

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH Annual Report 2014-2015

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

In 2014-15, the Committee on Research addressed a broad range of issues of significance to campus research policy and infrastructure. Most importantly, we completed our multi-year analysis of the structure and use of indirect cost receipt (ICR) allocations, culminating in an informative and useful consultation with Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Galloway. We began a campuswide survey and evaluation of shared research equipment and facilities, which will require follow up by the 2015-16 COR. COR continued to consult with Vice Chancellor Research (VCR) Brandt about changing policies and structures within the Office of Research (OR) and other issues related to the research climate on campus, including implementation of the Envision UCSC strategic planning goal to support research excellence, new OR guidelines for seed funding and cost sharing, revised Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) proposal preparation deadlines, the rollout of Cayuse proposal management software at OSP, and the NASA Academic Mission Support (NAMS) proposal to continue our campus' involvement with NASA-Ames. Much of the Committee's time, particularly during Winter Quarter, was spent evaluating proposals and making awards through our various faculty research grants programs (FRG, SRG, NFRG). In addition, COR collaborated with the Sustainability Office to evaluate proposals for the 2015-16 Campus Sustainability Champion award, funded by the Office of the President. Finally, we discussed various proposed changes to campus and UC-wide policies, procedures, and guidelines. Most significantly we provided critical feedback on the proposed campus Accessible Technology Plan and system wide Guidelines for Accepting and Managing Equity in return for access to University facilities or services.

COR Activities Regarding Matters of Research Policy

Analysis of Indirect Cost Receipts and University Opportunity Funds. Over the last three years, COR has been examining how indirect cost receipts (ICR) from contract and grants are used on our campus. We have paid particular attention to that portion of ICR that is directed to University Opportunity Funds (UOF), but also have been investigating how other categories of "Facilities and Administration" (F&A) fees get allocated. COR is particularly interested in the uses of ICR because these funds are generated directly by faculty through their research efforts. Thus, how these funds are allocated and used should be readily transparent to the faculty and should be used as directly and effectively as possible to support existing research and leverage new research opportunities on campus.

According to Systemwide policy, after the removal of Pre-Off-The-Top (Pre-OTT) funds by the Office of the President, the remainder of campus generated federal F&A fees are returned to the campus and divided three-ways into roughly 20% Off-The-Top (OTT) funds, 44% General Funds, and 36% University Opportunity Funds (UOF). While this general structure is mandated by UCOP, how funds within each category are used is left to the discretion of individual campuses. OTT funds are specifically designated for expenses directly associated with the administration of federal contract and grant activities. *Off the Top Funds:* These funds are

somewhat limited in that they may not be used for capital expenses. At UCSC, 25% of these OTT funds go directly into the campuses General Fund. Of the remaining 75%, an additional 25% are allocated to support central administrative units under the direct control of the EVC. An additional 20% of the remaining 75% goes to Business and Administrative Services (BAS), another central administrative unit. The remaining 55% (of 75%) is divided among the academic divisions (45%) and the Office of Research (10%). While OTT funds are designated specifically for administrative costs, COR remains concerned that such a large portion of OTT goes to the central administration and general fund, far from where most of the direct administration of contracts and grants actually takes place on our campus.

General Funds: The largest portion of F&A fees that is returned to campus (44%) goes directly into the General Fund. According to COR's consultation with EVC Galloway on May 19, 2015, no attempt is made to track these funds separately from other sources of general funding nor to use them specifically to support campus research infrastructure or administration. While COR appreciates the value to the University of maintaining flexibility in its use of ICR contributions to General Funds, we would encourage the administration to be more mindful of and accountable for how F&A funds are used and prioritize using them to support the research enterprise whenever possible.

University Opportunity Funds: In regards to the University Opportunity Funds (36% of F&A fees returned to campus), COR over the last two years has examined specifically how these funds are used by the Office of Research, the Academic Divisions, the Central Administration and COR. Of the three categories of ICR funding, UOF should be used most directly to enhance campus research capacity and excellence.

At present virtually all of COR's funding comes from its allocation of UOF, which represents about 5% of UOF or about 1.8% of all federal F&A funds returned to campus. All of this funding goes directly to reimburse faculty for scholarly travel to research conferences or support faculty research projects (New Faculty Research Grants [NFRG], Faculty Research Grants [FRG] and Special Research Grants [SRG]). In our reviews of FRG/SRG proposals, which have become increasingly selective, we pay particular attention to whether previous COR support has leveraged external funding and/or resulted in significant scholarly works or performances. The allocation of COR's UOF and their impact is publically reported each year in our Annual Report to the Academic Senate (see Section II below). Reports on individual faculty grants are also sent annually to the Deans of each Academic Division and School.

Last year, COR's analysis of the other (non-COR) uses of UOF by the Office of Research and the Academic Divisions suggested that for the most part these funds were being used effectively to support faculty research and infrastructure. Our only significant concern was with the rather large proportion of UOF that was being used to support retention efforts for a small number of faculty in one or two of the divisions. COR argued that UOF was best used in ways that were based on competitive merit, yet broadly and equitably accessible.

This year, at the request of COR, EVC Galloway and her staff provided detailed information on the allocation of UOF by the Central Administration (EVC to COR, December 18, 2014). As with our review of the Office of Research and the Divisions, COR was pleased to see that the

portion of UOF allocated to the Central Administration is predominately used to directly support campus research and infrastructure. However, we do have some concerns about the significant use of UOF to support University Relations/Development (UR). In 2013-14, UR received over 8% of total campus UOF. In comparison, COR, which returns all of its funding directly to faculty research, only received 5%. More clarity is needed about how UOF is used by UR to directly support campus research and infrastructure and if this level of funding for UR from UOF represents a short-term increase associated with the Comprehensive Campaign or a more permanent shift in funding priorities by the administration. If the latter, then future CORs need to follow up with the administration to understand the reasoning for this shift in the use of UOF away from what would appear to be more direct funding and support for faculty research. Also alarming was the fact that the portion of UOF designated for support of faculty start up and facilities maintenance dropped to below 2% in the 2013-2014 budget. This drop may be explained, at least in part, by the low number of faculty recruitments in recent years. However, why more of UOF was not allocated for research equipment and facilities support, some of which are in critical need of maintenance and repair, remains troubling.

After our extensive multi-year review of UOF, we have a clearer and broader sense of how COR funding fits within the larger structure of the uses of ICR to support campus research. While COR would welcome more funding for our NFRG/FRG/SRG and Scholarly Travel programs, we do not view increases to these programs as among the campus' most pressing needs in the area of research support. Some critical areas of research support need that surfaced in our discussions of UOF and in our annual reviews of faculty grant proposals and where COR feels more campus support are required include:

- *Support for faculty computers and other core technology.* While requiring that faculty purchase their own computers may make sense in some fields where large external grants are the norm, in other disciplines the loss of funding for replacement computers and support of associated software and technologies has essentially shifted these basic infrastructural costs for doing our job onto the faculty themselves. In the last few years, COR has seen a steady increase in requests from faculty for replacement of basic computer and printing equipment, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences. While we routinely deny these requests, we are deeply concerned that these basic faculty needs are not being met. COR feels strongly that a basic-level of computing support is essential to all faculty research across the disciplines and should be backstopped by ICR.
- *Replacement, repair and maintenance of research equipment and facilities.* As noted above, COR is concerned to see the percentage of UOF committed to facilities support drop over the last few years. Allowing research facilities to fall into disrepair may be “penny wise, but pound foolish” as cost of upkeep may be significantly less than replacement. Also, having old and out of date facilities without adequate technical staff support may make it more difficult for PIs to be strongly competitive for major contracts and grants. While purchase of new equipment should come from direct costs on contracts and grants, general repair and maintenance of equipment and facilities rightfully should be supported by ICR.
- *Waivers for Non-Resident Tuition on GSRs and TAsHips.* Currently PIs supporting graduate students who are required to pay NRT must cover that tuition in quarters where the student holds a teaching assistantship and not a GSR. However such tuition waivers of TAsHips cannot be charged directly to grants.

- *Incentive rebates to faculty who yield large contract and grants.* These discretionary funds are critical to many PIs to support expenses that are not allowable under federal guidelines—for example payment of NRT for TAs. They would also be highly motivational to those faculty.

COR hopes that our comprehensive review of UOF, and ICR more broadly, will open a campus dialog among COR, the Office of Research, the Academic Divisions, and the Central Administration about the most effective use of these funds and how they may best be used to support campus research and leverage increased research funding and ICR.

Implementation of Envision UCSC Strategic Planning Research Infrastructure Goal. The Envision UCSC strategic planning process identified support for research excellence as one of the primary areas of focus for the campus moving forward. Overall, COR found the research goal articulated on the Envision UCSC website (<http://cpevc.ucsc.edu/envision-ucsc/goals/research/index.html>) to be of interest and we are in general agreement with its intended aim to improve campus infrastructure in support of increased research capacity and excellence. However, COR was somewhat disappointed to see the extent to which the wide ranging discussion in the ‘research vision statement’ was truncated and homogenized in the final goal statement. The Committee had expected that the Envision planning process would help the campus reach some level of consensus on what priorities should be singled out for strategic investment. It is not clear that this has happened. Towards that end, we hope that the implementation process reincorporates some major priorities which were articulated earlier in the Envision UCSC process. COR recognizes the broad scope of these goal statements and we are committed to working with the Office of Research and other units tasked with implementing the research infrastructure goal. The details for how best to achieve this goal will hopefully be addressed more fully in the rollout of the anticipated specific action plans associated with Envision UCSC and we await the opportunity to review specific proposals related to improving research infrastructure as they are developed.

In the short term, COR was pleased to see that the central administration has committed approximately \$3M in one-time funds and around \$175K/yr in new permanent funds of support of the research infrastructure goal of the Envision UCSC strategic plan (CPEVC Galloway to VCR Brandt, October 30, 2014; VCR Brandt to Campus, April 17, 2015). This increased support will be used to staff new initiatives within the Office of Research in the areas of Research Development and Entrepreneurship, Industry Relations and Economic Development and to upgrade software systems in OR.

In addition, new research funding also includes \$500,000 in one-time funds for three-years (2014-15 to 2016-17) to temporarily seed-fund new research programs, provide matching funds and cost sharing for external grants, including major training and equipment grants, and overall enhance the research enterprise, at the discretion of the VCR. COR applauds this substantial, if short-term, re-investment in seed-funding and cost sharing, which should help our campus leverage more and larger external awards. In turn, increased indirect cost receipts from these awards should help to create a more permanent base for such funding campus-wide. However, more coordination is needed between OR, the divisions, departments, and COR to ensure that all faculty know when, where and how to appropriately access seed and matching funds. The Office

of Research's recently updated policy on "Campus Research Seed and Cost Sharing Funds" (see discussion below) is a good start, but individual divisional and departmental policies on accessing such funds continue to be disparate and opaque. The campus also needs better data and reporting on the impacts of seed funding and cost sharing so that these limited on-campus funds can be directed toward efforts that have the greatest potential to leverage outside funding and/or to lead to significant and impactful research outcomes (COR to EVC, October 27, 2014).

COR noted that the Envision UCSC research excellence goal referred almost exclusively to infrastructure within the Office of Research and did not engage with research infrastructure more broadly across campus. Overall, shared research infrastructure and facilities in the divisions need to be better staffed and maintained. During recent budget cuts, research facilities and the staff and resources to maintain them were very badly undercut. Large-scale equipment and shared research facilities are increasingly becoming old, broken, or inaccessible, preventing faculty from carrying out their research priorities. Examples include the closure of the scanning electron microscope facility and the non-maintenance of the aging electron microprobe in PBSci and the dismantling of the Social Sciences Media Lab. Institutional cost-sharing could be (re-)implemented to help alleviate the costs of skilled technical staff and maintenance upkeep. In particular, as noted above it may be necessary to reevaluate how ICR funding is distributed on campus in order to address these critical issues of research facilities maintenance and technical staff support. Careful campus-wide planning will be necessary to assess the best means for resource allocation in order to achieve the most impactful resource investments.

Finally, COR has noted a growing tension between teaching and research on campus. Tenure-line research faculty at UCSC do more teaching, both in terms of courses and students, than their colleagues at most comparable institutions. Campus standards in regards to what constitutes teaching versus research need to be clarified, especially in terms of supervising undergraduate research and graduate and post-doctoral mentoring. Plans for graduate growth, particularly in the number of Ph.D. per faculty member, will add to the workload of research faculty in ways that are not now clearly captured in campus metrics for teaching effort. Workload incentives and disincentives for research and graduate training must be widely discussed and addressed, and the scale and scope of possible support for research faculty better articulated. We are encouraged by the initial efforts to address these issues in the Report of the Joint Task Force on Graduate Growth.¹

COR is looking forward to engaging with these workload issues as part of any detailed implementation plan for the Envision UCSC Support Research Excellence Goal.

Shared Research Facilities and Equipment. COR would like to find ways to make the existence and availability of shared research facilities more visible to campus researchers (both students and faculty), as well as prospective faculty hires, post-doctoral candidates, and graduate students. In a joint request from COR and the VCR, we asked for an accounting from the Academic Divisions for all their shared research equipment and facilities. With these data, we hope that the Office of Research can curate a campus-wide catalog of shared research facilities and resources. We will work with OR and the divisions to make sure that information about

¹ The report may be viewed at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/archives/Current%20Issues/Task%20Force%20on%20Graduate%20Growth/TFGG%20Report>

these resources are accurate, widely available, and accessible to appropriate constituency groups. This effort is part of a larger COR agenda to examine the current state and future development of research infrastructure on campus. Next year, the committee will also attempt to assess and potentially redress issues related to management, staffing, funding models and sustainability of these equipment and facilities given the current fiscal environment. This review will also serve to make resources for grant proposals more readily available and accessible to researchers, thus increasing the potential success of such awards. It may also advantage faculty recruitments by leveraging startup funds in the most effective and efficient ways, by reducing the potential for unnecessary duplication of equipment and facilities.

Faculty Computing Support. COR continued discussion of the appropriateness of COR funding computer equipment and computer replacement and reviewed divisional policies for purchasing and replacing faculty computers. Faculty report decreased support for computing equipment by federal funding agencies and due to budget cuts on campus faculty computers are no longer upgraded on a regular or consistent basis within divisions. At least three of the divisions (Social Sciences, Physical & Biological Sciences, and Baskin School of Engineering) no longer provide any support to replace faculty computers. In contrast, most campus units continue to replace staff computers as needed. In CORs FRG/SRG reviews, if a faculty researcher made the case that particular computing equipment or software was highly specialized and necessary for a specific research project and was to be used exclusively for certain research-related tasks, then these expenses were considered allowable. An example would be the purchase of tablets to give to off-campus research subjects on which to run a particular Psychology experiment. Requests for general faculty computer replacements and upgrades, however, are routinely denied. COR needs to remain adamant about its position, since it is the administration's responsibility to provide faculty with the computing equipment and software necessary to engage in basic teaching, research, and service activities. Providing the resources and infrastructure necessary to meet the standard expectations of faculty duties should not be pushed onto project based research funding, since funding such basics will come at the expense of other aspects of the project and is increasingly considered by funding agencies as the responsibility of the institution (see UC Systemwide Uniform Guidance Workgroup Assessment Report, December 5, 2014). These are just the sort of resources that are supposed to be covered by "overhead" and should be covered by ICR funding that is distributed across campus. COR consulted on this issue with the CPEVC on May 19, 2015, and we hope to see the central administration and divisions make restoring funding for faculty computer replacement a priority in the coming year.

Consultations with Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) and The Office of Research (OR). COR continued to extend a standing invitation to VCR Scott Brandt to attend every COR meeting, except those where we were reviewing FRG/SRG proposals, to consult with our committee on issues of mutual concern regarding research policy and climate on campus.

Cayuse Grant Management Software. At our December 2, 2014 meeting, COR received a presentation, led by Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) Director Kate Aja, on the implementation of Cayuse research management software within the OSP. Cayuse is a commercial software package designed to assist researchers and administrators with sponsored projects management, proposal development, electronic submission, and compliance management. In general, the committee was satisfied with the overall look of the system and we

see the potential advantage in reduced workload for OSP staff. However, the committee was somewhat disappointed by the limited functions currently available directly to faculty. In previous consultations with the VCR, one of the primary selling points of the system was that it was supposed to have a tool which faculty could use to straightforwardly template their budgets and easily enter data. However, we learned from Director Aja that OSP staff were unhappy with the existing Cayuse budget-making tool and instead developed their own stand-alone Excel spreadsheet for planning budgets. These data will still need to be completed by OSP analysts and then hand entered into Cayuse or Fastlane. The system does appear to significantly streamline submissions to NIH, but most submissions will still need to be manually transferred to NSF/Fastlane and other agency systems. It was unclear who would be responsible for this transfer at the time of the presentation. Overall, the system is a definite step forward in technology for the Office of Research and COR supports its adoption at UCSC. In addition to assisting OSP analysts with routine tasks, the system will greatly enhance the campus' ability to track and analyze data on proposal submissions and awards. However, the committee is somewhat concerned that the system was initially oversold in terms of its overall capabilities and advantages especially for faculty users. In the future, COR hopes to work more closely with the VCR regarding decisions about the development or adoption of new processes and systems by OSP and within the Office of Research more broadly. In particular, COR can be helpful in prioritizing and evaluating the types of functionality faculty need and are offered by new systems. However, to be most effective, COR needs to be brought into decision making processes more fully and much earlier in their development.

New Procedures for Campus Research Seed and Cost Sharing Funds and OSP Proposal Deadlines. COR was given the opportunity to provide feedback on drafts of the New Procedures for Campus Research Seed/Matching Funds and the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) Proposal Deadlines before final versions were distributed to the campus community in April. COR fully supported the general substance of both procedural documents.

We were particularly pleased to see a clear statement of procedures from the Office of Research on how to access central resources for seed-funding and matching funds, as a general lack of information on this process has been an on-going concern of COR. Similar statements are needed for departmental and divisional procedures and all these procedures need to be collated in a central place (website) for easy-access by principal investigators. COR would also encourage OR or OSP to provide more specific examples of how a non-cash (or mixed cash and non-cash) cost-sharing budget should be summarized and formatted. Some standard formulas or templates for how to calculate the values for specific kinds of non-cash contributions would be particularly helpful.

COR, while in agreement with the aim of the new proposal deadlines to better manage workload and rationalize workflow in OSP, had some substantive critical comments on the original draft document that we reviewed. COR argued that the initial deadlines for contacting OSP when starting a proposal submission were the most critical and the ones that should be enforced most strictly. We recommended that the other deadlines for finalizing budgets and submitting final documents be treated more as guidelines and enforced less rigorously and on a case by case basis. We were pleased to see that the VCR took COR's advice and eliminated the originally proposed divisional review and signoff for Late Proposal Approval Requests (LPAR).

NASA Academic Mission Support (NAMS) Proposal. At our meeting on May 5, 2015, COR received a briefing on the NAMS proposal process from VCR Brandt, Associate VCR Williams, Assistant VCR Siegel, and Director Goulding. UCSC is now in the 12th year of its \$330 million University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) contract with NASA, which represents about one-fifth of our campus contracts and grants total. Rather than reapply to Congress for approval of another UARC, which was deemed politically infeasible at this time, NASA held a competition for a new 5-year \$250 million NASA Academic Mission Support (NAMS) contract at NASA-Ames.

Limited to universities and non-profits, UCSC, as the lead in a consortium of UC and Non-UC campuses, was one of three competitors for this new contract. VCR Brandt and his staff reported that both NASA and UCSC desired greater academic engagement among NASA, UCSC, and the broader UC system under the new contract. VCR Brandt and his team discussed a proposed organizational structure that would pair UC academic and UARC staff leadership in ways that were designed to create a more synergistic research environment. UCSC’s proposal was presented to NASA in April and a decision on the outcome of the contract award is expected in August. The loss of this contract would have significant fiscal consequences for the campus.

COR Grant Programs

In 2014-15, COR had two funding sources: the University Opportunity Fund (UOF)—with three components—and a small amount from the Earle C. Anthony Endowment.

Budget Source	Amount
Opportunity Fund (UOF) – ICR from federally funded grants	\$302,194
Education Fund (UOF) – ICR from privately funded grants	\$61,865
ARRA Funds (UOF) – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	\$0
Earle C. Anthony Endowment	\$8,867
TOTAL	\$373,026

Expenditures	Amount
Faculty Research Grants (FRGs)	\$132,153
Special Research Grants (SRGs)	\$161,939
New Faculty Research Grants (NFRGs)	\$16,989
Scholarly Meeting Travel (SMT)	\$133,796
TOTAL	\$444,877

Faculty Research Grants (FRGs) and Special Research Grants (SRGs)

Each year, COR solicits applications for its three research programs: New Faculty Research Grants (NFRGs), Faculty Research Grants (FRGs) and Special Research Grants (SRGs). These grants often provide seed funding for new research and especially help new faculty as they establish their individual research careers. There were 155 total requests, of which 111 (72%) were funded.

New Faculty Research Grants (NFRGs)

In order to give new faculty immediate access to research dollars, each year COR runs the New Faculty Research Grant (NFRG) program. Unlike the FRGs and SRGs, which are awarded for the following fiscal year, NFRGs are awarded for the current fiscal year. Essentially, an NFRG award gives new faculty access to the previous year's FRG program, because they were not faculty at UCSC at the time FRG applications were due. Of the 10 NFRG requests, 9 were fully funded. Total funds disbursed decreased from \$20,179 (2013-14) to \$16,989 (2014-15) due to a decrease in requests.

Scholarly Meeting Travel (SMT)

The other grant program offered by COR supports faculty travel to scholarly meetings throughout the world. Senate faculty may apply for a \$700 award once per academic year, provided the travel meets eligibility guidelines. 192 (\$133,796) individual awards were made to faculty for 2014-15 travel.

Other COR Business

Outstanding Dissertation Award Proposal. During 2013-14, COR and the Graduate Council, at the request of VCR Brandt and in consultation with the Dean of Graduate Studies, collaboratively developed a proposal to establish an annual awards program to recognize outstanding dissertation research and writing in each of UCSC's four academic divisions and the school of engineering. The Graduate Division was to administer the review of the divisional winners and to select an overall campus awardee. VCR Brandt secured funding for the campus-wide award through a gift from the Steck Family Foundation. It had been COR's understanding, based on consultations with both the VCR and Dean of Graduate Studies, that the Graduate Division would take the lead in administering this award program and coordinate with the Divisional Deans. Unfortunately, despite repeated efforts by COR to encourage the initiation of this process within the Graduate Division no award program was put in place for 2014-15. COR is extremely disappointed by this turn of events and is deeply concerned about losing the support of a major campus donor. A possible solution to this impasse may be for next year's COR to contact the Divisional Deans directly to initiate the award program process. Given VCR Brandt's personal interest in the program, administration of the campus-wide award process may need to be coordinated within the Office of Research, in collaboration with COR.

Faculty Climate Action Champion Award. COR was asked by the UCSC Sustainability Office to assist with developing a proposal submission and review process for the Faculty Climate Action Champion Award (\$25,000). The purpose of the award, which is funded by the UC Office of the President (UCOP) as part of President Napolitano's Carbon Neutrality Initiative, is to enable and promote faculty innovation and leadership on climate action and sustainability, and

to encourage integrated scholarship, teaching, engagement and advocacy about climate change solutions. The selected Champion is expected to work at the campus, community, state, national, and/or global level to apply their expertise towards addressing climate action, and provide a public lecture at the end of their tenure to discuss their work and activities as Champion.

COR set up an online proposal submission process, reviewed the submitted proposals and consulted with Sustainability Programs Manager Shauna Casey about our evaluation of the proposals and recommended two of the proposals for the award. The Office of Sustainability made the award to the proposal with the most COR support. It is unclear whether this will be a continuing program.

Draft Accessible Technology Plan. The Committee on Research (COR) reviewed the revised UC Santa Cruz Accessible Technology (AT) Five Year Transition Plan (March 17, 2015). While COR acknowledges the critical importance of the goal of the proposed plan to make research and teaching technology universally accessible to all students and research collaborators, the draft policy document raised several concerns amongst the COR membership. COR found the plan to be so vague as to be largely incomprehensible and thus difficult to assess its potential impact on research and teaching on campus. In order to adequately assess the plan's implications in practice, a revised draft will need to be accompanied by a fleshed out set of implementation guidelines and discussion of best practices with detailed associated examples.

An additional concern of COR is that, as written, the policy places the responsibility for ensuring the accessibility of purchased software and online course content and research materials entirely on the faculty. While faculty should be made aware of the requirements and guidelines for accessibility, COR feels that it is an unreasonable expectation that every principal investigator (PI) purchasing software related to a research project and posting research data or results online would have the required knowledge or technical expertise to implement these requirements without more precise guidelines and administrative support. COR recommends that a reference tool be attached to this plan that clearly documents acceptable elements of accessibility design, with detailed examples, for the pertinent resources related to research and teaching. A list of commercial and open source software products commonly used in teaching and research that meet these design criteria should be included.

COR is also concerned about what appears to be a new mandate for all campus PIs that there be an accessible technology plan in place “at the point of application for funding.” The draft policy and accompanying materials are very unclear about what such a plan will entail and what resources or staff will be available to assist PIs in developing and implementing such a plan for their research group. Furthermore, the committee wonders who will be responsible for assessing the adequacy of such a plan and how this new mandate will impact the workflow for proposal submissions. Notably absent from the proposed plan's list of staff assignments are Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) staff, yet it is likely that the burden of gate-keeping compliance with this plan “at the point of application funding” will fall on their shoulders. However, there is no discussion of how this increased workload within OSP will be mitigated.

Finally, COR notes that one of the Envision UCSC goals was to eliminate onerous bureaucracy. COR views this whole plan as perpetuating over-compliance and pushing responsibility

downwards onto the faculty without providing for adequate resources and staff support to meet these critical accessibility requirements.

Guidelines for Accepting and Managing Equity. Various UC Campuses are creating incubators and accelerators where new companies created by students, staff, and faculty and/or based on university-developed inventions can begin to develop business or product development plans. A common element of non-university incubators or accelerators is the ability to accept equity in the companies as an element of the financial consideration for access to space and business support services. On June 20, 2014, President Napolitano authorized the University to initiate a pilot program whereby the University may accept equity in a company as full or partial consideration for access to University facilities and/or services (“AFS”) in the context of University Incubators or Accelerators. COR reviewed revised guidelines for the three-year pilot program to allow campuses to accept equity in start up companies, in lieu of cash payments, for access to university facilities and services. COR expressed concern about the potentially negative impact to the research environment on campus should such equity agreements become commonplace. The committee believes that it is paramount that faculty, students, and researchers all have access, and top priority, for the use of research equipment and facilities. It is unclear as to whether or not this priority access could be impeded by the interests of potentially competing financial goals.

Finally, the Committee on Research would like to acknowledge all the hard work and wise counsel provided by our staff analyst, Matthew Mednick.

Respectfully Submitted;
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
Brandin Baron-Nusbaum
John Musacchio
Jason Nielsen
Jarmilia Pittermann
Raquel Prado
G .S. Sahota
Matt Wagers
Steve Whittaker
Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair

August 31, 2015