COUNCIL ON RESEARCH 1996-1997 ANNUAL REPORT

To The Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Council on Research (COR) is charged with dealing with emerging policy issues concerning research, such as research support, human subjects, and campus-industry cooperative programs. In addition, COR formulates Senate general guidelines to deal with reviews of Organized Research Units, establishes policies and procedures governing the allocation of funds within the purview of the Faculty Grants Program to facilitate faculty research, and conference travel to scholarly meetings for the purpose of presenting research results, as well as intercampus research travel for faculty to do research at other UC campuses. COR also provides periodic evaluation of units of the administration that support faculty research, including the Office of Research Administration, the Office of Sponsored Research, the Office of Intellectual Property Administration and Technology Transfer, the Office of Academic Computing, and the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects.

Funding awarded by the Council on Research/Faculty Grants Program (COR/FGP) is made available by the Chancellor to help support the conduct of research by eligible faculty at UCLA. Funds are competitively awarded through a peer review process that examines the merit and originality of a project, its potential to generate extramural funding, and non-overlap with other research supports. FGP grant applications for each division are evaluated, assigned priority scores and recommendations for funding levels by the subcommittees of the FGP. The assigned priorities are analyzed and evaluated by a subcommittee from COR to determine fund availability and funding ranges. The FGP subcommittees consists of a total of 14 senate faculty members, two from each of the seven divisions, the Humanities, Fine Arts, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, Professional Schools, and Health Sciences. Subcommittee members are appointed by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly to serve for up to 2 years. The policies and procedures governing the administration of research funds are based upon instructions formulated by President Sproul and the Faculty Grant Program of the Senate in the early 1950s. They are outlined in Appendix IX of the Academic Senate Manual, Los Angeles Division.

The Council on Research receives an annual budget for research support from State funds. For the fiscal year 1996-1997, funding received to support research was $1,741,680. Funding to support conference travel was supplemented from the Chancellor Opportunity Funds and State Funds ($299,370), a gift from the UCLA Foundation ($25,000), and from the State Tide Land Fund ($3,700).

COR research activities for FY 1996-1997 are summarized as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGP GRANTS DIVERISIONS</th>
<th>96-97 Request</th>
<th>96-97 Funded</th>
<th>% Funded to Request</th>
<th>96-97 Submitted</th>
<th>96-97 Awarded</th>
<th>% Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>159,692</td>
<td>87,820</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1,026,896</td>
<td>501,917</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>416,070</td>
<td>204,831</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>459,004</td>
<td>192,761</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>493,265</td>
<td>255,794</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>963,898</td>
<td>464,060</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>228256</td>
<td>107,015</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA Foundation</td>
<td>23,190</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,747,081</td>
<td>1,814,198</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMITTEE DELIBERATION AND ACTIONS

1. Vice Chancellor for Research Patel discussed the organizational changes in the Office of Contracts and Grants Administration to the Council on Research (COR). The main focus is to improve the overall effectiveness of their function and services to the faculty at UCLA, as well as to promote research on campus and in cooperation with local industries. The office has incorporated other functions under its new name “Sponsored Research” that consists of the Contracts and Grants Administration and the Business Partnership Administration which includes the Intellectual Property/Technology Transfer Administration. A networked computer program called R-Net was introduced to create a strategic research management initiative at UCLA. The main focus was to remove barriers to faculty research and at the same time build an efficient informational support structure on campus. R-Net was presented as a program to manage externally obtained grants. It is to be jointly owned with IBM, linked with AIS (Administrative Information System) and can be licensed for use at other UC campuses with minimal or no cost. The program browses through public sources of information to find new grant opportunities and list them for faculty, as well as identifying other UCLA faculty working on similar projects, using keywords. Currently, this program is being tested in four departments in UCLA. It is to be maintained by Sponsored Research. It is anticipated everyone will be brought into the system by June 1998. COR’s major concerns were: 1) the financial management of this new arrangement at UCLA and the cost to introduce R-Net; 2) whether or not it will be used enough to make it a useful tool; 3) whether the generic program will suit all disciplines with distinctive needs, e.g., humanities; and 4) how might it be affected by the high turnover of personnel for maintenance and data entry.

2. Members of COR were involved in discussions about changes to patent policy. A revision of the patent royalty distribution has been proposed to use a portion (15% of net royalties) of the revenue stream to fund research directly. In the final debates at the Office of the President, the Council of Chancellors suggested that the 15% research incentive fund be incorporated into their discretionary fund pool. Members of the COR at UCLA supported the position of President Atkinson’s Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) that funds should be identified as they became available and returned to each campus to support the conduct of research on each campus, as determined by the Campus research community. COR’s position is funds should be used to support the conduct of research either through the Council on Research and/or schools/departments, and not be incorporated into a Chancellor’s discretionary fund pool. With support from the Academic Council, TTAC’s position was adopted by the Office of the President.

3. Members of COR decided to retain the conditions set by earlier Committees on Research that no late FGP grant applications will be accepted. The rationale was that the funding formula used to allocate funding to different divisions is based, in part, on the number of applications received by the due date. If late applications were accepted, the funding allocations would not provide an appropriate distribution of funding among divisions.
4. The research environment at UC was reviewed and evaluated in two reports based on surveys that obtained responses from 2,400 senate faculty members from all nine campuses. One report was prepared by the system-wide Senate’s University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) and published in 1996, entitled “The Deteriorating Environment for Conducting Research at the University of California: An Interim Report Based on a Survey of UC Academic Senate Faculty”. This interim report was followed this year by the second UCORP report entitled “The Deteriorating Environment for Conducting Research at the University of California: A Qualitative Analysis of Frustrations and Rewards”. Members of COR unanimously agreed on the importance of these reports. COR members expressed interest in addressing some of the research issues discussed in these reports.

Problems identified in the above reports include many areas of inadequate research support: funding, research administration, space, equipment, clerical services, and office supplies. Members of COR have agreed that “the serious lack of the most basic supports for the fundamental academic enterprise” is the first and primary issue to be addressed. The basic support for the fundamental faculty enterprise includes everything that allows the faculty to function in the pursuit of Instruction and Research. The reports indicated an apparent insufficiency of funding at the department level in Supplies & Equipment (S&E) to support even the most basic needs of the faculty. Members of COR concluded that the funding to support the fundamental faculty infrastructure to permit the performance of instruction and the conduct of research is neglected in favor of competing priorities by the academic leadership.

Members of COR also expressed concerns on the inadequacy of the Faculty Support Rate (FSR) from the state budget that provides funds for Instruction and Research (I&R). (Within this budget category there should be funding for S&E for departments). The Council elected to inform the Legislative Assembly of their deliberations and the need for a call to action. The following motion presented by COR was endorsed by the Legislative Assembly: “The members of the Council on Research call the attention of the Executive Board and the UCLA Legislative Assembly to the deterioration of the core funding (funding for I&R) within the research and teaching environment of the general faculty. We request that the Academic leadership, in considering their budgets for Instruction and Research at the departmental level, ensure an adequate allocation, within the framework of the Faculty Support Rate, to meet the basic needs of the fundamental mandate of the academic mission of instruction and research. The support for I&R must be accorded a top priority as it is this support which sustains the vitality of the faculty enterprise. Therefore, it is resolved that the administration and the appropriate Senate bodies study and recommend mechanisms to insure adequate support for Instruction and Research, with accountability of the funds in the Faculty Support Rate”.

5. A report on “The Administrative Policies and Procedures Concerning Organized Research Units” was made available to COR for discussion. The following elements are essential and necessary to an Organized Research Unit (ORU): 1) a core group of faculty dedicated to a well-defined research mission; 2) a sound leadership for stability and vitality of the Unit; 3) institutional financial support to function and initiate programs; and 4) a designated space for identity and basic elements in support of its identity. An ORU is recognized for its strength in generating extramural research support, excellence in research productivity demonstrated by a solid publication record, and the paramount respect from the research community for the
core faculty. This year, the members of COR commented on the 5-year review of the Dental Research Institute.

6. Policies relating to allowable expenses/purchases from COR/FGP grants were discussed. COR was concerned that senate funding was being increasingly diverted to the purchase of supplies and equipment instead of being used to support the conduct of the research. COR believes that S&E purchases should be provided through departmental funding from S&E of the Faculty Support Rate fund. COR explicitly identifies communications charges such as fax, telephones and mail as allowable expenses if they are research related and adequately justified.

7. The integrity of the Faculty Grants Program was discussed. For many years, the Committee on Research has been attempting to obtain increased funding for the FGP budget locally and system-wide. In 1996, the Office of the President decentralized the budget by making block allocations of funds to each campus and each campus now decides how funds are allocated among the various programs on campus without the direct involvement of the system-wide administration. From this point onwards, it is to the Office of the Chancellor at UCLA that COR must make its case to increase FGP funding. COR members hoping to encourage future funding augmentations, introduced minor modifications to make clear that the FGP program supports outstanding research. FGP and COR members agreed to give a limited number of awards substantially larger than the average award based on merit, even if not all applications were funded. Members of COR were unanimous in their intent to seek additional funding for the Senate’s FGP when the timing is appropriate.

8. Copyrights for computer programs were discussed. As stated in the UC policies, if a program is generated during, or as a result of, an external funded program, and where substantial resources at the University were involved, the Regents have rights to the copyright. COR felt that UC policy does not deal with how or where the idea is generated. The distinction lies with who paid for it. Therefore, computer programs are treated the same way as patents.

9. The Council discussed at length - whether patents or other contributions by a faculty member to the University’s technology transfer obligations should be considered in the Academic Review process. At the President’s Conference in January 1997 on the University of California’s Relationship with Industry in Research and Technology Transfer, a recommendation was examined by the Council. The Council agreed that responsibility for discourse, examination and action on such matters should rest with the Academic Senate. It was suggested that in conjunction with an academic personnel review, the social and economic impact of faculty activities on the wider world could be an appropriate consideration. Members of COR acknowledged that invention disclosures, patenting and technology transfer should be considered in the review process, as well as any intellectual property that a faculty member can document because patents benefit the University and the person who secures one is of great value. Although it can be listed on the dossier, there are no provisions in the bylaws to include intellectual property as a recognizable contribution. COR agreed that this matter should be considered by CAP.

10. The Council on Research was established in September 1996 to advise on all aspects of research including both policy making and policy implementation. It was also given oversight of the faculty grant review process. The Council on Research is comprised of a Chair, a Vice Chair and council members. The 10 appointed members of this Council deal with policy
issues as part of their mandate. The Faculty Grants program is a program, not a committee. It is the grant review subcommittees of the Council on Research that act to ensure the program functions. These grant review subcommittees evaluate applications for research funding and implement policy dealing with those applications. It is the members of the seven grant review subcommittees who judge the submitted grant applications to the faculty grants program by the senate faculty and implement COR policy and procedures. The bylaw is to be clear in that the Core Council group of 10 appointed members cannot serve as members of the grant review committees. Both council members and grant review subcommittee members are appointed by the Committee on Committees. Currently, each of the grant review subcommittee consists of two members, one of the two serving as chair of their subcommittee. In the last year, members of the Council have met with the members of the grant review subcommittees to talk about the vitality and purpose of the grants program. This year COR agreed that it would be appropriate to increase members appointed to the FGP subcommittees from 14 to 21 to deal with an overwhelming number of grant applications submitted for review, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences. COR discussed whether the FGP subcommittee members should vote on policy issues. It was agreed that COR members deal with policy issues, where applicable, and FGP subcommittee members should implement relevant policy. The revision of the bylaws and appendix were not completed in this academic year.

11. The plans to introduce an Institute of the Environment (IOE) were examined. Professor Turco is to be the Director of this Institute. This institute is not seeking ORU status at this time. The I.O.E. will offer programs in collaboration with other campus departments such as Earth & Space Sciences, Geography, Atmospheric Sciences, and Biology, as well as the School of Law, & School of Public Policy and Social Sciences. Members of COR were unsure of the proposed academic structure for this organization and the way in which it resembled a conventional department. No actions were proposed pending greater elaboration of the plans. Professor Turco and associates were to be invited at a future time to meet with the Council.

12. COR was made aware that Acting Professor and Acting Associate Professor (with the exception of the Law School) were not eligible to receive FGP grants and conference travel funding. The origin of this arrangement is not known, but it is understood faculty holding these titles are not permitted to make application for extramural funding.

13. Negotiation of indirect cost rate with DHHS for extramural research was discussed. Starting in FY97-98, the rate will be 52%. COR members were concerned with the dollars that are actually returned to the campuses and ultimately to the Principal Investigators. VCR Patel also informed the Council that a GAO report done in August 1996 stated that Universities were siphoning off tuition funds to support research. COR unanimously concurred that faculty need to provide a united front to the University that in order to deliver the highest quality of teaching and training, research must continue on campus. COR members also discussed issues of indirect cost recovery on federal grants, and incentive awards and the general tax on direct costs of funded grants to pay these incentive awards. COR discussed and provided advice to Vice Chancellor Patel on defining the equipment threshold policy for equipment on inventory at the University, and how the faculty mission can be influenced by the contract agreements between the University and Industry. COR was concerned that emphasis and influence by industry may favor service-oriented objectives rather than basic research objectives and that this was an important distinction on how industry contracts may impact faculty activities.
14. Vice Chancellor Patel informed COR on the Office of the President’s recommendation of raising equipment limit from $500 to $5,000. The following facts were presented: 1) 86% reduction in tracking inventory; 2) indirect costs and depreciation are directly affected with higher limit; 3) VCR Patel’s opinion is that it is not to UCLA advantage to raise the equipment limit that high & recommended between $1,000 to $1,500; 4) administrative costs will be greatly reduced; and 5) R-Net will be used to trace inventory. Members of COR suggested: 1) the rate of inflation must be calculated to determine the adjustment level and 2) the limit should be raised to accommodate ease of purchase in the supply categories, since equipment funding is usually cut from agencies. Council members agreed with VCR Patel’s recommendation to raise the limit to $1,500.
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