



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

UC Davis Core Research Facilities and Resources

January 16, 2015

We are initiating Davis Divisional review of the UC Davis Core Research Facilities and Resources Report. The report was requested by the Vice Chancellor Research in 2012 because the number of recharge facilities and the scope of services offered on campus were unknown.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (AGRICULTURE)

January 18, 2015 9:21 PM

No response at this time.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES)

January 12, 2015 5:32 PM

The CBS FEC's position on this document is between "neutral" and "positive endorsement".

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: MATH/PHY SCI)

January 16, 2015 1:28 PM

The L&S Executive Committee discussed this report at our January meeting. We are generally sympathetic, but have several questions and concerns:

1. It was not clear to us how the decision was made as to what constitutes a "core facility." The list includes some facilities that have no central subsidies, and others that are fully subsidized; it includes some (but not all) department shops; it seems to include some facilities that are primarily funded by individual PIs' grants and start-up packages, but not others.
2. While there are certainly some advantages to having a facility considered "core," there are also possible disadvantages -- for instance, loss of control over prioritization. (A facility that recharges, for instance, cannot turn anyone away.) If a facility is established, paid for, and run by a department or a group of PIs, can the department or PIs opt out of being considered "core"? Or is this going to be decided centrally (how?) with no choice by the individuals involved in establishing and running the facility?

Added note (1/16): the MPS Steering Committee has asked me to forward some additional comments:

"Our feedback is brief as most of the facilities are outside of MPS.

The main point is that we question whether hiring more high-level administrative staff might be duplicative of what existing staff and faculty directors already do or could provide. Without a careful strategy the proposed scenario could create parallel administration and be overly cumbersome. We also propose that it would be wise to carry out a financial analysis prior to implementing the suggestions of the report."

Faculty Welfare

December 19, 2014 10:09 PM

No response at this time.

Graduate Council

January 15, 2015 3:49 PM

Response continued on next page.

January 14, 2015

RFC: NEW UCD CORE RESEARCH FACILITIES AND RESOURCES REPORT

The Graduate Council met on January 9, 2015 and considered the UCD Core Research Facilities and Resources Report.

The GC discussion led to the recommendation that the RCAC should include representatives from the Graduate Student Association, Academic Federation and Post Doctoral Scholars Association.

GC also received some additional comments from the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee. The APD Committee did not see good justification that a central core would enhance student training and courses, and arguments could be made that a more segmented facilities management plan might be better at student training and course development/administration. Graduate student training should also be included in the return on investment section. Finally, the APD Committee discussed that several other constituency groups may have been omitted from the committee's charge.

Sincerely,



Kyaw Tha Paw U, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

c: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director

Planning & Budget

January 20, 2015 1:12 PM

CPB discussed the core research facilities and resources proposal. Overall, the committee endorses and supports the response from the Committee on Research. CPB does note, like COR, that not all facilities on campus are included on the list provided. For example, the animal husbandry facilities are not included and this points to an issue that CPB would like to highlight: some facilities (e.g., animal husbandry) are managed by Budget and Institutional Analysis and not the Office of Research. It would be inefficient to centralize these facilities, but there should be some mechanism by which issues that transcend administrative boundaries can be discussed collaboratively. This is currently unavailable. In addition, CPB notes that some core facilities are struggling and the campus should develop some guidelines or best practices on how to survive and maintain adequate service for faculty.