

**MINUTES**  
**Committee on Research**  
**April 15, 2014**

**Present:** Judith Habicht-Mauche (chair), Sharon Daniel, Yat Li, Matt Wagers, Steve Whittaker, Fitnat Yildiz

**Absent with notice:** Pranav Anand, Jason Nielsen, Paul Roth,

**Chair's Announcements**

Chair Habicht-Mauche reported on the UCORP meeting, and on developments of the negotiations around the Composite Benefit Rates (CBR). After a presentation on CBR at a recent Council of Chancellors' meeting, three of the Chancellors met with Academic Council and agreed to work with the Council to set up a joint task force. Using the raw data from UCOP on salaries and categories of employees, the group will work on their own modeling to develop the optimal number of CBRs. Since this is a chancellor/senate collaboration it is hoped that the models will be adopted by UCOP.

Chair Habicht-Mauche also reported that at UCSD they use a blended rate for foreign and domestic tuition rates for Graduate Student Researchers, so that it doesn't matter what type of student a faculty member hires. COR appreciated the fairness of this, as it evens out the cost of graduate students, especially in the first year. COR would like to know what this blended rate is, and will ask the VCR to research this. She also reported on a letter requesting an increase in the funds that support MRUs, sent from UCORP to Academic Council asking for endorsement and transmission to the President. During budget cuts this budget was reduced from \$15M to \$3M. The Academic Council called for development of principles articulating the criteria for centrally supported university research. Senate Chair Jacobs will work with UCOP to develop a strategy or an index that will set a baseline for the budget (i.e. 1% of total research expenditures, etc.) MRPI is the current mechanism for starting new research ventures, and UCORP will work with UCPB on principles and policies, to be vetted by Academic Council, for use of those funds.

**Faculty Start-Up Funds**

COR reviewed the Library's proposal to alter the methodology for allocating library start-up funds for new faculty. The Library proposes to eliminate start-up funds for library collections from faculty packages by distributing half of the allocation as permanent funds to the library (for new FTE) and half as one time funds (for successful recruitments on existing open provisions). Fundamentally, COR agrees with the proposal's primary principle, that the library should receive a basic augmentation every time a faculty is hired. COR understands the problem with sustaining subscriptions, but the proposal's assertion that "an increasing number of new faculty are asking....to purchase subscriptions..." is not substantiated with sufficient data to determine the magnitude or location of the problem. COR notes that by disconnecting the funds from the hiring process, the current proposal effectively eliminates the new faculty's control over purchase decisions. The result is an overall reduction in the amount of start-up offered to prospective candidates. UCSC start-ups are already problematically low, and COR is curious

about how Deans and department chairs view the potential effect of this further diminution of packages on our ability to successfully recruit.

It is not clear what the mechanism is to influence the library's purchasing decisions and with the reduction in subject area librarians, it seems that decisions on general acquisitions are even less transparent. COR recognizes as sincere the proposals' assertion that the Library "will work with the faculty member to ensure his/her needs are met", but the fact is that the Library is not resourced to fully meet this need. Having a clear (and finite) amount listed in the start-up package, there is an explicit expectation set about what the Library can provide for collections for new faculty. While we understand the efficacy of not tracking specific purchases to specific start up accounts, we wonder if there isn't some other way to lessen this accounting burden without eliminating faculty discretion over how those funds are spent. Overall, the proposal needs more thought and COR does not recommend implementing it as written.

### **Revisions to the Compendium**

COR conducted an initial review of revisions to the Compendium, a policy document which formalizes systemwide review processes to establish, transfer consolidate, disestablish and discontinue academic programs, schools, colleges and research units. COR focused on the section about Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs) identifying two issues; MRU leadership appointments and decision making about funds for Multi-campus Research Programs. COR will continue the discussion at its next meeting.

### **Opportunity Funds -Continued**

COR reviewed the Dean's reports on how they use University Opportunity Funds. The responses from all the divisions have given the COR a lot of insight into the various uses of opportunity funds generated by overhead on external grants and understanding of the role of COR grants. The committee noted that the funds are appropriately directed at research activities with some variation among the divisions about amount that goes back to the PI or department, is accumulated for faculty start-up, or used for common instrumentation, services like grant writing, and facilities. COR's intention is to present at the Spring Meeting of the Academic Senate a broad summary of how these funds are mobilized to support faculty and graduate student research across campus. COR hopes to highlight best practices and recommend some general guidelines to potentially enhance the impact of these dispersed resources. Overall, COR noted the different roles of the recipients of opportunity funds; COR primarily for seed funding, the Divisional Deans for enhancing the research environment, the VCR for matching funds for larger grants and the CP/EVC for infrastructure and support.