



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **Indirect Cost Recovery Executive Summary**

**May 10, 2012**

Executive Summary produced by BIA to describe the indirect cost recovery process under review.

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**April 23, 2012 10:22 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Graduate Council**

**May 8, 2012 2:28 PM**

Graduate Council recommends that “Programmatic Uses” be changed to “Undergraduate and Graduate Programmatic Uses” under the heading “Program Funds” on the right side of the FLOW CHART – PROPOSED ICR ALLOCATION (page 2 of the Executive Summary and page 9 of the Whitepaper). This is necessary because graduate education generally and graduate groups specifically are often overlooked in strategic planning.

# **Planning & Budget**

**April 23, 2012 10:23 AM**

CPB strongly feels that ICR should come directly to the departments and NOT through the Dean's Offices. Over time the ICR will be used at the Dean's level to balance their books and nothing will end up in the department. The loss of the ICR funds that come to the departments will be devastating.

# Research

April 23, 2012 1:46 PM

COR reviewed the Indirect Cost Return whitepaper and executive summary. The committee understands that the proposal has already been approved for next fiscal year and has very serious concerns that there was not proper Senate consultation (including the Committee on Research) regarding the proposal. In addition, COR understands that the original motivation from the Blue Ribbon Committee was to return money to departments, not the Deans. Therefore, the proposal does not achieve the goals of the Blue Ribbon Committee. Finally, COR has the following concerns/comments regarding the ICR proposal:

1. ICR funds that are returned to the Dean will go into a large pool and some departments will never see any. This is a serious concern among the members of COR.
2. COR strongly recommends that the Provost's Office do a modeling of what this will look like for departments after the ICR funding proposal has been implemented.
3. COR also strongly recommends that the Provost's Office monitor the impact of this new ICR model on departments.
4. COR would like to know why the proposal was changed from the original intent to have the funds returned to the departments based on recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Committee.
5. It would be an incentive for faculty to go out and get external funds if they knew the funds were coming back to their department.