

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH Annual Report 2010-2011

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

I. COR Activities Regarding Matters of Research Policy

A. Relations with the Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR) and Office of Research

The 2010-11 Committee on Research (COR) continued its interaction and coordination with VCR Bruce Margon, who attended a large number of COR meetings as a guest, participated in discussions, and on several occasions, sought COR's input on matters of research policy.

B. Funding Streams Proposal

This year, COR was asked to opine on a systemwide proposal to restructure the way funds are allocated to UC campuses. This "funding streams" proposal offered a new, more transparent, methodology for allocating funds other than State General Funds to the campuses and marked the first effort in a two-stage restructuring project undertaken by the UC Office of the President. A proposal for allocation of State General Funds will follow.

On the whole, COR viewed the funding streams proposal positively, particularly the algorithm allowing for educational fees to remain at the campus of origin. However, COR felt that a discussion of individual campus impacts was missing and that the proposal significantly lacked specificity on the matter of graduate student financial aid.

C. Proposal for Allocating Federal Off-the-Top Overhead Funds

COR was also asked to respond to a campus-wide proposal to alter UCSC's allocation model for future incremental increases in Federal "Off-the-Top" (OTT) overhead funds. This proposal sought to remove OTT funds from the divisional I&R (teaching/research) model and instead distribute funds based on changes in overhead to the 5 academic divisions and to some non-academic units that support research. The rationale for this proposed change is that faculty FTE numbers may well be decoupled from extramurally funded support. That is, extramural funding is anticipated to increase in the near-term; faculty FTE are not. Such a decoupling has been observed since 2007-08.

COR felt that the fiscal impacts of the proposal were relatively small at this point in time, but the committee had concerns about its long-term implications. COR was concerned that if the campus research enterprise were to grow in the future, the OTT allocation formula would not be reassessed. The proposed algorithm, without reassessment, incorporated the implicit assumption that the research enterprise is immune to economies of scale (in short, that it would not be more efficient to manage a larger research enterprise). EVC Galloway informed the Senate that the reallocation methodology would be monitored and reviewed on both the short- and long-term.

D. Reviews of Research/Support Units

CITRIS

In February, COR responded to the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS) Review Panel Report. Judging from the information provided in the Report, COR felt that CITRIS is a highly effective and successful enterprise with positive influence at several of the UC's, including UCSC, and has provided a successful infrastructure for pursuing research initiatives with private industry. COR would have liked the Report to contain a cost-benefit analysis of the enterprise and urged CITRIS to document how it compares to similar endeavors at other institutions.

ITS

COR also commented on the Self-Study Report produced by UCSC Information Technology Services (ITS) in preparation for the unit's 2011 external review. COR members were concerned about the very low response rate of both faculty and students to the ITS campus survey analyzed in the Report. In addition, COR members were left wanting a clear description of how UCSC ITS compares to comparable units across the UC system, but such a discussion was missing from the Report.

COR's most significant concern was that only 2 FTE in ITS are *directly* devoted to supporting research on campus in the Research and Faculty Partnerships Unit. As a followup to the concerns raised by COR, Brad Smith, Director of Research and Faculty Partnerships, and Andrea Hesse, Director of Academic Client Relationship Management and Divisional Liaison for the Humanities, consulted with COR in May 2011. In that consultation, Smith and Hesse discussed the various ways that ITS supports research across campus (not just through the Research and Faculty Partnerships Unit), and agreed to pursue ways that improved articulation between ITS and faculty-driven research efforts could be achieved (such as improved web outreach, faculty information sessions).

CGPM

In June, COR reviewed the Proposal to create a Center for Games and Playable Media (CGPM) as part of its role as outlined in the revised UC Compendium (see Section IV D. for more information). COR's review of the proposed Center was very positive; committee members were impressed by the interdisciplinary nature of the Center and its potential to provide a locus for funding activities for the Gaming enterprise at UCSC. COR's main concerns were centered around the proposed budget for the Center; further clarification was desired with respect to the length of funding for the Center and as to whether external funding or the School of Engineering (or a combination) would fund the enterprise. COR members would have also liked a more detailed explanation of the role of the three proposed staff members. On the whole, COR responded very favorably to the CGPM Proposal.

E. Academic Plan for Silicon Valley

During the winter quarter, COR members discussed whether they should weigh in on a draft academic plan for Silicon Valley composed by the Graduate Council Chair. In order to learn more about current UCSC research and education plans in Silicon Valley, COR consulted with Gordon Ringold, Senior Director of Silicon Valley Initiatives, in February 2011. Dr. Ringold underscored the importance of gaining critical mass in Silicon Valley and in partnering with industry in order to ensure the success of this venture. COR appreciated Dr. Ringold's consultation and encouraged him to keep the committee updated on any new developments in Silicon Valley. COR also chose not to comment directly on the draft academic plan.

F. Possible Regional Data Center Funding at the UCSD Supercomputer Center

In the final days of EVC Kliger's tenure (August, 2009), he allocated \$200,000 per year over five years for possible computer support (housing, cooling, electricity) at the San Diego Supercomputer Center, under the aegis of funding to support a Regional Data Center for the campus. Current EVC Galloway confirmed this allocation amount in January. COR was asked by Douglas Hartline of ITS to develop criteria by which this monetary allocation could be awarded to the campus, including a call for proposals that would include research usages of this funding. COR developed criteria and a call-for-proposals for a competitive program to award these funds, and forwarded these to Hartline and VCIT Mary Doyle in January. No response was received from them about the criteria and call-for-proposals, including following a prod in March. Ultimately, following an inquiry to EVC Galloway about the status of this prospective program and the lack of responsiveness from ITS, a response (dated June 7) from VCIT Doyle was forwarded to COR by the EVC. COR's understanding of the June 7th letter from VCIT Doyle is that: (1) UCOP made a separate commitment to fully fund 10 racks of computing/storage space that for two years (at an estimated \$170,000/year), with 75% of their expense being funded in the third year, and 50% in the fourth year; and (2) 5 of these racks have been claimed by ITS on behalf of the campus. COR responded with a revised proposal-based plan (presumably for the remaining 5 racks of space) and posed a sequence of queries for EVC Galloway on June 28th. These inquiries included: (1) Doyle's letter stated that UCOP required each campus to submit a plan for usage of this money by "mid-June;" COR requested a copy of this campus plan--none has been received as of mid-August, and it remains unknown whether support for 5 racks (for ITS) or 10 racks (for the campus) was requested (or, for that matter, whether any campus plan was submitted at all); (2) Whether this UCOP funding commitment supplants the earlier campus allocation of funding, or whether it is supplemental?; and (3) Whether the administration actually endorses a proposal-based process for allocating these resources (whatever they turn out to be), and who the actual decision-maker on these resources actually is (VCIT Doyle? EVC Galloway?). Beyond the fiduciary and logistic aspects of these prospective allocations, the overall lack of both administrative responsiveness and clarity on these Regional Data Center funds does *not* represent a triumph of shared governance on the campus. And, determining what is actually going on in this muddled affair will clearly be part of the agenda for the 2011-2012 COR.

III. COR Budget and Grants Programs

A. COR Budget

COR has received a series of cuts to its permanent funding allocation in recent years. Cuts in 2008-09 (\$2900), 2009-10 (\$41,145) and 2010-11 (\$45,900) have resulted in a total reduction of \$89,945 to COR's base funding in the past three years. The COR permanent budget will receive an additional cut of approximately \$140,000 in 2011-12. To date, these cuts have been partially offset with carry forward funds from previous years, but those funds will be nearly depleted by 2011-12.

The total amount of 2010-11 funds allocated to COR was \$470,679. Taking a longer view, UCSC COR funding continues to slip behind levels during the late 1980s and early 1990s and remains well below funding levels at several other UC campuses (as documented in the COR 2004-05 annual report and the 2002-03 report on COR funding levels).

B. COR Grants Programs

COR continued to fund three primary grant programs during the 2010-11 year: Faculty Research Grants (FRGs), Special Research Grants (SRGs), and funding for Scholarly Meeting Travel (SMT). The FRGs and SRGs were awarded in the spring quarter, whereas SMTs were awarded throughout the fiscal year. COR also funded New Faculty Research Grants (NFRGs) in the fall quarter for new faculty. Total funding in support of these programs was \$527,527 (Table 1). It should be noted that the FRG expenditures listed below were allocated by the 2009-10 COR but paid with 2010-11 funds, in accord with long-term accounting practices.

Table 1. Summary of COR Research Expenditures during the 2010-11 Fiscal Year

Category	Amount	Comments
FRG (awarded in Spring 2010 by the 2009-10 COR) & NFRG (awarded in Fall 2010 by the 2010-11 COR)	\$166,856 \$3,458	Paid with 2010-11 funds
SRG (awarded in Spring 2011 by the 2010-11 COR)	\$218,155	Paid with 2010-11 funds
SMT (awarded throughout the year by the 2010-11 COR)	\$139,058 (\$4,550 for Intercampus Travel)	Paid with 2010-11 funds
Total expenditures	\$532,077	

In 2009-10, the 'basic' award for FRGs and NFRGs was \$2,000 for untenured faculty and \$1,500 for tenured faculty. The 2010-11 COR decided to increase these base amounts to \$2,000 (maximum) for tenured faculty and SOE lecturers, and \$2,500 (maximum) for junior faculty in an effort to make the application process slightly more competitive. SRG awards ranged between \$2,000 and \$15,000 (with a \$12,000 maximum for individual projects and a \$15,000 maximum for collaborative projects). The approximate average award amount was \$7,500. SMT funding was limited to \$650, with up to \$1,000 available every third year.

The large majority of NFRG and SMT requests were funded in full. Although there are restrictions as to how funds can be used in these programs, applicants who follow the instructions and properly justify their requests were generally funded. As previously stated, adjudication of FRGs was more rigorous this year, with almost all applicants receiving less than their requested amount. This was based on the sustained COR budget cuts and an effort to preserve funds in the face of a very large budget cut for 2011-12. The average FRG award for tenured faculty was approximately \$1,100, and the average for junior faculty was approximately \$1,575.

This year, COR received 37 proposals for the SRG competition, which represents a slight decrease in the number (45) of proposals received last year. COR received 127 proposals for the FRG competition, also down from last year's number of applications (155). COR feels this decrease in funding requests represents a lack of time due to the overall increased workload for faculty. This increased workload is the result of a broader fiscal crisis in the UC system that has been translated into, among other things, decreased administrative support and fewer teaching assistants.

Overall, COR felt that the quality of the submitted proposals for both FRGs and SRGs was very high. Many of the submitted proposals asked for funding toward the completion of important ongoing scholarly work, while others aimed at initiating new research projects or preparing proposals for major extramural grants.

Table 2. Summary Statistics on 2010-11 FRG Awards

Division	FRG apps requested	FRG apps funded	FRG amount funded
Arts	33	29	\$45,695
Engineering	4	3	\$5,500
Humanities	36	31	\$44,500
PBSci	16	15	\$22,340
SocSci	39	32	\$48,821
Campus	128	110	\$166,856

FRG awards listed in Table 2 were made by the 2009-10 COR but, as noted earlier, they were paid with 2010-11 funds. In Table 3 below, the SRG awards were made by the 2009-10 COR and paid with 2009-10 funds.

Table 3. Summary Statistics on the 2010-11 SRG program.

Division	SRG apps requested	SRG apps funded	SRG amount funded
Arts	9	8	\$45,629
Engineering	4	2	\$20,526
Humanities	6	5	\$40,500
PBSci	8	6	\$51,500
SocSci	9	8	\$60,000
Campus	45	31	\$218,155

In Spring 2011, COR also adjudicated the FRG awards for the 2011-12 academic year. Though these awards will be paid out of next year's budget, Table 4 outlines the awards granted by the 2010-11 COR.

Table 4. Summary Statistics on the 2011-12 FRG program.

Division	FRG apps requested	FRG apps funded	FRG amount funded
Arts	35	32	\$43,686
Engineering	2	2	\$2,475
Humanities	36	29	\$37,852
PBSci	20	16	\$23,063
SocSci	34	31	\$39,404
Campus	127	110	\$ 146,480

Table 5. Summary Statistics on the 2010-11 SMT Program

Division	SMT apps funded	SMT amount funded
Arts	27	\$ 20,658
Engineering	13	\$10,900
Humanities	46	\$ 35,100
PBSci	20	\$ 16,150
SocSci	56	\$ 56,250
Campus	162	\$139,058

IV. COR Events and Initiatives

A. Convocation on Research

In 2008-09, COR began planning the institution of an annual Convocation on Research aiming to highlight high-profile external research awards and recognition earned by UCSC faculty during

the previous academic year. In 2009-10, COR secured the support of all five Divisional Deans for the Convocation on Research and worked toward creating a preliminary list of awards and honors that should be included in the convocation.

The 2010-11 COR felt that such an event would not be optimal as a faculty-talking-to-faculty event, but would be improved by having a tangible fund-raising/community-outreach component. Thus, the 2010-11 Committee on Research wrote to Divisional Development Officers at the beginning of November, 2011 to inquire as to whether a Convocation on Research would be useful to the Divisional fundraising enterprises and to seek advice on structuring such an event. The COR Chair requested a response from the Divisional Development officers by November 15, 2011 but received no response. In January, COR wrote to Vice Chancellor of University Relations, Donna Murphy, about the lack of response, and the COR Chair met with the VCUR shortly thereafter where he received a lukewarm response for such a convocation from a purely fund-raising perspective. Despite enthusiasm on the part of the Chancellor and Assistant Chancellor, COR will *not* be pursuing the development of a Convocation on Research in the near future due to a seeming lack of interest from other campus units, and particularly with respect to being useful with respect to fund-raising/community outreach enterprises.

C. Hellman Fellowships

COR, in its advisory role, made suggestions to Senate leadership (conveyed to the VPAA) about how to conduct the awarding of Hellman fellowships to late-stage junior faculty. These recommendations focused on the first-year for which these awards were given on campus, given a tight timeline for applications and their consideration.

D. Senate Review of Centers

COR's review of the Proposal for a Center for Games and Playable Media (CGPM) raised some broader questions about the role of the COR and the Senate in the establishment of Centers and other types of research units, particularly those with non-ORU status. As described in the revised UC Compendium (in the section on Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units and Research Units), the review process for a non-ORU Center is specified as:

"The term Center may be used for research units not formally constituted as ORUs upon approval by the Chancellor after consultation with the divisional Academic Senate. Before approval is granted for a Center that is not an ORU, the campus may stipulate terms and conditions such as a process for appropriate periodic review, including administration, programs, and budget; appointment of a director and advisory committee; an appropriate campus reporting relationship; and progress reports."

Although systemwide policy states that newly-proposed, non-ORU Centers undergo review by the Academic Senate, this policy has not been widely observed on the UCSC campus over the past several years; there has been some confusion as to the actual process for the creation of Centers and about keeping record of the Centers on campus as well. As such, COR made a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Research that, in the future, UCSC adhere to Compendium policy on the establishment/approval of Centers.

V. Other COR Business

COR discussed and commented on several system-wide policies, and also discussed a number of other local issues, among them:

- Comment on Post-Employee Benefits changes (10/20/10)
- Review of Academic Council recommendation to UC Commission on the Future regarding university downsizing (11/2/10)
- Formal Review of CAPM 610.000: Postdoctoral Scholars Unit (4/5/11)
- Review of systemwide Library Planning Task Force Report (5/23/11)

VI. COR Representation

The COR Chair served as the campus representative on the systemwide University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), which met monthly. The COR Chair also represented COR on the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), which met bimonthly. COR member Scott Oliver represented COR throughout the year on the Advisory Committee on Information Technology.

VII. An Observation about COR Membership

This year, COR had five members who were on the Committee for two quarters; and five members for one quarter. While all COR members discharged their duties conscientiously and with diligence, the perpetually changing roster of COR did impede the effectiveness of the committee; significant meeting time had to be spent reviewing and revisiting ongoing issues, and a committee with large turnover every quarter substantially affected its continuity of viewpoint and perspective. While portions of these shifts in membership were unanticipated, large portions were by design. It is the emphatic recommendation of COR that the Committee on Committees be far more judicious about staffing committees with an abundance of faculty who cannot serve for the full year.

VIII. COR Senate Support

COR could not have functioned without the dedicated and superb support from our Committee Analysts, Liana Gamber Thompson and Stephanie Casher. As ever, COR is extraordinarily grateful for their conscientious contributions to the committee.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Carlos Dobkin (F, W)

Jody Greene

David Helmbold (F)

Patrick Mantey (W)

Scott Oliver

Ali Shakouri (S)

Su-hua Wang (F, S)

Quentin Williams, Chair

Frank Galuszka (W, S)

Gildas Hamel (S)

Mark Krumholz (F, W)

Matt O'Hara (F)

Vanita Seth (W, S)

July 19, 2011