

## Committee on Research Annual Report, 1999-00

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The following describes the activities of the 1999-2000 Committee on Research.

### I. UCSC Committee on Research (COR) activities

The UCSC COR met eight times during the 1999-2000 academic year. COR discussed a number of issues related to research policy on the UCSC campus. At two of the meetings, there was consultation with Associate Vice Chancellor for Research (AVCR), Jim Gill, and at one of the meetings consultation took place with the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) John Simpson. COR also consulted with Acting Graduate Dean Bud Bridges at one meeting. In addition to discussing issues of research policy, COR also reviewed and allocated funds for the faculty research grant proposals, both regular grants and the new "Special Research Grants" which were introduced this year.

Some of the principal issues discussed by COR were:

#### (i) Allocation of initiative money.

COR received \$40K in permanent funds from EVC Simpson as a result of an initiative submitted the previous year in collaboration with CPB. After extensive discussions, COR decided to allocate \$10K of the funds to reducing restrictions on travel grants and \$30K to establish a new type of faculty research grant, called the "Special Research Grant" (SRG). SRGs differ in two important respects from traditional Faculty research Grants (FRGs).

##### (a) The size of the award.

Traditional COR grants (FRGs) are awarded up to a "base amount" of \$1K for tenured faculty and \$1.5K for untenured faculty. Additional amounts of up to \$1K may be awarded in exceptional cases. The maximum award for an SRG is larger: \$5K.

##### (b) Policy towards distribution of funds among proposals.

With traditional COR grants most proposals which satisfy the guidelines and where there is clearly an ongoing research effort, receive some funding. With SRGs, COR fully funds only a small number of outstanding proposals and does not fund the others at all. The SRG is thus a more competitive grant.

The number of proposals submitted and the number funded, by division, is shown in the table below:

<u>Division</u>	<u># of proposals</u>	<u># awarded</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Arts	9	4	\$17,750
Humanities	5	2	\$10,000
Nat. Sci.	4	1	\$ 5,000
Soc. Sci.	6	2	\$10,000
Engineering	0	0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>\$42,750</b>

Since faculty who receive a SRG cannot receive a regular FRG in the same year, COR felt it was possible to exceed the \$30K amount available from the initiative by roughly the amount of a typical FRG times the number of SRGs awarded.

**(ii) Initiative for augmentation of COR funds.**

To try to increase the COR budget further, COR submitted, again with CPB, another initiative to EVC Simpson. The request was for an additional \$103K, mainly to boost the SRG program. COR made the argument that it is important for faculty morale, and for contributing to an overall campus community sense, that the University be seen to support and value research at the individual faculty level, in addition to providing matching funds to leverage external support for big projects. COR grants, though small, are the main support for many faculty who work in areas where outside funding is slight or non-existent. COR also pointed out that the amount of money per FTE that the campus has provided for individual faculty research and travel grants had decreased notably over the previous decade even without allowing for inflation. The initiative was fully funded, on a one-time basis. COR should work hard during 2000-01 to convince the EVC that this funding too, should be made permanent.

**(iii) Cal-ISI proposals.**

COR discussed with AVCR Gill the UCSC participation in proposals for the Governor's California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal-ISI). UCSC is participating in a proposal, based at UCSF, also involving UCB, on Bioengineering, Biotechnology and Quantitative Biomedicine. UCSC is also participating in a proposal for a Center Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS) at UCB, with additional participation from UCD, and UCM. COR felt that these were appropriate areas for UCSC involvement and commended AVCR Gill and the others involved for endeavoring to ensure that UCSC will be a participant in this large new research venture from the Governor.

Added note: The Bioengineering proposal at UCSF was one of the three proposals selected by the Governor's review panel. In addition, the Governor was so impressed by the CITRIS proposal that he is requesting additional funding from the state legislature to fund this as a fourth center. Thus it appears that both proposals with UCSC involvement will be funded.

**(iv) Silicon Valley Regional Center.**

COR discussed with AVCR Gill possible research roles for the Silicon Valley Regional Center. COR felt that, even though the primary motivation for the center seems to be to educate more students than permitted by the LRDP, there are opportunities for research stemming from UCSC having a presence in Silicon Valley which should also be pursued. These are not necessarily restricted to the Natural Sciences and Engineering.

**(v) Research unit regulations.**

The COR Chair participates in the Research Advisory Council, an advisory body to the AVCR. One topic discussed was a revision of the regulations for establishment, review and disestablishment of research units such as ORUs. The new regulations are based on systemwide guidelines and were approved by COR.

**(vi) SCIPP review.**

COR reviewed the report on the Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics (SCIPP) and recommended continued UCSC support.

## **II. University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) activities**

The UCSC COR representative to UCORP was Professor Peter Young. UCORP provides formal advice to the UC administration through the Academic Council and also discusses more informally with the Vice Provost for Research, Robert Shelton, and his staff, on a variety of issues concerning research at a systemwide level. Shelton meets with the committee at most of its meetings.

UCORP held an all-day meeting once a month from October 1999 through June 2000. Some of the principal issues addressed by UCORP were:

### **(i) DOE laboratories**

UCORP held extensive consultations with Rulon Linford, Associate Vice Provost for Research and Laboratory Programs at the Office of the President, about the three laboratories, Lawrence Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore, and Los Alamos, which are funded by the Department of Energy, DOE, and managed by UC. There is a heavily politicized atmosphere, particularly at the weapons labs, Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore, and several undesirable steps, such as the introduction of polygraph tests for some employees and restrictions on Sensitive Unclassified Information (SUTI) (which is not even defined), have been introduced. There are also concerns about the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore, which is behind schedule and over budget.

In order to inform itself better about the labs prior to the expected renewal of the contract in September 2002, UCORP held one of its meetings at Lawrence Berkeley Lab., holding discussions with managers, including the Director, and with scientists. UCORP also visited some of the facilities at the Lab.

During another of its meetings UCORP held a video conference with managers and directors at Los Alamos, which provided a very informative and frank exchange of views. UCORP hopes to visit Los Alamos during the 2000-01 academic year.

### **(ii) Director of Campus-Laboratory Collaborations**

A UCORP member (Young) served as Chair of a search committee for a director of Campus-Laboratory collaborations, whose role will be to enhance collaborations between staff at the labs and UC faculty. The search was successful.

### **(iii) UCORP participated in reviews of several MRUs including ``Sunset'' reviews.**

It became clear that the budgets of many excellent MRUs have been stagnant and there is little or no money for the formation of new MRUs. UCORP therefore made proposals to revitalize the MRU program. The Vice Chancellor for Research was very supportive of these ideas and made clear that he would endeavor to obtain the necessary funds.

### **(iv) Initiatives for the Regents' budget.**

UCORP made comments on the initiatives from the campuses for inclusion in the Regents' budget. A UCORP representative (Young) was also on the review panel which made recommendations to the UCOP administration about these initiatives.

### **(v) Cal-ISI proposals.**

The Governor proposed the establishment of three large Centers for Science and Innovation, with each receiving \$100M in state funding which will have to be matched two for one by outside sources. UCORP discussed with Director of the Systemwide Biotechnology Research and Education Program Susanne Huttner, the responsible person at UC for the selection process, the request for proposals, and UCORP was also represented in the review committees for the pre-proposals. This large research initiative is being set up

at a rapid pace, and the hope of UCORP is that this will not be too fast to allow a selection based on the scientific merit of the proposals. UCORP also expressed concern that some campuses may go into debt if they are not able to raise the external matching monies as promised.

(vi) UCORP also has representation on the UC Merced Task-force, the Industry University Cooperative Research Program, the President's Council on the National Laboratories, and the Council on Research.

### III. Distribution of COR Research Funds

#### (i) Faculty Research Grants

#### (ii) Scholarly Meeting Travel

<u>Division</u>	<u>(# awarded)/Amount</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>(# awarded)/Amount</u>
Arts	34/\$44,826	Arts	14/\$ 9,854
Humanities	59/\$77,194	Humanities	42/\$24,339
Nat. Sci.	28/\$34,090	Nat. Sci.	33/\$23,231
Soc. Sci.	33/\$40,602	Soc. Sci.	54/\$33,592
Engineering	1/\$ 1,500	Engineering	5/ \$ 3,500

Respectfully submitted,

#### COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Alexander Brandwajn  
Deanna Shemek  
Margarita Azmitia  
David Cope  
Peter Young, Chair

January 30, 2001