

MINUTES
Committee on Research
May 14, 2013

Present: Scott Oliver (chair), Elisabeth Cameron, David Koo, Sri Kurniawan, Debra Lewis, Barbara Rogoff, Fitnat Yildiz, Matt Robinson (Committee Analyst), Mary-Beth Harhen (Senate Director)

Absent with Notice: Nathaniel Deutsch, Andrew Smith (GSA)

Committee Business

The minutes from the April 16th and April 30th COR meetings were approved as written.

Member Koo updated the committee on the May 13th UCORP meeting. All campuses have been mandated by UCOP to impose a 33% composite benefit rate on summer salary. UCOP is considering putting the surplus that this rate produces—actual summer salary benefit rates are closer to 12%—into a defined contribution plan that will benefit all faculty. Chair Oliver added that UCORP is working with UCOP to collect data regarding faculty workload for NSF grants. A survey is available for UCSC faculty to complete that will then be aggregated into a systemwide response to NSF. COR will send this survey to faculty who have received an NSF grant recently.

Chair Oliver updated the committee on the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR). The search committee will meet to discuss bringing additional candidates to campus. If the search is unsuccessful, an interim VCR will be appointed by the EVC from our campus faculty.

Review of Proposed Revisions to APM-241

COR was asked to review proposed revisions to APM-241 from the systemwide Academic Planning Council. The current version of APM-241 is at variance with Regents Policy 2307 in its specification of the selection of systemwide Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) directors. APM-241 currently invests the authority to appoint MRU directors with campus Chancellors, while Regents Policy 2307 invests appointment authority with the President of the University. The Compendium conforms to Regents Policy and the proposed revision would align APM-241 with Regents Policy.

COR discussed the wording of the proposed revision, under which the search committee candidates for an MRU director can be selected entirely by the UC President or his/her designee, typically the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (VPRGS). The proposed wording also indicates that the MRU director must be an existing faculty member. COR believes it would sometimes be beneficial to conduct an international search for a director among the larger MRUs, and that the Chancellor must concur with both the selection of the search committee members and the final choice of MRU director.

COR proposed its own revision of APM-241 that addresses the above concerns and will continue the discussion at its next meeting.

Consultation with Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Galloway

COR began by asking about the recent announcement of the departure of the UCSC University Librarian. EVC Galloway responded that there will be an interim librarian from within UCSC for the 2013-14 academic year. A search for a new librarian will be mounted in the fall, and the EVC was open to COR's suggestion that a representative from COR be a member of the search committee.

Regarding the VCR search, the EVC stated that she is asking the search committee if they have a strong preference either way. If they do not, she will be looking for other candidates in the existing pool or moving towards the appointment of an interim VCR. VCR Margon will be retiring from the position regardless. If a new search must be mounted, UCSC will likely employ a search firm and re-examine the job description. The office may have to be re-organized as well, to incorporate an associate dean position to help with internal management. If an interim is needed, EVC Galloway stated that she would appreciate input from COR regarding candidates for the interim position. COR asked about the future of Silicon Valley Initiatives (SVI) if the VCR search is unsuccessful. EVC Galloway responded that this needs to be addressed. SVI Director Ringold is stepping back, leaving a leadership void in an area with many opportunities for UCSC.

COR reminded EVC Galloway about her consultation with COR on November 6, 2012, in which she explained that any increase in COR's budget would have to come at the expense of another unit's budget, due to the lack of any new funds available for distribution. In response to this, COR identified the division of the University Opportunity Fund (UOF)—a portion of the Indirect Cost Receipt (ICR) revenue brought to back to campus each year from externally-funded research—as an area for potential redistribution. Currently, the UOF is comprised of 36% of all ICR brought back to campus. Of that 36%, 6% is paid to UCOP as a tax, 40% is held centrally, 40% is distributed to the academic divisions and support units that generated the ICR yielding grants, 15% is distributed to the VCR, and 5% is distributed to COR. As COR has lost all of its permanent 19900 state funding due to budget cuts, the 5% of the UOF currently comprises 98% of COR's annual grant budget. So COR asked EVC Galloway about the potential to re-examine the 15/5 split between the VCR and COR.

EVC Galloway first explained that with the Funding Streams initiative, the 6% UCOP tax has been replaced with a single tax (~1.45%) on all of UCSC's expenditures. The 36% that comprises the UOF is a systemwide mandate. COR explained that the campus distribution Off-the-Top (OTT) fund, which comprises 19.9% of the ICR returned to campus, underwent Senate review in 2010 but the campus distribution of the UOF (40/40/15/5) has never undergone Senate review. The EVC explained that before the campus considers any re-distribution of the UOF, all of the data needs to be collected. COR has provided all of its data from FY09 through FY13, but the data from the VCR is missing. She clarified that the funds going to the VCR are not wasted, to which COR agreed. The issue is one of transparency.

COR also asked about the 40% that goes to the academic divisions. Re-examining the 15/5 split between the VCR and COR, thus giving COR a larger budget for its faculty support, would mostly benefit faculty in areas that do not have access to large external (ICR-generating) grants.

Historically, COR funding has mostly aided faculty in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Science Divisions. In order to consider the distribution of the UOF holistically, the 40% that goes to the divisions should also be examined. COR asked about reserving 5% of this 40% to distribute directly to the faculty members that bring in the ICR-generating grants. EVC Galloway responded that she needs to see how the divisional portion of the UOF is being used.

EVC Galloway contended that the VCR and the divisional Deans would make the same argument as COR: they distribute their UOF funds to faculty to seed new research. She further explained that some administrators view COR grants negatively, believing that they are small amounts of money that allow non-productive faculty members to continue to build their CVs. What is needed is an analysis of all of the ways faculty can receive internal research support at UCSC. Then a determination can be made about the best ways to re-invest in research using ICR. She stated that she will get data from the VCR and the divisions regarding their use of the UOF.

EVC Galloway said that COR should be more transparent in its reporting and clearer in its explanation of the impact of COR grants (note: the entire budget of COR is transparent and published in its annual reports). In her opinion, COR should report what projects were not funded and why. Perhaps there is room for direct collaboration with the VCR office to fund projects. But for now, more data is needed before redistribution of the UOF can be discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm