

**COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
MINUTES
April 11, 2017**

Present: Steve Whittaker (*chair*), Fernando Leiva, Longzhi Lin, Daniel Oliver (GSR), Guest: Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Quentin Williams, Assistant for Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives Tedd Siegel

Absent: Todd Lowe, Ahmet Ali Yanik

Consultation on the Institute of Marine Sciences – ORU Review

The Committee on Research evaluated the five-year review of Institute of Marine Sciences organized research unit and in attendance was Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Quentin Williams and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Strategic Initiatives Tedd Siegel from the Office for Research to provide the committee context. Members praised outgoing Director Griggs for his leadership of the IMS for the past twenty-five years. It is clear from current and prior reviews that Director Griggs has put in incredible service and energy over an extended period, often operating with an unpredictable budget and low-levels of direct salary support for the Director position. Notable achievements of his tenure have been: to create a strong research infrastructure for the support of Marine Sciences; to spearhead and manage the excellent new facilities; to conduct very successful and visible public outreach and fundraising.

The committee was surprised with Director Griggs' comment in his December 5, 2016 letter that this is the fifth review for the IMS, and that specific feedback has been consistent over prior reviews without leading to action or change by the Physical & Biological Science Division. It seems the previous reviews have "similar conclusions drawn and recommendations made in each of the prior reviews...1) a budget augmentation, 2) the establishment of a Scientific Advisory committee; and 3) the development of a Strategic Plan." These reiterated concerns are consistent with comments that we found in the current external review documents. Furthermore, this repetition without changed outcomes is worrying, as it both (a) raises concerns about the stewardship of the IMS and (b) seems to significantly undermine the point of such reviews if recommendations are repeatedly not acted upon.

In terms of the review process, we note that Senate might have been more constructively and effectively consulted according to the UC Compendium, the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units and yet the Senate has not been heavily involved in the past.

Members recognized that the committee was consulted about the nature of the review process, as well as the selection of the review committee - although the recommendations were largely overlooked - in future similar reviews the committee suggest that there be representation from COR on the review board itself. Members advised the following:

- **Create a Research Vision:** Other ORUs focus on a common research mission and this critical need is underscored in the compendium. In contrast, IMS seems to emphasize research support services and public outreach. While recognizing the great value that support and outreach have provided in the past, this is not enough. Such a vision would help facilitate greater research focus and allow clearer allocation of resources to the many activities conducted at IMS. What barriers are there to creating such a shared vision? How might IMS overcome the various intellectual, locational and logistical challenges to promote a core research vision that facilitates collaboration among faculty and researchers? A productive discussion could be had about activities that might potentially support such a vision such as workshops or seminars around topics of broad interest to researchers.
- **Ensure Support from the Division and Office of Research:** It seems that IMS has been operating somewhat in isolation from the UCSC campus. How might this be redressed? In what ways might the Division of Physical & Biological Sciences and the Office for Research better support the IMS mission to promote intellectual collaboration and research? It may be that the Division and OR need to be clearer in their evaluation of the role of IMS as part of the campus and divisional research portfolio. This relates to the point made above about defining the IMS mission and priorities, however there are also financial considerations that we return to below.
- **Greater Financial Stability and a Clearer Funding Model:** Both the committee report and outgoing Director's comments indicate that there are issues of financial instability. IMS is funded on an ad hoc basis using a combination of research overheads from the Dean and public donations. As indicated by various comments in the review as well as the Director's response, this instability makes it difficult both to plan for the future as well as to develop the kind of vision and priorities we have just identified. There are also critical issues mentioned in the report about clearer reporting of overheads and support of research that is currently supported by IMS, but without formal

recognition of that support. Regularizing and crediting overheads would help with funding, but also clarify where the IMS is contributing to campus and divisional research.

- **Recruit a New Director:** In addition to these concerns, this financial instability and lack of a clear campus role present a considerable challenge in hiring an incoming director. What steps are being undertaken to ensure the incoming Director is offered a competitive salary, or has the necessary administrative support and can operate with a stable budget allocation from year to year? Failing to address these issues will make it extremely hard to recruit a high caliber incumbent. While the committee understood that part of the role of a new director would be to define new priorities, the campus needs to be clearer about its expectations and relationship to IMS.
- **Lack of An Effective Advisory Committee.** Another key point in the administration of the IMS concerns the lack of an effective Advisory Committee. The need for such a committee is stipulated in the compendium as a requirement for the effective functioning of an ORU, but the committee has not been operational according to reviews.

Review Questions for Faculty Research Support Survey

Last quarter, member begin discussing and drafting the questions to create a short survey to understand research support needs. Members reviewed the drafted questions to date and decided on the final questions to possibly share and consult with the Office of Sponsored Projects.