

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH Annual Report 2009-2010

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 2009-10 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. In addition, COR provided feedback to the campus workgroup on Research, chaired by VCR Margon.

B. Research Funding and Indirect Cost Recovery

There was much discussion this year, on campus and at UCORP, regarding the mechanisms through which research funding flows to the individual campuses. One issue that directly impacts UCSC is that educational fees are not returning to campuses in balanced percentages.

COR also discussed the need for greater transparency regarding Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR), and debated whether or not UC should be lobbying for a higher ICR rate, which is an issue that has been examined in some depth by several different working groups of the UC Commission on the Future. Overall, COR expressed concerns about increasing the ICR rate, which in effect makes it more expensive to do research. Increasing ICR will likely hurt small campuses, such as UCSC, because our campus' research infrastructure is not on a par with that at other UC campuses. However, one COR member did point out that an increased ICR rate would have a different impact, depending on the source of funds. For example, some funding agencies do not charge ICR against the PI's grant funds.

EVC Kliger approved COR's request (made at the urging of VCR Margon in Spring 2009) that from now on funds from awards coded as "private," but originating from federal sponsors, will be distributed by the same mechanism as direct federal sponsored research. This means that sub-awards that have underlying federal sponsors, even though arriving here from non-federal entities, will now generate the same return to the Divisions and the School of Engineering as do direct federal awards.

C. Research Strategies working group of the UC Commission on the Future

In fall 2009, a UC Commission on the Future was constituted with President Yudof and Board of Regents Gould as co-chairs. The charge to the commission was to examine how the University of California can best serve the state in years ahead and maintain access, quality, and affordability in a time of diminishing resources. To explore the many facets of this issue, five working groups were established. One of these workgroups was on "Research Strategies."

During the winter quarter, COR conducted consultations with Gail Hershatter (UCSC Professor of History, and member of the Research Strategies working group) and Mary Croughan (Co-Chair of the Research Strategies working group), to provide feedback on UCSC's specific concerns about research funding, the overall research enterprise, and UCSC-specific research issues. A list of the questions COR posed to the Research Strategies working group for consideration can be found in Appendix A. In May 2010, COR formulated its response to the first round of recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future; COR's response can be found in Appendix B.

D. Reviews of Divisional Research Units

COR discussed the five-year review report of the Institute for Marine Sciences (IMS). Overall, COR feels IMS is a well-run program, and one of the best functioning units on campus.

E. Resolution to Rescind Salary Reductions for lowest-paid faculty

At the Special Senate meeting on October 19th, the issue of using COR-funds (at some campuses) to backfill the salaries of the lowest-paid faculty came up. Chair Kolaitis clarified at the Senate meeting that, at least in the case of the Berkeley campus, COR was used as a vehicle to transfer funds from the Chancellor's Office to a group of lower-paid faculty in the form of summer stipends for research. This practice was cited in a resolution that came off the Senate floor that all newly-hired faculty members and all faculty members earning less than \$75,000 have their salaries supplemented.

COR reviewed this proposed resolution and decided to express COR's firm position that it is not appropriate for a Senate committee to be used as a "pass-through" vehicle in this way. Furthermore, COR does not support the use of COR funds, independent of their origin, to give out awards on a non-competitive basis.

II. COR Activities Involving the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP)

A. MRU/MRPI Competition

In November 2008, VP Beckwith sent out a call for proposals for Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPIs). All existing Multicampus Research Units (MRUs) were invited to apply for funding competitively, except for UCO Lick and White Mountain, which will participate in a future MRPI competition. UCSC submitted 20 proposals for new programs and existing MRUs with UCSC as the lead campus, and four such proposals were eventually recommended for funding. However, since MRPIs are a newly-created category, there are no procedures governing their establishment and disestablishment outlined in the UC Compendium.

COR has written to the Senate leadership, urging that UCOP move swiftly to implement the recommendations from the Report of the Task Force on the Compendium, namely to:

1. Establish a subcommittee to investigate and define MRPIs, and establish review and disestablishment processes for them.

2. Clarify and elaborate on processes for establishment, review, and disestablishment of MRUs, to provide guidance for how to handle existing MRUs.

B. Changes to IP Agreement

In a recent case between Stanford and Roche regarding patent acknowledgement, the court found in favor of Roche because the language used in the UC patent agreements was not as strict as the language used by Cetus, a company acquired by Roche. UC has moved to adjust the language of its patent agreements, and have all faculty sign a modified agreement.

III. COR Budget and Grants Programs

A. COR Budget

As a result of the budget crisis, COR has received a series of cuts to its permanent funding allocation. Cuts in 2008-09 (\$2900), 2009-10 (\$41,145) and assigned cuts for 2010-11 (\$45,900) have resulted in a total reduction of \$89,945 to COR's base funding in the past three years. Further cuts are possible if the budget situation does not improve.

Despite the cuts to the state funds COR receives as permanent funding, a change in the mechanisms for allocating overhead generated on private grants that have originating fund sources fully funded by the federal government has resulted in an increase of funds flowing to COR from other sources. This has helped to offset the cuts to state funds, but these amounts tend to fluctuate year by year, as they are tied to the external grants and awards UCSC researchers are able to secure.

The total amount of 2009-10 funds allocated to COR was \$489,524. 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 2009-10 year: Faculty Research Grants (FRGs), Special Research Grants (SRGs), and funding for Scholarly Meeting Travel (SMT). The FRG and SRG awards were made in the spring quarter, whereas SMT awards were made throughout the fiscal year. COR also funded New Faculty Research Grants (NFRGs) in the fall quarter for newly-arrived faculty. Total funding in support of these programs was \$530,018 (Table 1). The amount expended by COR in support of research in 2009-10 that exceeded 2009-10 funding was made up by carry-forward from the preceding year. It should be noted that the FRG expenditures listed below were allocated by the 2008-09 COR but paid with 2009-10 funds.

Table 1. Summary of COR Research Expenditures during the 2009-10 Year

Category	Amount	Comments
FRG (awarded in Spring 2009 by the 2008-09 COR) & NFRG (awarded in Fall 09 by the 2009-	\$203,092	Paid with 2009-10 funds

10 COR)		
SRG (awarded in Spring 2010 by the 2009-10 COR)	\$213,680	Paid with 2009-10 funds
SMT (awarded throughout the year by the 2009-10 COR)	\$113,246	Paid with 2009-10 funds
Total expenditures	\$530,018	

As in 2008-09, the ‘basic’ award for FRGs and NFRGs was \$2,000 for untenured faculty and \$1,500 for tenured faculty. Due to the budget crisis, COR was unable to offer an additional \$500 for exceptional applications, as it had in the past. SRG awards ranged between \$1,500 and \$10,000, with an approximate average of \$8,000. SMT funding was limited to \$650, with up to \$1,000 available every third year.

The vast majority of FRG, 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 are generally funded.

This year, COR received 45 proposals for the SRG competition, which represents a slight decrease in the number (53) of proposals received last year. COR received 155 proposals for the FRG competition. COR feels this decrease in funding requests represents what the committee feels is the most significant factor impacting faculty research—lack of time due to increased workload resulting from the fiscal crisis in the UC system that has been translated to, among other things, decreased administrative support, and fewer teaching assistants.

Given the overall high quality of the submitted proposals, COR felt that it was important to award as many SRG grants as possible. Many of the submitted proposals were towards the completion of important ongoing scholarly work, while others aimed at initiating new research projects or preparing proposals for major extramural grants. In view of the limited funds available, however, almost all successful SRG proposals were funded for amounts lower than those requested in the proposal.

Table 2. Summary statistics on the 2009-10 FRG and SMT programs.

Division	FRG apps funded	FRG amount funded	SMT apps funded	SMT amount funded
Arts	37	\$52,280	25	\$18,350
Engineering	3	\$5,500	7	\$5,950
Humanities	36	\$51,810	40	\$29,846
P&BS	18	\$25,272	16	\$12,200
SocSci	44	\$68,230	66	\$46,900
Campus	138	\$203,092	154	\$113,246

In Table 2, the FRG awards were made by the 2008-09 COR but, as noted earlier, they were paid with 2009-10 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 2009-10 SRG program.

Division	SRG apps requested	SRG apps funded	SRG amount funded
Arts	9	7	\$46,180
Engineering	1	0	0
Humanities	6	5	\$26,000
P&BS	10	7	\$50,500
SocSci	19	12	\$91,000
Campus	45	31	\$213,680

In Spring 2010, COR also adjudicated the FRG awards for the 2010-11 academic year. Though these awards will be paid out of next year's budget, Table 4 outlines the awards granted by the 2009-10 COR.

Table 4. Summary statistics on the 2010-11 FRG program.

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
P&BS	16	15	\$22,340
SocSci	39	32	\$48,821
Campus	128	110	\$166,856

IV. COR Events and Initiatives

In 2008-09, COR began planning to institute an annual Convocation on Research aiming to recognize high-profile external research awards and recognition earned by UCSC faculty during the previous academic year. The original plan was to have the first Convocation on Research take place during 2009-10. To this effect, COR wrote to the divisional deans and asked them for a list of external award recipients. In the fall quarter of 2009-10, COR

reviewed the input that had been received by the Deans up to that point and discussed the plans for instituting this Convocation. During the winter quarter, Chair Kolaitis attended a Council of Deans meeting with Senate Chair Kletzer, and was able to secure the support of all five divisional deans for the Convocation on Research.

Upon receiving the external award recipients from all Division, COR had a difficult time coming up with selection criteria that are applicable across Divisions. COR felt strongly that care should be given to determining what awards and honors should be included, as this will set a precedent for future Convocations on Research. Given that there was not much time left in the academic year and in order to give everyone ample time to review the lists, COR felt that it was better to defer this matter to the 2010-11 COR with the recommendation to ask the department chairs to identify which awards and honors should be included in the Convocation on Research, and then proceed with holding the first Convocation on Research during the academic year 2010-11.

V. Other COR Business

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

- Systemwide Review of Policy Leave Changes for Senior Management Group (SMG) (11/3/09)
- Report from the Workgroup on the Library (1/26/10)
- Report from Humanities Advisory Task Force on the Reconstitution (1/26/10)
- Formal Review of APM 241 & 246 (4/6/10)
- Final Report of the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force on the Compendium (5/11/10)

VI. COR Representation

The COR Chair served as Vice Chair on the system-wide University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), which met monthly, and COR member Fitnat Yildiz served as the campus representative on UCORP; furthermore, the COR Chair represented COR on the Senate Executive Committee, which met biweekly. COR member Scott Oliver represented the Committee throughout the year during most Instructional Technology Committee meetings.

VII. COR Senate Support

COR is deeply indebted to Committee Advisor Stephanie Casher, for her dedication, professionalism, and outstanding support. Her contributions were enormously important to the functioning of the Committee throughout the year

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Elliot Anderson (F, W)

Ray Gibbs

Qi Gong (F)

Donna Hunter (F)

Jody Greene (W)

Melissa Gwyn (S)

Sharon Kinoshita

Scott Oliver

Paul Roth (S)

Holger Schmidt (F, W)

Vanita Seth

Fitnat Yildiz

Phokion G. Kolaitis, Chair

September 27, 2010

APPENDIX A

COR issues for consideration by UC Commission on the Future Research Strategies working group

- Is it possible to make the process of obtaining, receiving, and disbursing external funds simpler (i.e. removing some of the layers of bureaucracy associated with extramural funds and awards)?
- The current model for research is, to a large extent, a model geared, towards science and engineering. What does this leave for scholars in other areas? How do we enhance the infrastructure to support getting external funding for the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences?
- What is the commitment of the powers-that-be to funding in the Arts? There needs to be a greater understanding of how research in the arts (which is often in non-written forms) constitutes research. One way to achieve this is to ensure Arts representation on relevant committees/working groups.
- More transparency regarding the Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) formulas, rates, and distribution. Can a small fraction of ICR be returned to PIs as an unrestricted funding source?
- Does the current formula that determines how tuition/fees get distributed to various campuses promote an equitable distribution of resources? (For example, it has been reported that UCSC gets .60 cents for every dollar, while UCSF receives \$4 for every dollar). Are fees collected in some campuses (and, in particular, at UCSC) being used to subsidize some of the larger sister campuses?
- How is graduate student support funded? Faculty find that nonresident tuition presents a barrier to recruitment. Furthermore, being able to offer attractive 4-5 year packages is of the essence in attracting top-tier graduate students.

- Tuition increases and grant funding – Can there be a grace period on the implementation of tuition increases? Some multi-year grants, which did not budget for astronomical fee increases, may see much more of their awards diverted from research activity to paying increased fees for students.
- Scholarly Communication and Intellectual Property – there seems to be a lack of understanding at local IP offices, and at UCOP, about what constitutes Humanities research and its dissemination.
- How is the Silicon Valley Initiative viewed by UCOP and other campuses? Are other UCs hostile to UCSC's expansion into this area, due to a perception of competition?
- Efforts must be made to strongly communicate that all UC campuses (and, in particular, UCSC) provide an undergraduate research experience that sets them apart from other state universities. It should also be emphasized that we don't support the delivery of research and instruction remotely.
- Addressing the way the budget crisis impacts the research enterprise via the cutbacks in services (Library hours, etc.) and the campus research infrastructure (staffing in the Office of Research).
- Funding to campus CORs is still very small, and getting smaller. At the very least, the funding we receive should be protected, if not enhanced.

APPENDIX B

May 11, 2010

Lori Kletzer, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Commission on the Future Workgroup Recommendations

Dear Lori:

COR reviewed the recommendations from the Working Groups of the UC Commission on the Future, with a focus on the recommendations of the Research Strategies Working Group. The first thing that COR noted was the absence of a strong statement articulating the importance of research to the University, as well as the importance of supporting “curiosity-driven” research. Instead, much of the emphasis is on the utility of research and on short-term impact and deliverables. As a constituency, we need to be constantly advocating for research, and that point should be highlighted by the Research Strategies Working Group.

We also had the following comments:

- COR endorses Recommendation 1 (increasing transparency) and Recommendation 4 (streamlining risk management practices), though we feel that Recommendation 4 is somewhat unrealistic in the current budget climate, as staff are being cut back virtually everywhere to deal with the budget crisis.
- COR is concerned about increasing the ICR rate across the board, which in effect makes it more expensive to do research. Increasing ICR will likely hurt smaller campuses, such as UCSC, because they lack robust research infrastructure; furthermore, it may end up penalizing divisions (e.g., the Humanities) where the “cost” of doing research is considerably lower. Perhaps ICR rates should be differentiated across campuses, with larger campuses receiving a higher ICR rate, and smaller campuses retaining rates that are consistent with the infrastructure available.

It should also be noted that the case for increasing the ICR rate lacks thorough documentation and justification. Specifically, there is a general statement to the effect that other leading universities have increased ICRs, but no examples are given. A comparison to public universities of similar rank would be good to have, especially because COR members reported that they have reviewed proposals from places of similar rank to UCSC that have lower ICR. Also, it is stated that UC’s ICR should be “equal to or greater than” similar universities. Why greater than?

Finally, we wish to question the sentiment that "Nevertheless, it is important that the actual costs of conducting research be explicitly stated and recovered," which is repeated throughout the document. This is simply not true, unless we are a business. The State should not abrogate its commitment to fund research in the UC campuses, and UC should not give up on expecting the State to honor this commitment.

- COR feels there should be more emphasis on graduate education. Research relies on strong graduate programs, so anything that erodes the quality of graduate students we are able to attract is troubling. We would like to see concrete recommendations aimed at strengthening graduate education and recruitment (such as eliminating nonresident tuition for graduate students), and are very concerned about the proposal to increase graduate fees. We note that, at present, it costs about the same to hire a postdoctoral scholar as it does to hire a GSR, which is not a best practice for sustaining excellence in graduate education.

Outside of our specific purview, COR also had some concerns about the proposal to increase out-of-state undergraduate enrollments to generate more revenue for the campuses. What we find particularly troubling about this proposal to increase enrollment is the lack of discussion about capacity issues, space issues, reduced FTE, and ballooning student-to-teacher ratios. We should not be increasing enrollment if cannot ensure our students access to a *quality* education.

COR also feels that it is important to maintain UC as a 4-year institution. Proposals that advocate a 3-year pathway and/or online instruction run the risk of weakening the research experience of undergraduates, which is one of the major differences between the UC and the CSU.

Finally, COR strongly opposes differential fees by campus, which will inevitably result in the creation of tiers in the UC system and the erosion of research in the campuses that will be delegated to the lower tiers.

Sincerely,

/s/

Phokion G. Kolaitis, Chair
Committee on Research