

Report of the Research Centers Task Force

April 2010

Submitted by

M. Belinda Tucker, Chair

César Ayala

Ronald J. Mellor

Roberto Peccei

Jenny Sharpe

Joseph B. Watson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
The Committee Charge and Review Process	4
Sources of Data and Information	6
Metrics Used to Guide Deliberations	8
The Role of Research Centers in the University of California	8
Cautions and Concerns	9
Findings	10
Recommendations	16
Conclusions	18
References	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Research Centers Task Force was charged with the task of recommending strategies for reducing the support of UCLA research units with state funding—specifically function 44 funds. The committee reviewed multiple sources of data, including financial reports, center reviews, annual reports, and conducted interviews with key figures. The report discusses the role of research centers at UCLA and their unique contributions in several critical areas, including the provision of student funding, support for instructional activities, the provision of research apprenticeships, the recruitment and retention of faculty, and support for library development. The centers are also at the forefront of community engagement.

As context, the committee notes that relative to some other campuses, UCLA seems significantly underfunded in function 44 funding (receiving about 10% of the total allocated system-wide as compared to UCLA's more customary 20%+) and questions whether this is the most appropriate area for "give-backs." Since UCLA receives so little, why should any be sacrificed—especially since these funds typically generate external funding? Additionally, the committee was asked to seek reductions in a group of centers that receive only \$8 million of the roughly \$20 million in total UCLA function 44 funding. The rationale for exempting certain function 44 recipients was not always clear, though some consideration of the functionality of support (e.g., short-term coverage vs. long-term investment) might serve to better inform cost-saving efforts. Given the likelihood that this pool of funding will still be tapped for campus savings, the committee makes the following recommendations for achieving greater economic efficiencies in the research operations under review:

1. ***Provide greater budgetary transparency.*** There must be an effort to be clearer about sources of state funding and how funding decisions are made. If center directors and managers knew more about the funding process and had clearer pictures of their budgets at the start of the year, they could better plan to achieve cost efficiencies.
2. ***Use indirect costs recovery funds to support administrative functions.*** For centers that generate substantial levels of indirect costs, it seems more appropriate to use indirect cost recovery than function 44 funding to support their administrative operations.
3. ***Identify best-practices in publishing to minimize financial losses.*** The nature of the publishing business has changed quite dramatically over the last decade. A campus wide effort to identify best practices in publishing may help centers adopt strategies that at least prevent financial losses in this area. (Potential strategies are outlined in the report.)
4. ***Reconsider the structure and financing of libraries.*** It is increasingly difficult to justify the existence of stand-alone libraries that require maintenance by a professional librarian, as well as a substantial acquisition budget. Though acknowledging that in some

instances, stand-alone libraries serve multiple goals, some reconsideration of the structure and financing of campus libraries is necessary.

5. *Gradually phase-out function 44 funding for the Traumatic Brain Injury program.*

Though the committee has been careful to avoid singling out individual units for specific actions, the Traumatic Brain Injury program represents a very unique case. Having received approximately \$34 million in funding since 2000 (far more than any other unit under consideration), this center seems better positioned than most to take advantage of external funding opportunities.

OVERVIEW

This report is presented in four parts: 1) the committee charge and review process, 2) a discussion of the role of research centers in the university and their unique contributions, 3) the committee's findings, and 4) the set of recommendations for achieving greater economic efficiencies in research centers that emerged from the committee's deliberations.

THE COMMITTEE CHARGE AND REVIEW PROCESS

In a letter dated August 28, 2009 (see Appendix A), Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott L. Waugh charged the Research Centers Task Force with the following assignment:

“We ask that you take on the challenging task of recommending how we can reduce state support for research centers by 50 percent, including the possible elimination of some centers. In formulating your recommendation, you should establish criteria against which to frame your recommendations, beginning with UCLA's priorities of excellence, diversity, and community engagement. Other criteria might include: availability of extramural funding; quality; or the availability of alternative approaches to accomplishing the work. Additionally, you may choose to recommend that centers remain with full support, lose some of their state support, or lose all state support.”

Provost Waugh also sent letters to the research units under review, an initial letter that described the problem and the process, and a second letter indicating that the committee had been established and charged (see Appendix B1 and B2). This second letter also listed all of the centers included in the review as well as the amount of function 44 funding that each received, so each center director became aware of how much every other center included on the list was receiving in function 44 funds.

The committee met to formally receive the charge on September 23, 2009 and began its official work on October 16, 2009. As was pointed out to the committee at this initial meeting, the defining factor in the list of entities compiled for this review was the receipt of function 44 funding from the state. Function 44 funds are general funds from the state designated for research support. It should be noted that prior to the committee's formal deliberations a number of units were taken off the list of function 44 funded units to be considered in this review. Specifically, for various reasons, the following entities which were on the original list were not included in this review process: Academic Senate Grant program (which received \$1,682,969 in function 44 funds 2009-10), the UCLA International Institute (which received \$1,192,187 in 2009-10), and the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics (which received \$1,472,510 in 2009-10). In effect, the Cotsen Institute of Archaeology (\$229,412) should be added to this list, since the terms of the endowment established by the Institute's chief benefactor, Lloyd Cotsen, requires this basic level of support to be provided by UCLA. That is, a reduction in the level of support

would nullify the terms of the contract and jeopardize the \$7 million gift donated in 1999 and the 2006 pledge of an additional \$10 million.

After removing these units from the discussion, this meant that the initial amount of \$12.5 million for function 44 funding under consideration by the taskforce was reduced to just over \$8 million.” In the committee’s view, the fact that only \$8 million of the approximately \$20 million total function 44 funds received by UCLA (to the committee’s knowledge) was “on the table” lent a certain randomness to its task. It should be noted that function 44 funds are distributed to other campus entities that were never under consideration by this task force, including selected deans’ operations.

Sources of Data and Information

Several types of data and information were utilized during the committee’s deliberations:

Formal Center Reviews. The committee received all of the most recent five-year reviews conducted on each Organized Research Units (ORUs) on the list of affected centers. In general, we did not receive formal evaluations of the so-called “small-c” centers, which were not formally established ORUs.

Financial Data. The committee requested and received from Glyn Davies, associate vice chancellor in the office of Academic Planning and Budget, the following information on the budgets of the centers under review:

1. Summaries of all General Fund Research Budgets (function 44) by unit showing all appropriations and expenditures for 2009-10 (Q1), 2004-05, 1999-00, and 1994-95. Financial performance comments were provided for most units (e.g., specifying sources of carry-over funds, overages, etc.).
2. The committee chair also met with Glyn Davies to review the committee request and to clarify areas of ambiguity.

Center Director Reports. The committee wrote each center director, requesting responses to the following questions (see Appendix C1 and C2):

- How, specifically, are function 44 funds used in your center?
- How do these uses relate to your center’s mission and goals?
- How does your center contribute to current campus priorities?
- How does the success of your program, in its current situation, positively affect other programs, units, or activities on campus?
- Are there items in your budget that may be viewed as “pass through” commitments that may not relate directly to your core mission (e.g., items associated with faculty retentions)? If so, please specify such items.
- How important are libraries to your mission?

- What other crucial facts should we know about your center in order to properly assess your budgetary needs?
- We would also like you to include a copy of your most recent income and expenditures report (usually a 2-4 page document). Many of you submitted such a summary with your last Annual Report.

The committee received responses to these queries from all but two centers.

Interviews. The committee also interviewed a number of individuals in order to achieve clarification of specific issues:

Professor Angela Riley, Director, American Indian Studies Center.

Professor Alex Ortega, Director, Institute for Social Research (formerly Institute for Social Science Research).

Professor Nick Entrikin, Director, International Institute

Professor David Hovda, Director, Brain Injury Research Center

Professor Alesandro Duranti, Dean of Social Sciences.

Professors Riley and Ortega were interviewed because they had been newly hired to direct their centers, which had both been identified in much earlier reviews as facing some significant difficulties. These directors were given the opportunity to “provide more current information on your priorities, activities, and finances.”

The committee met with Professor Entrikin in order to learn more about how the large array of centers within the International Institute function and the role of the Institute in that process. A key consideration was whether or not some cost efficiencies could be obtained by combining certain kinds of operations common to all centers (e.g., publications, etc.). Note that the International Institute was not on the list of centers considered in this process, so no review of its financial operations was performed. However, a number of centers within the International Institute, (Center For African Studies, Center For World Languages, Asia Institute, Center for Latin American Studies, Near Eastern Studies-Von Grunebaum Center, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Center for European & Eurasian Studies, Center for Japanese Studies, Center for Chinese Studies, Center for International Relations) were indeed under consideration by the committee. It is hard to locate efficiencies between the International Institute and its subdivisions when looking only at the smaller units, which perhaps carry out functions that could be centralized under the umbrella of the International Institute. The committee feels that this limitation may have impeded its search for efficiencies.

Professor Hovda was interviewed in light of the unusual nature of the Brain Injury Research Center’s designation as a recipient of function 44 funding and the rather substantial amounts that had been received over the years (\$34 million since 1999-00; although \$55 million had been allocated in the state budget, local reductions were made

beginning in 2002-03). The committee wished to learn more about this center's operations, opportunities for external funding, and potential areas for cost savings.

The committee met with Dean Duranti (a new appointee) in order to discuss his approach to the issue of research center funding more generally within his division, but in particular his thoughts about the future of Institute for Social Research (ISR), given its critical role across campus in project development and management. It was the committee's sense that a major reduction in resources for the ISR could have a wider impact, given the absence of such support within social science departments.

Metrics Used to Guide Deliberations

Early on, the committee discussed and identified a set of metrics that it would use to review a center's eligibility for function 44 funding. The committee returned to this list throughout its deliberations for modifications, but eventually settled on the following indicators as crucial determinants of an entity's need for basic state support:

- Need for funding in broader budgetary context
- Activities consistent with UCLA's overall mission and current core priorities of excellence, diversity (student, faculty, and staff), and community engagement (including UCLA's obligations as a public institution serving the people of California and, most immediately within it, the Los Angeles Community.)
- Impact on other programs in the university
- Need to preserve functions that have broader utility in the university
- Ability to use money to generate other funding
- Sustainability (i.e., the prospects that a center would be able to serve its core mission and continue its activities)

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH CENTERS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This report must be contextualized by a discussion of the long-standing and crucial role of research centers in the University of California. This point and the perils of reducing the research investment are articulated in the 2010-11 University of California budget request

The University of California is one of the leading academic research enterprises in the United States. ...With over 800 research centers, institutes, laboratories and programs, UC research tackles some of the most pressing problems facing California and the world today. UC's research enterprise is the result of California's long-term planning and investment, dating back to 1960 and the Master Plan for Higher Education, which established UC as California's primary academic research institution.

For every \$1 dollar of State funds, UC leverages more than \$5 dollars in Federal and private funding. ...To sustain the research enterprise at UC and its beneficial impact on the State economy, California must renew its investments in UC's faculty and the University's research infrastructure.

The Importance of State Investment in the Research Enterprise

The California Master Plan for Higher Education designates the University as the primary State supported academic agency for research. Funding from the State of California has been vital to the establishment of the UC research enterprise and will be paramount for its sustainability and continued excellence. ... State support is critical for ensuring that UC can continue to recruit and retain the world-class faculty who teach and train the next generation of California's workforce.

Value to the Instructional Program

Undergraduate and graduate students alike pursue an education at UC because of the high quality of the University's faculty, quality that includes excellence in teaching, cutting-edge research, and leadership in academia. For students, formal instruction is supplemented and enhanced by myriad informal learning opportunities that occur across the system. The 2008 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey found that 86% of senior undergraduates had participated in research and other creative activities with faculty as part of their coursework. The opportunity to learn from professors who are leaders in their fields in the informal settings of the research laboratory, fieldwork site, or faculty office, is one of the unique and unsurpassed benefits of being a UC student for both undergraduates and graduates.

—Source: University of California 2010-11 Budget for Current Operations: Budget Detail. As Presented to the Regents for Approval. pp. 66 -72

We emphasize here the fact that research centers, as envisioned and realized in the University of California system, have multiple leveraging functions. Not only do they bring in critical research support (through funding and the development of key partnerships), but they also support and enhance teaching functions, and develop and nurture relationships with broader and diverse communities (local as well as global).

CAUTIONS AND CONCERNS

Before presenting the committee's findings, some words of caution are in order. There remains some degree of mystery about both the source and distribution of function 44 funds throughout the system and on campus. Some directors and even higher-ranking administrators had not even heard of function 44 funds. Although approximately \$240 million in function 44 funds are distributed systemwide, the committee understands that UCLA receives about \$20 million (which seems low given its prominence in research). This amounts to less than 10% of the total amount allocated, when UCLA's share of resources is typically over 20%. A number of centers received state funds in numerous ways—function 44, temporary, "other state" funds, etc.—and the committee could discover no discernable logic behind the form of distribution. Sometimes recruitment and retention funds (even a housing allowance) were bundled with a center's function 44 allotment. The committee also found that more often than not, the externally-sourced income figures maintained by

centers were highly discrepant from the amounts shown in the documents prepared by the Planning Office. There could be any number of reasons for this. Endowment pledges may not be officially acknowledged for some time. Grants to individuals affiliated with centers may not be formally administered by that center. Nonetheless, the overall sense among committee members was a high level of frustration and an intense desire for greater transparency in this area.

FINDINGS

Overall, the committee learned a great deal about the operations of these centers, which tend to be little understood by the broader academic community. Despite the fact that a number of committee members had, at one time or another, been members of research centers, none had extensive knowledge of the myriad functions of these particular units. Through the annual reports, interviews, evaluations, and budgets, the members achieved a greater appreciation of the range of activities undertaken by these units and the various ways that they contribute quite directly to the academic mission of the university.

It should also be noted that based on the reviews to which the committee had access, the vast majority were judged to be “outstanding” — even world-class. All centers were judged to merit continuation by their respective review committees (which always included external national leaders in the field). The two centers that were viewed as most problematic in their reviews were clearly on a path of renewal. The point here is that the committee did not find any centers that had either outlived their usefulness or were unsuitable to continue, based on the evidence before it. The findings and recommendations below, then, should not be interpreted as statements about the relative merits of individual centers.

While reviewing the amassed materials, the committee was mindful of Chancellor Block’s statement about UCLA’s plans for addressing the budget crisis. This included, in particular, those items that are most relevant to this committee’s charge: i.e., removing redundant functions and reducing the use of general funds to support research, with the goal of attracting funding from other sources. We summarize below the key findings.

There is an artificial divide between research and instruction.

Perhaps the most critical finding of this committee was that the separation between research and instructional activities is, in effect, quite artificial. Though the offering of degrees is solely the function of departments and interdepartmental programs (IDPs), research centers play a far greater instructional role than is generally realized. The committee learned that virtually every one of the centers under consideration contributes in very significant ways to instruction. This instructional role took a variety of forms as detailed below.

Financial support for students. Nearly all of the centers provide funding in some very direct form to students, including scholarships, fellowships, the provision of apprenticeship opportunities (e.g., graduate student researcher appointments, work-study positions, bibliographer positions, etc.), the payment of student fees through GSR support, funding for dissertation research, as well as the provision of travel grants for research and presentation/attendance at scientific meetings. This funding comes from a variety of sources, including research grants, training grants, and endowments. For example, the Molecular Biology Institute provides \$1,142,000 annually for graduate student support in the form of 34 training slots. Although this kind of support might be expected in the south campus science oriented centers, north campus centers have also brought in significant amounts of student funding. For example, the ethnic studies centers have generated numerous scholarship programs for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Another extremely valuable source of student support is the Title VI program, which was launched by the Department of Education in 1958 to provide support to centers (specifically) for the teaching of languages deemed critical for government, business, industry and education (Scarfo, 1998). Six of the centers under review are Title VI grant recipients and a seventh (which for years had such support) submitted an application in March 2010 for new funding. All of these centers are housed in the International Institute. The program is described as follows on the Department of Education website:

The United States today faces unprecedented demand for globally competent citizens and professionals. Although 9/11 brought broad public and political attention to global integration and national security needs, the Federal government has long recognized this need. To this end, U.S. Department of Education (ED) Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs form the vital infrastructure of the Federal government's investment in the international service pipeline. These programs' support for foreign language, area, and international studies infrastructure- building at U.S. colleges and universities ensures a steady supply of graduates with expertise in less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), world areas, and transnational trends. Title VI primarily provides domestically-based language and area training, research, and outreach while Fulbright-Hays supports on-site opportunities to develop these skills.

-U.S. Department of Education, International Education Programs Service: Title VI Programs (2010).

Individually, the UCLA Title VI programs receive roughly between \$230,000 and \$600,000 annually. Among other activities, these programs provide substantial funding for graduate student fellowships (e.g., the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships—FLAS) as well as research and travel support for both students and faculty. For example, the Asia Institute provides over \$300,000 annually in graduate fellowships through FLAS and other programs.

Direct support for instructional activities. Some of the centers manage and support Interdisciplinary Degree Programs (IDPs) (e.g., the Neuroscience program is managed by the Brain Research Institute; The Cotsen Institute houses the Archaeology Program and the UCLA/Getty Master's Program in the Conservation of Archaeological and Ethnographic

Materials). This seems to be a natural outgrowth of the interdisciplinarity of the ORUs and research centers more generally. That is, a core consideration in the development of research centers is that they provide an alternative to the natural disciplinary boundaries that tend to exist in departments. Research centers also offer courses and fund faculty positions. The centers with Title VI support often directly fund course offerings by transferring instructional costs to departments and divisions. For example, the Center for European and Eurasian Studies annually contributes \$120,000 to fund Humanities Division courses and \$30,000 to fund Social Science courses. Centers without Title VI funding have also provided direct funding for courses by transferring funds to affiliated IDPs when the need arises.

Recruitment and retention of faculty. The centers also play a crucial role in the recruitment and retention of stellar faculty, several of whom have explicitly credited the national and international reputation of UCLA's research centers as figuring into their decisions to come and remain here. Centers have performed this function in several different ways. First some centers were provided with institutional FTE for the purpose of stimulating scholarly growth by making faculty appointments in concert with academic departments (e.g., the International Institute, ethnic studies centers). Second, many centers have participated in the recruitment of faculty by helping to host recruitment visits and receptions, providing resources for faculty recruits (e.g., research grants, office space), and directly soliciting prospective faculty to encourage them to come to UCLA. Third, centers have actively worked to keep outstanding faculty at UCLA by facilitating their research with grants and administrative support, and by providing a community of scholars with similar interests for synergistic intellectual engagement.

Direct support for reference materials acquisition and development. This activity is realized in various forms. Some centers actually house and manage libraries. Others (in particular the Title VI centers) provide funding directly to the Young Research Library for purchase of reference materials and to support acquisition travel by YRL personnel. Still others have developed reference systems. For example, the Latin American Institute transferred \$63,000 to YRL for acquisitions and \$13,400 for acquisition travel. The LAI also publishes on line the Hispanic American Periodicals Index (HAPI). Another very critical campus resource is the Data Archives run by the Institute for Social Research that houses and provides support for using the invaluable Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) Data, a collection of over 500,000 social science datasets. These data are used for faculty research, dissertation and masters theses, and courses.

Summary. It seems clear from the above, that the research centers play a very critical and essential role in the training and support of students and the instructional enterprise. Elimination of such units would mean either the loss of core elements of the curriculum or the need for departments to cover the funding of this core instruction. Since today's doctoral students are financed in large part by university funding (or funding routed through the institution), elimination of the support provided by the research centers would necessitate replacement by some other sector of the university.

The payoff from investment in the selected research centers has been great.

Table 1 provides a breakdown by general area of function 44 investment relative to what the centers in the grouping bring to the campus in various forms of support. It should be noted that no center is funded entirely by state funds, though the level of function 44 support varies quite dramatically, from \$18,369 to \$1.9 million. The committee divided the centers into four broad categories based on the fact that the nature of the enterprise and the opportunities to obtain outside support differ substantially for each:

- South campus research centers
- Area, international and language studies centers
- Humanities centers
- Social science, ethnic and women's studies centers

Table 1 shows that for every dollar of function 44 support invested in these research centers, each center subgroup has at minimum more than doubled the amount of funding received by attracting external support in the form of research and training grants, general gifts and endowments, as well as endowed faculty chairs. As expected there is a difference by center type. The south campus centers generated support at a level that was 32 to 42 times the amount allocated through function 44 funds. Though the scale of return was lower, all other center groups generated support at levels that were multipliers of the state funding provided. This distinction is no different from the relative financial gains likely to be realized in university settings from, for instance, engineering compared to philosophy. The level of endowment fundraising on north campus is particularly impressive, given its legacy potential. For example, the Center for the Study of Women established the \$2 million Irving and Jean Stone Graduate Student Fellowship program, that will provide annual fellowships via earnings generated by the fund. The Asian American Studies Center has raised \$10 million in endowment and gifts (including pledges). It should also be noted that the research centers are continuing to raise funds throughout this period of review, so the numbers presented in Table 1 ultimately underestimate the investment payoff. For example, the Chicano Studies Research Center recently received several grants from the Getty Foundation, the California Endowment and other foundations, totaling over \$3 million. They have also received \$65,000 in gifts and pledges for the renovation of their library. Another \$8 million in requests are still undergoing review. The Bunche Center generated the largest single gift to UCLA from an African American in the form of the Roxanne Chisholm and Jeannette Moore Endowed Scholarship Fund. Many of these endowment and gift pledges are not yet reflected in center financial summaries.

The committee displays these figures with the caveat that though in a number of instances the function 44 funding is small, the amount is nevertheless critical for obtaining many kinds of outside support. This expectation may take the form of required "in-kind" contributions, required displays of university commitment (e.g., training grants), or as a formal component in the terms of a gift (e.g., Cotsen).

**Table 1. 2009-10 Function 44 Investment and Return in External Funding
(Excludes Some Endowments and Pledges)**

<i>Center Type</i>	<i>f44 Allocation</i>	<i>External Funding</i>	<i>External Funds/f44</i>
South Campus	\$2,889,242	\$122,347,629	42.35
		94,238,939*	32.62*
Area, International & Language	1,282,561	11,247,314	8.77
Humanities**	665,803	1,606,902	2.45
Social Science, Ethnic & Women's Studies	3,959,275	9,441,330	2.38

*Without Jules Stein Building Fund.

**Includes only 2 of 3 centers, due to missing data.

These figures underestimate returns due to the exclusion of very recent awards and certain endowment funds (when annual returns were not available) and pledges, including the following:

- Asian American Studies Center: approx. \$10,000,000 in gifts and pledges
- Costen Institute of Archaeology: \$10,000,000 pledge
- Molecular Biology Institute: \$8,000,000 (Whitcome bequest); \$10,000,000 pledge

The centers are at the forefront of community engagement.

The committee very strongly notes that payoff from investments in these particular research centers must not be viewed only in financial terms. Community engagement is a core priority at UCLA and is realized in various forms by the activities of these centers.

Direct training of public school teachers, counselors, and students. A number of the centers host summer programs for public school teachers, including language courses and cultural travel. Most of the Title VI funded centers hold K-12 summer seminars and workshops for teachers. The African Studies Center took 13 L.A. teachers to Morocco last summer to study North African cultures and to learn basic Arabic and has been funded to take and train another group this coming summer. Some centers, such as the Center for World (i.e., heritage) Languages also hold language classes for high school students during the summer. The Terasaki Center for Japanese Studies additionally contributes to the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies thereby enabling 6 UCLA graduate students to study advanced Japanese in Yokohama. The Brain Research Institute sponsors a number of outreach programs geared toward educating schools and the general public about neuroscience related issues (e.g., neurorepair, learning and memory, neurogenetics). During Brain Research Week, 500 school children visit UCLA under the auspices of BRI. And, the Brain Injury Program visits classrooms in the LAUSD to educate children and teenagers about traumatic brain injury and to instill habits that can prevent such injuries.

Assisting communities to solve local problems. Some centers have been directly involved in community problem resolution. The Chicano Studies Research Center has partnered with a number of community organizations to address such issues as archival preservation (with Self-Help Graphics), emergency shelter for minors (Casa Libre), and health care (AltaMed Health Services). The Bunche Center helped organize community groups to address the crisis of low African American undergraduate enrollment, which led to the development of a \$1 million scholarship fund. Other centers realize such goals through the provision of service learning options.

There are also a number of large multi-unit initiatives under development that are designed to address chronic problems. The Chicano Studies Research Center is presently spearheading a collaborative effort involving the Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing and Public Health that aims to build a medical informatics system for the Latino community. Partners also include the Mission Community Hospital in the San Fernando Valley, the health and mental health planning collaborative for LA County Planning Area 2, as well as numerous county agencies, schools, medical centers, faith-based and community agencies, and corporate partners (e.g., Apple, Verizon, Orgsync). On a more global level, the African Studies Center and the Graduate Division are working together with Ethiopia's Addis Abba University to build the capacity of their Business and Economic faculty to both expand educational opportunities in the nation and to more efficiently manage Ethiopia's economic development. USAID has provided seed money for this effort, which they hope will be funded at the level of \$500,000 annually.

The provision of community programming. Most centers provide programming specifically designed to attract people beyond the university “walls.” The Center for 17th and 18th Century actually has a presence in the community through the Clark Library located in the Adams District. Many events are held at the Clark thereby attracting people from that community and others who find it more convenient than attempting to navigate UCLA. The Jewish Studies Center, which employs a community affairs coordinator, sponsors 50-60 public events each year attracting thousands of visitors from off campus.

Other issues.

It should be noted that the future of the Institute for Social Research developed as a separate and distinctive issue. As noted above, the director had been newly appointed in 2008. However, separate ongoing discussions about the structure and function of the Institute are proceeding in other venues, including the Office of the Dean of Social Sciences and the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR). The VCR has charged a separate committee to examine the present functions of the ISR as an Organized Research Unit and to make a recommendation as to whether the unit should continue or be disestablished. Given that another body is now making a more fundamental determination about ISR, it did not seem appropriate for the Research Center Task Force to further consider its structure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has focused quite deliberately on the contributions of research centers in order to set forth the potential consequences of making large or even modest cuts in the basic funding provided by the state. Nevertheless, the committee was mindful of Chancellor Block’s statement about UCLA’s plans for addressing the budget crisis, including in particular those items that are most relevant to this committee’s charge: i.e., removing redundant functions and reducing the use of general funds to support research, with the goal of attracting funding from other sources.

We do wish to reiterate and expand on several points, however, to contextualize these recommendations. As noted earlier, UCLA is significantly underfunded in function 44 funding. Therefore, it could be argued that making major reductions in activities that typically generate external funding is a counterproductive response to the current fiscal crisis. Second, the committee was asked to seek reductions in a group of centers that receive only \$8 million of the roughly \$20 million in total UCLA function 44 funding. It is clear that certain elements of the \$12 million pool of function 44 funding that is not before this committee should, indeed, be preserved at all costs (i.e., Academic Senate faculty research grants). However, less apparent is the rationale for exempting certain other funding pools (e.g., Dean’s allocations), which could be viewed as short-term needs, as opposed to more long-term programmatic support. It may be more appropriate to tap such short-term uses first for function 44 returns.

Though the committee members feel quite strongly that the strategies noted above should be applied first, we put forth the following recommendations for achieving greater

economic efficiencies in the operation of the selected research units. These recommendations may also be relevant to the centers and operations that were removed from consideration.

1. *Provide greater budgetary transparency.*

There must be an effort to be clearer about sources of state funding and how funding decisions are made. It is troubling that a number of center directors and one key administrator had no knowledge of function 44 funds or their role in their unit's operations. For a number of the centers, the "permanent" and "temporary" portions of their state funding varied widely from year to year without explanation. Moreover, there were numerous discrepancies between the centers' own figures and that provided by the Planning Office. If center directors and managers knew more about the funding process and had clearer pictures of their budgets at the start of the year, they could better plan to achieve cost efficiencies.

2. *Use indirect costs recovery funds to support administrative functions.*

A number of the reviewed centers receive substantial funding from grants that bring in full indirect costs (i.e., the NIH negotiated research grant rate as opposed, for example, to the much lower indirect costs rates paid by many foundations or received from training grants). Although the amount of indirect costs that centers ultimately realize is often quite low, it would appear that the indirect costs generated by these grants, rather than function 44 funds, would be a more appropriate source of funding for administrative operations.

3. *Identify best-practices in publishing to minimize financial losses.*

The nature of the publishing business has changed quite dramatically over the last decade. The budgetary issues that have diminished both the product and the process of production of newspapers, magazines, journals, and books have been evident in the academic world for quite some time. A few centers have extremely efficient publications operations that have, in fact, produced a profit. Others contend with persistent large deficits, despite producing world-class unique journals. This problem is certainly not confined to these centers. A campus wide effort to identify best practices in publishing may help centers adopt strategies that at least prevent financial losses in this area. Even without the benefit of professional consultation on this matter, the committee views the following as potentially useful strategies:

- Partnering with well-established publishing houses that can absorb the cost of publishing and can more effectively market the product.
- Favoring the use of on-line publishing instead of hard copy products.
- Elimination of hard-print brochures, pamphlets, advertisements, etc. in favor of on-line versions.
- Considering the possible elimination of products that simply are not economically viable in today's publishing market.

4. Reconsider the structure and financing of libraries.

It is increasingly difficult to justify the existence of stand-alone libraries that require maintenance by a professional librarian, as well as a substantial acquisition budget. Some centers have partnered with YRL to acquire materials deemed to be essential in a particular field, using funds from external sources. Having said this, however, it is not clear that YRL is equally positioned or motivated to create and maintain collections in all of the fields under question. The committee also acknowledges that in some instances, stand-alone libraries serve multiple goals, including the provision of a gathering and presentation space for students and faculty, and the development of more modern reference techniques. These functions may be separable from library or reference activities. Though the committee is not suggesting that one solution will be appropriate in all cases, some reconsideration of the structure and financing of campus libraries is necessary, nonetheless.

5. Gradually phase-out function 44 funding for the Traumatic Brain Injury program.

Though the committee has been careful to avoid singling out individual units for specific actions, the Traumatic Brain Injury program represents a very unique case. The vast majority of the other units were funded through an academic process that includes regular review and oversight. The funding for this center was rather the direct result of a fortuitous event that took place when the state of California was well funded. This has resulted in \$34 million in funding since 2000, far more than any other entity under consideration. The program has generated considerable funding, in part as a consequence of this funding, but also due to exceptional science and entrepreneurship, and the fact that there are multiple sources for funding for both clinical and academic pursuits in this area. It seems appropriate that in these austere times this type of funding should be reconsidered.

CONCLUSION

It is clearer than ever that all sectors of the university must be reviewed for redundancies, inefficiency, and inadequate or outdated scholarship and management. The research centers have no special position in the university that should absolve them of accountability on these points. The Research Center Task Force reviewed all available evaluative and budgetary information on each of the designated centers. The committee emerged with a much greater appreciation of the critical contributions that these centers make to the instructional enterprise and to the core university priorities. Clearly cuts must be made somewhere. However, this committee cautions those who will make these final budgetary decisions, that the key supports provided by these centers will most likely need to come from someplace else. The function 44 funds in this case harness the fundraising and community engagement efforts of core faculty, who would likely not commit to such a task without the supports of the center structure. It is not in the best interests of the university to be pennywise and pound-foolish.

REFERENCES

- Scarfo, R. (1958). The history of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays. In J. N. Hawkins, C. M. Haro, M. A. Kazanjian, G. W. Merckx, & D. Wiley (Eds.). International education in the new global era: Proceedings of a national policy conference on the Higher Education Act, Title VI, and Fulbright-Hays Programs. Accessed on March 20, 2010 from:
<http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupid?key=olbp19011>
- University of California Office of the President (2010). University of California 2010-11 Budget for Current Operations: Budget Detail. As Presented to the Regents for Approval. pp. 66 -72. Accessed on March 5, 2010 from:
<http://www.ucop.edu/budget/pubs.html>
- U.S. Department of Education (2010). International Education Programs Service: Title VI Programs: Building a U.S. International Education Infrastructure. Accessed on March 20, 2010 from:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/title-six.html>