



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

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

June 27, 2005

**ROBERT C. DYNES
PRESIDENT**

**M.R.C. GREENWOOD
PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT-ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Re: IGCC Funding and Oversight of Multi-campus Research Units

Dear Bob and M.R.C.:

This is the Academic Council response to the decision of the Laboratory Management Office (LMO) in November 2004 to cut \$400K of funding from the annual budget of the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC). This decision, which was made unilaterally and outside established UC procedures for the review and oversight of multi-campus research units (MRUs), generated an array of serious concerns among both administrative agencies and faculty regarding budgetary authority, observance of the tenets of shared governance, and the question of IGCC's very survival. At the June 22 Academic Council meeting, you announced that the funds in question have been taken back out of the laboratory management fees and restored to IGCC. The Council is happy to hear that the immediate funding crisis has been handled directly and with some expedition. Nonetheless, the widespread discussion, which this situation engendered, has brought to light other, broader issues that remain troubling.

The Academic Council's consideration of this matter was given extra impetus from a request on the part of IGCC Director Peter Cowhey for the Senate to reaffirm the policy principle governing IGCC, and to help ensure continued support (both for the short term and the long term) from the President and the Regents. Accordingly, I asked UCORP, UCPB and CCGA (the three Senate committees responsible for Senate review of MRUs) to consider IGCC's request and formulate recommendations. The committees reviewed documents relating to the inception, charge, funding, and programmatic vitality of IGCC, and were briefed by the Office of Research on the background and current situation. Their responses form a strong general consensus. The Academic Council concurs with the committees' positions and shares their sense of dismay with the situation. Our collective concerns and recommendations fall into these somewhat overlapping areas.

Consultation with the Senate

The LMO's cut to IGCC represented a 45 percent drop in the amount of support channeled to that MRU from lab management fees, and coming as it did on top of the State's complete removal of funding for IGCC, seriously threatened the program's ability to continue to operate. This unilateral decision, as UCPB puts it, "is tantamount to disestablishment of an existing MRU without Senate review." The Academic Council views the action of the LMO as inappropriate in light of established UC procedures regulating the oversight of multi-campus research units. We request that in the future, the LMO adhere to existing UC policies governing the establishment and disestablishment of MRUs, the role of the Office of Research and the Senate in the funding of MRUs, and the consultative process that is UC shared governance.

Restoration of Funding and ongoing support

The Academic Council applauds the action of the President restoring funding to IGCC. The Council and the Compendium committees maintain, moreover, that OP funding at the previous level of \$900K per year should remain secure until otherwise determined as the result of established review processes carried out in accordance with the Compendium. The future funding of ICGG and other research units that are funded through and work with the DOE labs, must, of course, be considered as part of the eventualities of UC's management bid. Therefore, it may be helpful to synchronize review schedules of the MRUs to coincide with determining junctures in the bidding schedule for the DOE labs.

Fiscal authority

Clearly, the authority over allocation of lab management fees to UC research units needs to be resolved. The Office of the President should clarify, and codify if necessary, the authority over funding decisions that affect UC research operations such as the MRUs associated with the labs and other collaborative programs. At the same time, and as noted above, the LMO needs to be aware of the regular consultative process involved for assessing the value of and maintaining the fiscal health of all systemwide research units, including those associated with the labs. As CCGA notes, "much of the current discussion would have been avoided (and the net magnitude of the cut might have been more judiciously considered) had an appropriate and defensible administrative line of consultation and deliberation been followed in conjunction with this exceedingly important and impact-laden decision."

IGCC's charter and the question of independence

The first point in IGCC Director Cowhey's request to the Senate was to reaffirm "the policy principle governing IGCC." In our discussions, this has been formulated as a question of the relevance of IGCC's research to the activities of the labs. IGCC does perform collaborative work with the labs, but is not, in view of its charter, a simple extension or "beneficial adjunct" of the DOE labs. And although funded by the lab management fees, IGCC is an independent UC research enterprise and not accountable to that office or obligated to do research for the benefit of the labs. We are troubled to hear that the LMO seems interested in trading funding in return for having more influence in IGCC's research agenda. In view of the initial charge of IGCC to *balance* the work of the labs, the Academic Council concurs with UCORP's assessment that a "lack of correspondence between IGCC's research agenda and that of the labs [is not] a valid basis either for denying funding or for having direct influence over the MRU's research direction."

The Senate appreciates the communications we have received from IGCC supporters, as well as the helpful input of the Office of Research in our committee discussions. Again, the Academic Council is relieved to know that the immediate funding situation for IGCC has been resolved with dispatch. We hope that the additional concerns which have surfaced in connection with the LMO and MRU oversight will be addressed by your respective offices, and we look forward to hearing what specific steps have been or will be taken. Please see the enclosed letters from UCORP, UCPB and CCGA for their individual comments.

Best regards,



George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost – Research
S. Robert Foley, Vice President, Laboratory Management
John Birely, Associate Vice President, Laboratory Programs
Cory Coll, Director, Laboratory Collaborations
Peter F. Cowhey, Director, IGCC
IGCC Director Emeritus Herbert F. York

Enclosures: 3

GB^{bgf}



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)
Max Neiman, Chair

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

June 10, 2005

GEORGE BLUMENTHAL
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

Re: IGCC Funding

Dear George,

UCORP has reviewed the two letters you forwarded relating to recent funding cuts to the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC): IGCC Director Cowhey's letter of April 18 requesting the Senate's support in their effort to maintain short- and long-term funding; and the May 16 letter of support from Professor Fredrik Logevall, past chair of the IGCC Steering Committee. In addition, Director Noto of the Office of Research briefed the committee on the background of the IGCC funding cut as well as the associated issues regarding budgetary authority over the lab management fees that fund IGCC and the program's research direction.

As we now well know, IGCC's support from the lab management fees was recently cut from \$900K to \$500K. The question of whether that decision was made by the rightful authority is one that will be resolved on an administrative level, but also one that we feel must be clarified to the satisfaction of those UC research entities that collaborate or are otherwise associated with the labs. The fact that the Lab Management Office (LMO) made the decision unilaterally and wholly without Senate consultation is, however, a matter of direct and significant concern to the Senate. Just two years ago, the Senate reviewed and approved the stated goals of IGCC, and recommended its continuing support. IGCC's strategic plans have been developed based on that budgetary assumption, and to issue a cut of this size – coming as it did on top of complete removal of the program's state funding last year – unjustifiably and seriously impairs IGCC's research agenda and its graduate student enterprise. LMO's decision to cut IGCC's support effectively overrides the Senate's position, without warrant, and represents a breach of established consultative process in matters relating to MRUs. Therefore, UCORP recommends that:

- IGCC's funding be restored to its previous level, and that its continuing support be duly determined as part of regular UCOP / Senate review
- The authority over allocation of lab management fees to UC research units be resolved (as stated above)

- Measures be taken to better enfold the LMO into the consultative process that is UC shared governance.

Another question raised in this discussion is that of the relevance of IGCC's research to the activities of the labs. IGCC is clearly willing to work with the labs on some projects but sees itself as an independent UC research enterprise funded by the labs and not accountable to that office or obligated to do research for the benefit of the labs. UCORP agrees in general with this position and, since the initial charge of IGCC was to balance the work of the labs, does not view a lack of correspondence between IGCC's research agenda and that of the labs as a valid basis either for denying funding or for having direct influence over the MRU's research direction.

Respectfully submitted,

Max Neiman, Chair
UCORP

Copy: UCORP
Executive Directory Bertero-Barcelo



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
Michael Parrish, Chair
mparrish@ucsd.edu

The Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9467
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 15, 2005

**GEORGE BLUMENTHAL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: IGCC Funding

Dear George,

At its June 7, 2005 meeting, UCPB devoted considerable attention to the precipitous removal of substantial laboratory funding from IGCC. To say that we were distressed by this development would be an understatement. There is a long-standing process in this university through which MRUs are reviewed, disestablished and their resources curtailed or withdrawn entirely. This is an essential component of what we call shared governance and it has been followed this year with respect to Cal Space, IGPP and the Institute of Transportation Studies.

The unilateral decision by Director Cory Coll, reducing IGCC's lab funding by \$400,000, is tantamount to disestablishment of an existing MRU without Senate review and therefore a serious violation of the procedures set forth in the Compendium and the basic principles of shared governance. This unilateral decision is completely unacceptable and merits strong censure by the Council.

We are deeply troubled, in addition, by statements attributed to Coll that suggest funding for IGCC "will be more likely to the extent you [IGCC] focus greater effort on areas of collaborative interest between the institute and the two laboratories." As others have noted, such a dictum threatens the intellectual autonomy of the MRU and its researchers. In the opinion of many UCPB members, the Director's funding decision and his dictum raise a fundamental question about the appropriateness of the Regents' decision to compete for continued management of the Los Alamos facility. Are we prepared to sacrifice the independence of an MRU on the altar of laboratory lucre?

UCPB recommends that President Dynes request Director Coll to restore the \$400,000 to IGCC promptly, thereby returning the situation to the status quo ante. Any decision regarding the funding for IGCC or its disestablishment should be subject to full review by the appropriate Senate committees as mandated by the Compendium and the tradition of shared governance.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Parrish, Chair
UCPB

cc: UCPB
Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Quentin Williams, Chair
qwilliams@es.ucsc.edu

The Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 587-6138
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 9, 2005

GEORGE BLUMENTHAL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: CCGA IGCC Response

Dear George,

CCGA viewed the correspondence and historical documentation associated with the recent budget cuts of IGCC with considerable concern. Our concern is simply motivated by the long-term history of IGCC as a major supporter of graduate education within the UC system. This support is associated, as was documented in their recent 15-year review, both with direct funding, through their graduate fellowship program, and through leveraging of funding for graduate education, as through their IGERT funding. Our specific concerns can be loosely divided into jurisdictional and logistic categories.

The jurisdictional aspects are, if the correspondence is accurate, quite shocking. Apparently, the Office of Laboratory Collaborations was responsible for making the decision on cutting the funding of an academic enterprise (and an MRU) without consultation with OP's Budget Office, the Office of Research, or the Academic Senate. In our view, this is a classic example of misplaced authority. The control of the disbursement of laboratory-derived funds by an office whose principal intent is to foster lab interactions must inevitably result in lab-derived funds being directed towards lab-associated and likely even lab-approved purposes. Dr. Coll's comment to IGCC Director Cowhey that IGCC might financially fare better with "greater effort on areas of collaboration between the Institute and the two laboratories" is fully consistent with such a sea-change being promoted by some at UCOP. If the fiscal control of lab-derived money is consigned to laboratory-oriented administrators, than the relevance of UC as an academic entity overseeing the labs—supporting academic scrutiny and critical thought about the labs' missions as a crucial part of their mutual association--will be utterly lost.

Moreover, the historical documentation on IGCC, as illustrated by the Haas Report, is inconsistent with IGCC having been established as a simple extension (or "beneficial adjunct" in VPR Coleman's term) of the DOE labs. The bottom line here is that we view the funding decision relative to IGCC as inappropriate not just for the lack of broad consultation, but principally for the apparent locus of the decision-making itself. While we hesitate to make a recommendation on how to ameliorate the current situation, as it is principally a fiscal issue, we do believe that the Office of the President needs to ensure that there are clear lines of authority and avenues of consultation for funding decisions relevant to an MRU such as the IGCC. Indeed,

much of the current discussion would have been avoided (and the net magnitude of the cut might have been more judiciously considered) had an appropriate and defensible administrative line of consultation and deliberation been followed in conjunction with this exceedingly important and impact-laden decision. Indeed, this entire issue has produced puzzlement for us as to who within UCOP is charged with initiating such decisions, and with the approval of such decisions.

Our second set of concerns with this action is logistic in nature. The issue of IGCC's declining funding is clearly a consequence of its easily-traceable lab-connected funding line (and the effectively decreased lab management fees of the recent past), as well as the elimination of its funding as a line-item in the state budget. Obviously, such abrupt changes in funding may occur in response to a broad suite of unpredictable forces, varying from political to societal to even security-related. Yet, academic enterprises have particular difficulty in responding to such rapid and unpredictable changes in funding: ongoing research projects may have to be discontinued, graduate student funding lines may need to be abruptly eliminated, and the careers of faculty and students are abruptly put into a funding limbo. It is in this context that we would urge UCOP to consider establishing a buffer fund for those academic entities with funding lines that might be particularly susceptible to abrupt elimination. We note that even spreading a cut of the magnitude proposed for IGCC over two years, rather than just one, could greatly help faculty both to successfully wrap up funded research projects and to generate alternative strategies for funding their graduate students. While recommending funding strategies is certainly not our province, our sense is that even a fairly modest tax or preserved carry-forward from a number of limited-funding-line programs might produce a sufficient "insurance" fund to soften the deleterious academic effects of an unforeseen major fiscal blow to a single program.

Finally, given the current climate of uncertainty on the future disposition of two of UC's DOE laboratories, we can certainly envision that the fiscal difficulties currently being suffered by IGCC could soon extend to other entities within UC. And, the cuts to IGCC have come in the face of a quite recent and successful 15-year review. Accordingly, it might be appropriate to synchronize the review schedules of some of the MRU's to coincide with benchmark events associated with their principal funding lines, such as the rebidding schedule of the DOE labs.

Respectfully submitted,



Quentin Williams
Chair, CCGA

cc: CCGA
Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo