other categories.

Newly-established Non-call Pathways

Mentoring Project

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) received \$50K to develop a new online module aimed at educating faculty as to the expectations for advancement and promotion within each series, as well as supporting faculty in self-assessing if they're on track for the next advancement. CAP worked with a subcommittee of former-CAP members in development of this project. An initial survey was sent to all faculty in May-June 2016; it garnered a ten percent response rate and will serve as a benchmark for the future success of this module. CAP is working with both the Faculty Mentoring Program and the CTSI Mentorship Program in the development of this module. The content for the online module was determined in Year 1; the online module itself is currently in development (Year 2). The module is on track to be released to faculty towards the end of Year 3. This project will request funding of stipends for Year 3, but no funding for project development.

Volunteer Clinical Preceptor Program

The School of Pharmacy proposed development of this program to support training and professional development for their vast number of volunteer clinical faculty who precept UCSF SOP students throughout the state and country. Faculty member Tim Kelly, UCSF Fresno, is leading this project.

LAUNCHING THE CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

During fall 2015, minor improvements were made to the online application including web content, as dictated by new criteria approved by the Coordinating Committee. The Senate Office, in partnership with Accounting, also vastly improved upon the post-award process, reducing effort and time to funds release. The Senate launched three separate Calls for Applications for the four pathways. The first two went to specific UCSF-maintained listservs for Senate faculty, and Adjunct and Health Sciences faculty at or over a fifty percent appointment time. It was discovered at the second launch that numerous faculty who should be on either of the Non-Senate listservs weren't; therefore a third call for applications was sent to all faculty.

Faculty Enrichment Fund. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed and approved funding for 87% of all applications received. After CFW approved these applications, the intention was to place all approved applications into an electronic lottery, as was done in the prior year. However CFW received fewer applications than the full value of the funds for the award, so all qualified applicants were awarded. Those few applications that CFW did not approve for funding were rejected for technical reasons (e.g., prohibition of repeated funding in sequential years, which was clearly stated in the application instructions).

In the end, the Faculty Enrichment Fund received a total of 32 applications with 25 being funded. These statistics reveal a significant decline from the pathway's inaugural year, during which 102 Enrichment applications were received, and 82 were funded. That being said, the average award given this year was \$3,375, whereas in the inaugural year the average award was only \$1,349.

Faculty Learning & Development Fund. Each School, except Pharmacy, supplemented this pathway with additional School matching funds ranging from \$22,901 to \$25,000. As was the case in the inaugural year, applications for this fund fell into two general categories:

- Leadership Training: Many faculty members are assuming new roles within their Departments, Schools, or the new Mission Bay Hospital, and sought training to develop leadership skills.
- Trainings or Coursework for Teaching or Clinical Skills: Other faculty sought additional education to either remain current or to expand their knowledge in a specific clinical course and/or to assist in their teaching efforts.

Each Faculty Council reviewed applications and made funding decisions for its own faculty. The following is a breakdown of the funding in the Faculty Learning and Development Fund by School (please refer to Appendix 2 for a more detailed breakdown):

- SOD: 14 applications received and funded for a total of \$35,809.56. No funds remained.
- SOM: 10 applications received. Two applications were rejected due to a lack of funds. Eight applications were funded for a total of \$32,573. No funds remained.
- SON: 17 applications received. Two applications were rejected due to lack of funds. 15 applications were funded for a total of \$51,977.28. No funds remained.
- SOP: This School did not participate in this pathway.

While no Senate funds remained for these pathways, some of the School's matching funds were unused. It is hoped that the Schools will assume ownership over this pathway in future years; SON has expressed interest in doing so for 2016-2017. Built into the award letters for this particular fund was a request that the faculty members share learned information with colleagues in their respective Divisions and Departments. This is particularly helpful when the coursework is broader in scope – so relevant to those beyond the immediate group of awardees.

Educational Technology. This pathway produced more applications this academic year than last. Examples of applications included: Recording of faculty lectures for 2015-2016 academic year; purchase of a broadcast microphone for faculty lecture recordings; purchase of a computer monitor/display, and a purchase of a mobile projector.

- Educational Technology Fund: Eight applications awarded for \$7,044.16.

Travel Grants. This pathway received more applications in both Education and Research than it could fund, but received only one in Sustainability. As a result, funds were combined to cover the additional Education and Research grants.

- Education Fund: Seven applications awarded for \$10,490.
- Research Fund: Ten applications awarded for \$14,244.02
- Sustainability Fund: One application awarded for \$1,505.26.

ADMINISTERING AWARDS

Of the four individual faculty funding pathways, the Senate Office administered the transfer of funding to successful applicants via an accounting transfer and provided an award letter to faculty and finance analysts for their records. For those topics that were pre-established or would be handled by one group, the Senate Office reached out to the respective campus office or outside group to initiate a financial transfer. Those offices involved included:

1. Campus Life Services (Child/Elder Care): Suzie Kirrane, Family Services Manager, Campus Life Services, partnered with the Procurement Office to develop a formal agreement securing three additional slots into those allotted for children of faculty members. Those three additional slots – which cost \$16,538– remain a very valued commodity for faculty with young children. The Rules & Jurisdiction Committee (RJC) put forth this proposal for a second year.
2. Diversity Theatre: The Committee on Equal Opportunity (EQOP) worked with the Diversity and Outreach Office to host an Interactive Diversity Theatre presentation and training. Lead by Emily Roxworthy, Associate Professor, Theatre and Dance Department, UC San Diego, this presentation was created at the urging of the UC Office of the President. It is intended to inspire attendees to work towards a more inclusive climate for diversity. The program aims to shift organizational culture around intractable issues—such as insufficient attention to improving diversity and addressing discrimination—that have proven elusive to address in

the data-drive accountability that faces today's institutions. Held at both the Parnassus and Mission Bay campuses, both presentations were fully attended.

3. National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD): EQOP partnered with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office for Diversity and Outreach to subsidize half of the cost of online enrollment (\$1600) for six faculty members in NCFDD's Boot Camp (Faculty Success Program). Faculty members of the boot camp will report to EQOP on their experience, why it was valuable, and how they will mentor going forward.
4. Research Development Office & Clinical Translational Science Institute (EQOP):
 - a. The Equal Opportunity Committee (EQOP) continued to fund the CTSI Under-represented Faculty & Senior Fellows in Clinical and Translational Research Awards grants funded through the Research Allocation Program (RAP) in the Research Development Office. However of those applications scored by RAP in spring 2016, none from faculty received a fundable score. EQOP will work with the Research Development Office to explore the history of this pathway, to determine if improvement of long-term mentoring for URM faculty at UCSF is needed.
 - b. Funds not spent in the 2015-2016 academic year in this pathway will carry over to the 2016-2017 academic year, to be spent on the same pathway. This would be consistent with the Senate's support of the University's commitment of developing and providing pathways to success for under-represented faculty and fellows.
5. Library Services: The Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (COLASC) requested funds to bolster Open Access funding, as well as to fund a one-year trial of the online Embase Biomedical system, which would be made available to all interested faculty. Upon receipt of these requests, the Coordinating Committee opted to fund the Embase trail in full, and 46% of the Open Access request.
6. Online Course Review System: Housed in the Academic Senate Office, this online Course Review System allows all courses being offered in each semester's catalog to be reviewed and approved. UCSF faculty, Registrar, and Committee on Courses of Instruction members all supported the development of a Help function within the system. The Senate provided a stipend of \$2K to a computer programmer to develop and implement this feature. It was completed in spring 2016.
7. Supplemental Bridge Funding (SOP): While the SOP Faculty Council requested supplemental bridge funding (\$25K), they advised that receiving such funding made the difference between awarding one Bridge award or two. For the faculty receiving that second award, this was incredibly appreciated.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2016-2017

For the 2016-2017 academic year, the Senate received and funded less individual faculty applications than the prior year. However the dollar amount of the individual applications—and the number of faculty who would benefit from the awarding of them—increased. Only one pathway, Travel grants, was oversubscribed. Various faculty did comment that as the funds were provided a second year, and seemed guaranteed for several more, the sense of urgency had diminished around submitting immediate applications; instead, groups and Departments were engaging in thoughtful discussion to determine the best use of these recurring funds in their long-range planning. This rationale aligned well with the Senate Office’s experience of receiving fewer applications, but with higher dollar asks, thereby benefitting more individuals.

For the Senate Office, we appreciate being able to seed new technologies or projects, and sustaining valued campus pathways.

Faculty Involvement and Faculty Requests

Initial discussions at the Senate Leadership Retreat revealed faculty concerns that the Chancellor’s Fund might be used to provide resources that should be provided by departments and Schools. While members still sought to fund smaller individual requests, they discouraged support for furniture like sit/stand desks, even removing them as an example for the Enrichment Fund category. The Senate did see an overall drop in requests for physical items and individual requests, and saw an increase in larger department- or group-focused applications. Following discussion with Coordinating Committee members, a portion of this year’s Chancellor’s Funds was set aside for faculty engagement purposes. These were used for several areas, including gift cards for the first twenty respondents in the CAP PMAP Survey (\$500) as well as funding Division Meeting costs. Any remaining funds will be carried over to the 2016-2017 academic year.

Senate Office Staff Involvement

Staff time dedicated to the funding process varied depending upon what each committee elected to do with its allotted funds. For those committees that opted to use pre-existing funding streams, staff time was minimal and in line with what would be considered regular committee support. For other committees, analysts shepherded specific campaigns to draft criteria, have those criteria approved, and created a system of review for the applications. Analysts also fielded queries regarding the application process. All told, this amounted to an approximate 25% increase in the workload for each of those analysts. This is less time spent than the inaugural year of these awards, but still above and beyond the expected workload. The Senate Office continues to explore ways to centralize Chancellor’s/FAR Fund processes and minimize impact on general Senate operations and committee support.

2016-2017 Chancellor's Fund

While the Senate Office greatly improved the post-award process this past academic year, moving forward the focus will be to streamline the pre-award process. One idea is to have the Senate Office determine criteria for individual faculty awards. If these criteria remained constant, it would reduce faculty confusion during the application process. We would also encourage the Schools to take over the process of reviewing and funding the Learning & Development applications from their respective faculty, with the Senate's Chancellor's/FAR Funds supplementing the financial resources.

In its inaugural year, the Senate launched the Call for Applications in March. This past year we launched it in January/February. The intended launch for 2016-2017 is December /January.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Committees	2015-2016 Budget Item Ask	2015-2016 Budget Ask (FINAL)	2015-2016 Budget Actual (FINAL)	2015-2016 Budget Remainder
Academic Freedom	None	None	None	None
Academic Personnel	Programmer support to develop online advancement and promotion module	\$57,733	\$50,000	None
Academic Planning & Budget	Continue funding Learning & Development pathway		Defer to Faculty Councils	
Clinical Affairs	Individual faculty stipends of \$2K (covering 250 faculty)	\$500,000	None	None
Committee on Committees		None	None	None
Courses on Instruction	Develop "Help" function in online course review system	\$2,000	\$2,000	None
Educational Policy	Education Technology and Travel Grants (\$5K each)	\$10,000	\$10,000 \$5K Ed Tech \$5K Travel-Ed	Over by: \$2,044.16 \$3,990.00
Equal Opportunity	Divided between three projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity Theatre NFCDD online Bootcamp Supplement funding to URM CTSI Grants (RAP) 	\$110,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$20K \$10K \$80K 	\$56,600 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$7K \$9.6K \$40K 	\$40K remaining Supplemental funding for RAP URM CTSI Grants carried over to 2016-2017

Faculty Welfare	Continue funding Enrichment pathway	\$120,000	\$91,000	\$1,257 remaining
Graduate Council	None	None	None	None
Library & Scholarly Communication	Divided between two projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support of UCSF Open Access Fund 1 Year Trial of Embase 	\$136,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$100K \$36K 	\$81,800 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$45K \$36K 	None
Privilege & Tenure	None	None	None	None
Research	Travel grants	\$10,000	\$10,000	Over by: \$4,214.82
Rules & Jurisdiction	Divided between two projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing support for childcare Exploration of creation of faculty-centric web portal 	\$66,538 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$16,538 \$50K 	\$31,538 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$16,538 \$15K 	\$15,000 remaining Being released fall 2016 to ITS for discovery
Sustainability	Travel grants	\$10,000	\$7,500	\$5,994.74 remaining
Faculty Engagement	Funds to be put towards food, marketing of Division meetings	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$8,509 remaining
SOD Faculty Council	Continue support of Learning & Development pathway	\$22,500	\$25,000	None
SOM Faculty Council	Continue support of Learning & Development pathway	\$22,500	\$25,000	None
SON Faculty Council	Continue support of Learning & Development pathway	\$22,500	\$25,000	None

SOP Faculty Council	Divided between two projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer Clinical Faculty Preceptor Development • Supplement bridge funding to School 	\$84,500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$62K • \$22.5K 	\$40,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$15K • \$25K 	None
Combined Total		\$1,214,271	\$475,438	\$60,511.76

APPENDIX 2

OUTCOME DATA

Funding Opportunity	Amount Awarded	Average Amount of Award
Total grants awarded	88	\$2873
Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	17	\$2,236
Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	40	\$2,680
Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	24	\$3,020
Total grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	7	\$1,231
Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded	36	\$3,371
Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	14	\$2,629
Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	8	\$4,072
Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	14	\$3,564
Total Faculty Learning and Development grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	0	0
Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded	26	\$3,375
Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	0	0
Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	19	\$3,468
Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	5	\$3,599
Total Faculty Enrichment/Needs grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	2	\$2,779
Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded	8	\$880.53
Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	1	\$1000
Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	3	\$921.67
Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	2	\$921.67
Total Educational Technology Needs for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	2	\$675

Funding Opportunity	Amount Awarded	Average Amount of Award
Total Travel Conference (Education) grants awarded	7	\$1284
Total Travel Conference (Education) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	1	\$1500
Total Travel Conference (Education) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	4	\$1500
Total Travel Conference (Education) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	0	\$0
Total Travel Conference (Education) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	2	\$745
Total Travel Conference (Research) for Faculty grants awarded	10	\$1424
Total Travel Conference (Research) for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	1	\$2000
Total Travel Conference (Research) for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	5	\$1518
Total Travel Conference (Research) for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	3	\$884.71
Total Travel Conference (Research) for Faculty grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	1	\$2000
Total Travel Conference (Sustainability) grants awarded	1	\$1505
Total Travel Conference (Sustainability) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Dentistry	0	\$0
Total Travel Conference (Sustainability) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Medicine	1	\$1505
Total Travel Conference (Sustainability) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Nursing	0	\$0
Total Travel Conference (Sustainability) grants awarded to faculty members in the School of Pharmacy	0	\$0

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDED APPLICATIONS 2015-2016

