

November 8, 2005

Teleconference

Minutes of Meeting

### **I. Draft Guidelines for Non-Competitive Funding**

**Issue:** An ad hoc administrative group has, in response to a request from President Dynes, drafted guidelines that are intended to regulate the growing trend within UC of pursuing directed federal funds for research. The University's official position is against earmarking.

Chair Glantz posed these initial questions: 1) the proposed policy seems clear on requests that would go to the California senators, but why does it not include more clarifications on interacting with the congressional delegation?; 2) although this proposal deals with federal earmarking, does the same issue need to be addressed at the state level?; and 3) is there a role for the UC Senate in providing peer review of requests?

Based on information offered at the recent Council on Research meeting, member Calvin Moore reported that earmarked funding at UC at present is less than 1% of a total \$3B of research funds, and that earmarking is the norm for some federal agencies, e.g., the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Transportation.

Ellen Auriti, UCOP Director of Research Policy Legislation, clarified that the guidelines call for UC presidential coordination for earmark requests that will go to the senators, the idea being to provide system wide priorities that have already been subject to coordination and review by UC at that level. It is felt that the chancellors are in a better position to interact with congressional representatives, and there is not an need for OP to insert itself. Nonetheless it is hoped that OP's Office of Governmental Relations will be kept apprised of the approvals. The draft guidelines are meant to maintain existing policy but add flexibility. They are focused on the federal level, since that is where the biggest area of concern has been; however, state earmarking is not to be ignored, and OP strongly discourages faculty from approaching state legislators for directed research funding. Earmarking should be a rare practice, but in some cases only directed funds are available. The guidelines recognize this in their criteria, and try to rationalize the process of pursuing directed funding without being an invitation or encouragement. Other institutions that have such policies in place report no appreciable increase in the number of earmarks.

### **Discussion/Comments**

- The growing national trend away from competitive peer review is a big issue and in the earmarking arena, California will not do well against the smaller states.
- The Academic Senate should function as gatekeeper - through the campus CORs and at the system wide level.
- Can this policy counteract the trend? And may the guidelines not be making it too onerous to get funding?

**Action:** By acclamation, UCPB agreed to send formal comments to the Academic Council Chair endorsing the Draft Guidelines for Non-competitive Funding and recommending that the campus Committees on Research and the University Committee on Research Policy participate, at the local and system wide levels respectively, in the review of requests for exception.

## **II. Proposed Policy on University-wide and Senior Leadership Compensation, RE-61C.**

**Issue:** An Academic Council Resolution on RE-61 is being forwarded to the Assembly for endorsement at its November 9 meeting. The statement incorporates much of UCPB's position on parts A and B of RE-61. Regarding part C, which recommends the use of private funds to augment senior management salaries, Council's statement 'applauds' what was thought to be the Regents' decision to remove that proposal from consideration. Because part C has actually only been tabled and not fully removed from consideration, UCPB may now want to propose its original position on RE-61 C as an amendment to the Council's resolution when it is considered at Assembly, to wit: "The Academic Council opposes the use of private fund-raising to pay all or part of senior management salaries." RE-61 would apply salaries in excess of \$350K, which would include the president, the chancellors, the deans of management, engineering and law, and, could be expanded in the future to include senior vice presidents and executive senior vice chancellors.

**Discussion:** It was noted that the issue, as it was discussed by UCPB at its last meeting, is one of conflict of interest and avoiding any perception of UC management being beholden to outside agencies. Some members expressed support for putting an amended version of the UCPB position forward at the Assembly meeting which would specify opposition to targeted fund-raising for senior management salaries. Some felt that it should be made clear that there is no objection to the use of discretionary funds for deans or other salaries. One member stressed that given the market demand for top business school deans, augmented salaries are necessary. The proposed amended Council resolution, which is being brought to the Assembly as an option (and is in the Assembly "Blue Book"), was suggested as a reasonable option for the committee to support. That proposed language expressly opposes RE-61 recommendation C. There was general consensus to support this proposed amended resolution of the Council.

**Action:** UCPB agreed that the committee position at the November 9, 2005 Assembly meeting will be in support of the proposed amended Academic Council resolution on RE-61 C, as formulated and published in the Assembly Notice.

## **III. New Business: Establishment of UCPB Subgroup on Privatization**

**Issue:** Chair Glantz proposes the formation of a UCPB subcommittee that will follow up on the UCPB Resolution on Maintaining the Private Status of the University of California. The group will develop future graduate fee and enrollment scenarios based on 3 to 5 year projections of the terms of the Higher Education Compact. The effort is to paint a holistic picture, applying the mix of funding sources, of the impact of the Compact on UC graduate education, campus growth, undergraduate financial aid, and

admissions and to have a report that can be a tool for interacting with UCOP's Long Range Guidance Group. Volunteers are requested to join UCPB Vice Chair Chris Newfield in this effort.

**Action:** Members Calvin Moore and Henning Bohn will be on the UCPB subgroup.

Attest: Stan Glantz, UCPB Chair

Minutes prepared by  
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst