



*Office of the Chair*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9303*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: clifford.brunk@ucop.edu*

*Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

December 2, 2005

**RORY HUME**  
**ACTING PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT-ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND HEALTH AFFAIRS**

**BRUCE DARLING**  
**SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT- UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS**

**Re: Draft UC Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding**

Dear Rory and Bruce:

The Academic Council has completed its consideration of the draft *Guidelines on Non-competitive Funding*, which were recently developed by an ad hoc administrative work group as a proposed means of defining and regulating allowable exceptions to UC's policy against 'earmarking' funds for research. The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) took the lead in reviewing the proposal. At its November 30, 2005 meeting, the Academic Council approved the recommendations of UCPB and UCORP and, based on their comments, endorsed the idea that competitive bidding is generally superior to earmarking and that in the rare instances when earmarking occurs, UC's regulatory mechanism should include Senate consultation.

I am enclosing the reports of UCORP and UCPB for your information. Briefly, though, the main recommendation common to both committees calls for formally incorporating into the implementation of the guidelines the Senate's advisory function with respect to the research environment and research policy. The Senate's role in this process can, we believe, be realized in a supple and effective manner. On the campuses, where much of the review of requests for exception will take place, appropriate Senate representatives - from the campus committee on research, for example - would participate on an ad hoc basis in what may be a fast moving review process. At the systemwide level, UCORP would monitor implementation of the guidelines and provide comments to the administration annually. For general oversight purposes, each local Committee on Research would receive an annual list of campus requests for exception. Similarly, UCORP would receive for review an annual list of all submissions that were considered for the prioritization list sent to our California Senators, with an indication of those that were forwarded.

The Academic Council fully agrees with the administration's stated position that merit-based peer review provides the best mechanism for allocating government funds for research and for serving the research community at UC and at large. This initiative would offer an internal means for regulating in a reasonable and flexible manner the pursuit of directed funding. We trust that the Senate will play a helpful role in oversight and review of the process and in any further efforts on the part of UC to maintain and promote a healthy funding environment in which competitive peer review remains the standard for academic research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cliff Brunk". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Clifford Brunk, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council  
Senate Director Bertero-Barceló

Encl.: 2

Chbdgr



*UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET*  
*Stan Glantz, Chair*  
[glantz@medicine.ucsf.edu](mailto:glantz@medicine.ucsf.edu)

*Assembly of the Academic Senate*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor*  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-0630  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

November 9, 2005

**CLIFFORD BRUNK**  
**CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**Re: Draft UC Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding**

Dear Cliff:

At its November 8, 2005 teleconference, the University Committee on Planning Budget (UCPB) considered the Draft Guidelines for Non-Competitive Funding that were recently developed by a special administrative work group. UCPB endorses the Guidelines as a reasonable and effective way to reaffirm University policy against 'earmarking' and rationalize a process by which exceptions to that general position can be accommodated. Further, the committee recommends that divisional Senate committees on research participate in the review and approval process at the campus level of requests for exception, and that the University committee on Research Policy likewise participate in review of those cases that are considered at the systemwide level.

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to comment on this important regulatory initiative.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stanton A. Glantz".

Stanton A. Glantz  
Chair, UCPB

cc: UCPB  
Senate Director Bertero-Barceló



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)**  
*George Sensabaugh, Chair*  
[sensaba@uclink.berkeley.edu](mailto:sensaba@uclink.berkeley.edu)

*Assembly of the Academic Senate*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor*  
*Oakland, CA 94607-5200*  
*Phone: (510) 987-0630*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*

November 17, 2005

**CLIFFORD BRUNK**  
**ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

**Re: UC Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding**

Dear Cliff:

At its November 14, 2005 meeting, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) considered the draft *Guidelines for Non-Competitive Funding* that were recently developed by a systemwide administrative work group. UCORP endorses the proposed guidelines as a useful affirmation of the existing university policy against earmarking of federal research funds and a reasonable means of defining and regularizing those instances that would constitute allowable exceptions to that policy.

UCORP sees the Senate's role in this proposed process as helping to set research priorities and maintain balance in the overall UC research enterprise and within each campus context. Toward this end, we recommend that the draft guidelines and the draft process for review of requests for exception be modified to include Senate consultation at both the local and systemwide levels. At the campus level, for example, the ad hoc faculty review process used for limited submission reviews could be followed; this would allow streamlined Senate participation in what may be a fast moving review process. Additionally, and as a basic measure of oversight, the campus committee on research would receive for annual review a list of all submissions.

At the systemwide level, we suggest that UCORP review implementation of the guidelines on an annual basis. Included within this review, UCORP would receive an annual itemization of all requests for exception indicating those included in the priority list given to the senators from California. Any comments UCORP may have would then be forwarded to the administration through the Academic Council.

UCORP believes that new regulation of an ongoing and heretofore often unmonitored activity should be as unambiguous as possible. The current draft policy in particular appears directed toward establishing a procedure so that UC can respond efficiently when our senators request a priority list. The more general issue of how campuses are to deal with non-competitive funding sources is not so clear. UCORP suggests that the draft guidelines and process be revised to better

clarify the procedural differences, if any, between submissions that will be forwarded with chancellorial approval and those requiring prioritization by the UC Office of the President for action by our US Senators. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on these draft guidelines and look forward to offering advice and direction in the future as we observe the outcome of their application. UCORP believes that academic research is best served by peer review but appreciates the evident need to address the growing trend of federal research dollars being allocated without the benefit of a competitive peer review process.

Sincerely,

George Sensabaugh, Chair  
UCORP

Copy: UCORP  
Senate Director Bertero-Barceló