

**Committee on Research (CoR)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**January 29, 2020**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 1:00 pm on January 29, 2020 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Michael Scheibner presiding.

I. Consultation with Interim Chancellor Brostrom, EVC/Provost Camfield, & APAPB Schnier

Interim Chancellor Brostrom, EVC/Provost Camfield, and APAPB Schnier attended the CoR meeting to discuss their proposed, indirect cost return policy. (Draft policy was not yet available for CoR's review.)

EVC/Provost Camfield began by stating that one of the motivations for the revision to the indirect cost policy was a conversation with a faculty member who was applying for a large grant and required sufficient indirect cost recovery for appropriate staffing. As more faculty apply for these significant grants, it is important for the campus to support the faculty with more indirect cost return funding. Another motivation for revising the indirect cost return policy is the realization that much of indirect cost return is currently used for capital planning. While this is an important area for campus growth, we need to ensure that more money is returned to faculty, deans, and the EVC/Provost. One option would be to move funds from another source, but that would place restrictions on spending, e.g. if more indirect cost return funds were allocated to the deans under this funds-transfer model, the deans would have to spend that money in one year. Across the UC campuses, the allocation percentage of indirect cost return to faculty, deans, and EVC/Provosts varies.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom pointed out that indirect cost return at the UCs tends to be less than other institutions, because the UC system normally relies, at least partly, on state funds for growth. However, that is not true in the case of the building of UCM. The last General Obligation bond was in 2006 and the last state revenue bond was in 2011. The state is not paying UCM's debt service on our buildings. Therefore, the goal is to create an indirect cost return model that allocates more money to faculty, deans, and the EVC/Provost, but also keeps some of the funds in a central location for capital projects. The EVC/Provost reiterated that more indirect cost funds will help the campus in supporting faculty who apply for large, center grants. But while we want to incentivize research, we also have to meet other campus obligations.

Chair Scheibner stated that CoR wishes to increase the amount of funds provided for the Senate faculty grants program. This program is especially helpful to faculty who lack extramural funding opportunities. CoR is proposing a similar model to the current academic planning process, whereby Schools are given the authority to allocate Senate research funds to their faculty. CoR recognizes that it lacks sufficient expertise to judge all proposals solely by merit. The committee envisions a future process in which Schools review their own faculty's proposals and make their own decisions on awarding. CoR would ask the School Executive Committees for proposals on how they would allocate the funding. Funds could be allocated to programs that cross Schools, e.g. conceptualization grants for large scale proposals, core facility support, shared equipment, and staffing. Funding could also potentially be tied to graduate student support, e.g. fellowships, GSRs, teaching positions, or used to award a stipend to graduate students for working as custodians of research instruments. VCORED Traina pointed out that CoR should work with Graduate Council

on the idea about graduate student funding, given that students' salary and tuition would both have to be covered.

APAPB Schnier stated that bridge funding is needed for faculty so they no longer have to hold on to their start up funds. On other UC campuses, the portion of indirect cost return that is allocated to Schools/deans is held for the purpose of bridge funding. Such localization of funds also makes it more transparent and easier to track.

A CoR member stated that a crucial need for faculty members is to retain an account of funds with no restrictions and no expiration date. CoR members then discussed the idea of a savings account model. Interim Chancellor Brostrom pointed out that UC Berkeley used to have a central bank structure whereby faculty could draw on a line of credit. APAPB Schnier cautioned that under such a model, the campus would have to locate the funds when faculty request them, and this could potentially lead to a "bank run". A CoR member then suggested capping the amount of money each faculty member could draw out. APAPB Schnier inquired what a reasonable cap would be. CoR members responded that that would vary across the disciplines. A CoR member suggested a good "cushion" of funding would be the amount of money equivalent to supporting one graduate student for one semester.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom, EVC/Provost Camfield and APAPB Schnier thanked CoR members for their input. The Interim Chancellor ended by stating that the new indirect cost rate proposal from HHS is anticipated in 2021-22.

## II. Chair's Report – Michael Scheibner

Chair Scheibner updated CoR members on the following:

### A. UCORP meeting January 13

- i. A wild cat strike (a strike that occurs in the absence of union leadership approval) of graduate student workers was carried out UC Santa Cruz, although the union later supported the action.
- ii. Climate change resolution discussion is ongoing.
- iii. UC-Elsevier negotiations update.
- iv. The UC Office of Research and Innovation informed UCORP of a requirement from the Department of Education for reporting gifts and grants that are over the \$250,000 threshold per entity per year. The issue for faculty is that this requirement affects items that are contained in confidential agreements that would be made public.
- v. UCORP's review of two MRUs is ongoing: UC Observatories and Bioengineering Institute of California.

### B. Division Council meeting January 22

- i. The Senate Chair reported that the cohort-based tuition plan is still being discussed. The plan was scheduled for a vote at the Regents meeting but the vote was not conducted.
- ii. Some UC campuses are not satisfied with the Governor's proposed budget, as it does not provide the desired amount of funds for seismic retrofitting.

- iii. Graduate Council and the VPDGE approved a policy to allow individual graduate groups to decide whether to use GRE scores in graduate student admission. GRE scores will no longer be a campus-wide requirement for admission.
- iv. Consultation with Professor Roger Bales on his proposed, carbon neutrality resolution. Division Council supported the resolution but recommended coordination with other entities on campus who are also working on climate change and carbon neutrality goals.
- v. Senate committees and School Executive Committees had many comments on the VPF's proposal for Division-level faculty FTE appointments. Comments will be transmitted to the VPF.

### III. Consent Calendar

#### A. Today's agenda

**Action:** The agenda was approved as presented with two additions: discussion of the process for the review of Senate faculty grant proposals and a brief announcement from VCORED Traina.

### IV. VCORED Traina Updates

VCORED Traina announced that an MRPI competition is upcoming. A letter of intent will be issued in the spring and proposals will be due in the fall. The competition has identified no targeted research areas; it is an open competition.

### V. ORU Policy Revisions

CoR members discussed the remaining question with regard to the revision of the ORU policy, which is the appointment and review of ORU directors. CoR members agreed that the initial appointment of ORU directors should be five years, and their first review should begin at the end of their fourth year. Chair Scheibner also stated that he will remove the paragraph in the draft policy that requests a list of ORU director duties, as director duties vary greatly across the ORUs. In lieu of this paragraph, he will add a sentence that requires, in general terms, that proposals should outline both ORU director and staff duties and to factor these duties into the subsequent reviews of the ORU.

Chair Scheibner reminded CoR members that three different groups of faculty on campus have expressed interest in submitting proposals to establish an ORU.

**Action:** Chair Scheibner will distribute the revised, draft ORU policy to CoR members for review and approval. The final version of the policy will be transmitted to Division Council.

### VI. Research Enhancement Proposal

Chair Scheibner presented his revised version of the CoR research enhancement proposal. With regard to graduate student support, VCORED Traina suggested that the proposal should outline the duties that graduate students would carry out. CoR members also suggested that the proposal be revised further to include a bridge funding request. Chair Scheibner asked for more input from CoR members and stated that

he will contact the Graduate Council chair and the VPDGE for their input on the graduate student support component of the proposal. Chair Scheibner will also ask the Graduate Council chair and VPDGE if they are willing to co-sponsor this proposal with CoR when the proposal eventually gets transmitted to campus academic leadership.

Lastly, Chair Scheibner intends to contact the deans to obtain concrete numbers on what this research enhancement proposal would cost and how much funding would be needed for seed grants or instrumentation grants.

**Action:** CoR members to send additional input to Chair Scheibner on the revised research enhancement proposal. The proposal will be added to a future CoR meeting agenda.

#### VII. Senate Faculty Research Grants

Chair Scheibner announced that 35 proposals have been received: 11 from SNS, 7 from SOE, and 17 from SSHA. Three CoR members will recuse from reviewing the grant proposals due to conflicts of interest. The grant proposals are uploaded on Box, and CoR members have already been granted access to the Box folder.

**Action:** Committee analyst will send CoR members a reminder with the link to where the grant proposals are uploaded. Chair Scheibner will send a sorting spreadsheet for CoR members to work from. The remaining CoR members with no conflicts of interest will conduct a final review of the proposals and select awardees at the next CoR meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Attest: Michael Scheibner, CoR chair