

INTRODUCTION

The Commission on Research at Emory was charged in October 2001 to recommend ways to strengthen research at Emory and to improve its support, as well as compare Emory with peer institutions. Four broad themes were identified to describe the scope of the commission's work. These themes concern the content and nature of research, the people who do research, the infrastructure supporting research, and the culture and values of research. To carry out the charge, subgroups were established for each of the themes, each with their own chair and cochair. An executive committee was formed consisting of the commission's chair and cochair, the chairs and cochairs of each of the four sub-groups, two additional commission members, and the administrators who supported the commission (see Appendix B for a complete list of commission members with their biographical sketches).

For the past fifteen years, Emory University has engaged in a sustained process of self-examination. In 1987 President James Laney initiated a commitment to enrich the undergraduate experience, build graduate programs of genuine distinction while strengthening the professional schools, double the amount of sponsored research, and enhance interdisciplinary work. Billy Frye, who during his long career at Emory served as dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, provost, interim president, and chancellor, built on these initiatives as well. His report, entitled *Choices & Responsibility* (1994), provided a set of philosophical guiding principles for the university's future and was adopted in 1996 by the Board of Trustees as a "values platform" for strategic planning. The report recommended balancing teaching and research, strengthening the intellectual community, encouraging collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship, providing a strong infrastructure to support research and teaching, and enhancing the university's external relationships while exercising a renewed sense of moral purpose and public responsibility. Follow-up activities resulted in the *Teaching at Emory* report (1997), which offered a blueprint for improving teaching and balancing the priorities of teaching and research. Building on these initiatives, President Chace, who was appointed in 1994, developed the *Campus Plan for Emory University* (1998). This initiative yielded a physical transformation of the campus during a time in which the university was experiencing a significant increase in research and teaching space.

Over the last few decades, Emory has shown dramatic growth in research funding and associated scholarly products such as publications and innovation, income from patents and licenses, the establishment of research centers of excellence, and the number of start-up companies. In a 1999 article, historian Nancy Diamond described some of the reasons behind Emory's success as resulting from an extensive portfolio of externally funded medical research, charitable giving by a major donor, critical hiring decisions, campus leadership, and Emory's geographic location. However, Emory also has benefited greatly from a consistent emphasis on the arts and sciences, the strength and vitality of all its professional schools, and interdisciplinary scholarship.

Although the focus of this commission is on research, the members recognize the symbiotic relationship between research and teaching. As researchers pursue the advance of knowledge, they aspire to disseminate this knowledge to a multitude of audiences, particularly the next generation of scholars. Traditional classroom teaching is one of the most powerful tools for knowledge dissemination. At the same time, other forms can be just as influential, including pedagogical activities outside of the classroom, mentoring in laboratory or clinical settings, and participation in community forums. Throughout this report, *research* and *scholarship* are used interchangeably. Some scholars refer to research as those activities funded by external sources, whereas others use the term to refer to a phase in the overall effort of scholarship. Thus, being a scholar represents a variety of realities that should be met by effective strategies to target university-wide research support to Emory's scholars.

Typically universities provide support to scholars on the basis of their departmental affiliation. However, the commission believes that a more effective approach is to target support based on the cultures of research within the university. Cultures of research take into account the varying modes of inquiry, collaborative methods, scholarly products, and funding needs. The commission has identified distinct cultures of research in the humanities, social sciences, sciences, health sciences, business, law, and theology, which are described later in this report.

In the next section, the commission presents principles and recommendations that will allow Emory to sustain competitive growth at a rate commensurate with the university's aspirations.

The commission calls for the reallocation of existing resources and the acquisition of new resources through various means, including a capital campaign. While allocating current resources more efficiently will allow Emory to move forward, the aspirations reflected in this report may exceed existing resources even if those resources are allocated judiciously. Subsequent sections of the report describe how various practices at Emory might be affected by the commission's principles and recommendations, and they provide more background into the report's methodology, comparisons with peer institutions, and challenges faced by research universities in the twenty-first century. Several reflective essays by Emory faculty are included in the hope they start a conversation on issues that have surfaced over the last two years. Throughout the commission's deliberations, members have been mindful of the role that ethics plays in research. Successful research universities benefit enormously from the ethical obligations of researchers and the institution. Despite Emory's long ethical tradition, the university must remain vigilant at a time when external forces threaten the traditional academic values of autonomy, freedom, and public service.