June 14, 2024

To: Elizabeth Watkins, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

Re: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

Dear Liz and Rodolfo,

I write to respond to your request for consultation regarding the Administration's draft updated operating procedures with attached center list related to the Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers at UCR. Executive Council included this topic for discussion during their June 10, 2024 meeting.

Executive Council reaffirms appreciation of the documents and updates sent forward, as well as the tangible and positive steps regarding centers affiliated with our campus. We echo the much of the attached comments from committees which I have included for your information and consideration.

We look forward to continued communication around this issue.

As always, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have questions.

Yours,

Sang-Hee Lee
Chair, Academic Senate

Cc: Vice Chancellor Torres
Vice Chancellor Bomotti
Associate Vice Chancellor Coss
Dean Wang
Executive Council
Director Cortez

Attachment
May 23, 2024

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Wesley Leonard, Chair  
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

The CHASS Executive Committee reviewed and discussed the Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers at the Regular meeting on May 15, 2024. The committee recognizes the need for transparency and updating the UCR Operating Principles for Research Centers, highlighting a consistent review structure that would not be compromised with personnel turnover. Although we are supportive of the establishment of these Operating Principles, we request that the following issues be addressed:

Questions:

1. Beyond addressing issues identified during a formal review in relation to specified campus metrics, what is the mechanism to ensure broader accountability in Centers, and to respond if people involved with those Centers raise concerns? What is the plan to ensure that the campus administration will be accountable to Centers, for example, in terms of providing adequate staff support and following through with any promises that have been made?

2. What are the policies guiding Research Centers? We believe there should be more clarification on the review procedures and on processes for resolving issues.

3. Peer review may be beneficial for some of the Centers. It appears that the review process is done at the administrative level, and we suggest that this should also include the academic level.

4. What are the policies for creating and reviewing councils such as the Council for Intellectual Values & Inclusive Community?
Editorial comments:

5. Some information in “Research Centers at UC Riverside” is incorrect; for instance, the final four entries in the list have the wrong director names.

6. Part II (“Establishment of Academic Research Centers”) of the proposed Operating Principles reads “They still need formal approval from the corresponding dean.” Given that it is possible for an Academic Research Center to involve more than one College or School, we believe the reference should be to “the corresponding dean(s)”.

May 24, 2024

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair, Academic Senate
   Elizabeth Watkins, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

From: Linda Walling, Physical Resources Planning Committee

Re: Operating Principles for Academic Research Centers

The Physical Planning Resources Committee reviewed the March 2024 Operating Principles for Academic Research Centers document that will guide the establishment, review and disestablishment of a new entity for the UCR campus – the Academic Research Center. We provide the following comments.

PRP applauds the Provost’s initiative to restructure the processes that guide center and institute establishment, review and disestablishment and make these processes transparent. This is long overdue. These processes have been largely neglected in recent years and this has led to the birth of ‘centers’ that have not gone through a Senate or campus approval process.

The lack of review and disestablishment processes has led to the persistence of obsolete centers that no longer serve the campus research needs, lack sufficient leadership, or are ‘one-person’ centers. In addition, PRP is aware of several groups of faculty who are anxious to establish new centers and this has been severely delayed to the lack of active and transparent policies. For example, all past guidelines and forms for the establishment of centers and institutes have been removed from the RED website (https://research.ucr.edu/vcr/centers).

In the past, UCR center and institute establishment and function was guided by two policy documents. These documents should be acknowledged in the 2024 Operating Principles document.

- the 2005 Operating Principles for Research Centers at the University of California, Riverside (UCR) document. This document was prepared by the UCR’s Office of Research and the office’s Vice-Chancellor Charles Louis. This over-arching document provided guidelines for all units that enable research on our campus including: Multicampus Research Centers (MRUs), Inter-campus Research Programs (IRPs), Organized Research
Centers (ORUs), Institutes, Centers, Laboratories/Facilities, Research Support Stations, and Administrative/Service stations.

- The 2014 *Compendium: University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units*. This document provides the guidelines for internal and system-wide review of graduate programs and research units for the UC system.

The 2014 Compendium provides important dictates for the establishment and function of new ORUs and non-ORU Centers that to our knowledge have never been embraced by UCR. This document states that all ORUs and non-ORUs are “approved by the Chancellor after consultation with the divisional Academic Senate” (page 9 of the Compendium). For this reason, consultation with the Academic Senate is a critical step that must be integrated into the new *Operating Principles* protocols. The Senate can provide impartial decisions about the need for center establishment and provide an opinion on the need for external or internal reviews of UCR’s research entities. The appropriate Senate committee(s) for consultation need to be determined. Furthermore, Chancellor approval of all non-ORU Centers is required. If UCR delegates this to the Provost, which seems appropriate, this change in system-wide policy must be clearly iterated.

In comparing the 2024 *Operating Principles* document with the 2005 *Operating Principles* document many principles have been retained and others have been changed. For this reason, the PRP thinks the 2024 document needs to iterate the past processes that guided our campus’ centers and institutes and how the new policies have changed and the rationale for this change. PRP calls out two examples to emphasize this point.

1. IRUs are not present in the 2024 *Operating Principles* and the ARCs are new.
2. While guidelines for disestablishment of research centers are largely the same in the 2005 and 2024 documents, the entities that authorize disestablishment have changed.

Currently the 2024 *Operating Principles* document largely focuses on a proposed new research entity – the Academic Research Center (ARC). In principle, PRP supports the ARC concept. The nature of ARCs and the guidelines for ARC function are clearly defined within this document. Unfortunately, in reading the 2024 *Operating Principles* document, the language is not sufficiently inclusive to inform the reader that the proposed 2024 *Operating Principles* would guide all current and future research entities of the UCR campus. If the 2024 *Operating Principles* document is to only guide ARCs, additional explicit language for non-ARC centers and other research entities should be clearly iterated.

The RED website currently lists four research centers under the direction of their office. Some of these centers have been in place for decades and others have emerged recently. It is unclear if any of these centers went through the requisite Senate consultation and if reviews have been or will be performed in the near future.

- ALIANZA UCMX (an MRU)
- Center for Advanced Neuroimaging
- Central Facility for Advanced Microscopy and Microanalysis (CFAMM)
- High Performance Computing Center (HPCC)

PRP thinks that the campus needs to provide a clear statement about the evaluation and review process for all *current* research entities; transparency and equity will be critical to assure faculty engagement and satisfaction. For example, it is not clear if all current centers that are listed in Table 1 will be evaluated and placed under the ARC umbrella. No matter where the research entity resides (RED, college, department, etc.) Senate consultation and uniform guidelines for establishment, review and disestablishment should be used by the campus.

PRP would like some clarification about how centers that are formed and funded by external grants will be handled. Will a center that is created due to federal grant funding undergo a campus approval process and review? There was concern that imposing a campus approval and review on such a center would add an additional layer of administration and this might deter faculty being PIs for large center grants.

Finally, PRP notes two small elements that should be changed in the 2024 *Operating Principles* document.

- The names of directors for the last three centers on page 24 of 2024 *Operating Principles* document are incorrect.
- The last page of the document sent to the Senate for review appears to be a rogue page. It is not clear if this was part of the Provost’s 2024 *Operating Principles* document or just a misformatting of the Senate review document. The last page appears to be part of a memo that discussed the School of Business Center for Economic Forecasting Development (CEFD) and Beacon Economics, LLC (Beacon). The page should be moved to its appropriate position in this document or should be removed.

PRP looks forward to the establishment and implementation of clear guiding principles for all research units at UCR and Senate engagement in this process. The benign neglect by the campus has led to the current morass of research centers spanning the robust to the dysfunctional and prevented the establishment of new centers that can promote faculty research and visibility.
TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair  
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: [Campus Review] Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

Date: June 10, 2024

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the document “[Campus Review] Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers”

Our Committee was pleased to see the creation of such explicit policies, especially given the very public incident with the School of Business Dean that would have, essentially, enabled a non-UCR-affiliated, outside research firm to pay for access to UCR’s logo and (in turn) perceived campus expertise and credibility on its reports and analyses. However, we were disappointed to find numerous factual errors in this document regarding information about the Centers housed in the School of Public Policy. Considering that this was a central administration effort to take stock of existing campus centers (important information to have on file), one would expect an administrative unit like the Vice Chancellor of Research and Economic Development Office to have already been maintaining up-to-date records on every campus center.

All of these errors are found in the table on pages 20-26. The directors listed for SPP’s four Centers and these center’s establishment dates are all incorrect and one of these centers is even incorrectly named.

1. The Center for Social Innovation:
   a. The Director is Mark Long (in SPP), not Walter Clark (in Music) who is Director of the Center for Iberian and Latin American Music

2. Inland Center for Sustainable Development:
   a. The Director is Qingfang Wang (in SPP), not Edward Chang (in Ethnic Studies) who is the Founding Director of the Young Oak Kim Center for Korean American Studies and not affiliated with ICSD.
   b. Established in 2003, not 2012

3. The Presley Center of Crime and Justice Studies (3 errors)
   a. The Center is misnamed in the document. It is “The Presley Center of Crime and Justice Studies” but the document calls it the “Center of Crime and Justice
Studies.” It was established by the California State Legislature via a statute for which State Senator Robert Presley was among two others (including former UC President David Gardner) instrumental in helping obtain after a nearly decade-long effort.

b. The Director is Sharon Oselin (faculty member in Public Policy and Sociology) and it is run in SPP; the document incorrectly lists the Director as Alfonso Gonzales Toribio, who is a faculty member in Ethnic Studies and not affiliated with the Center. Per the document, Dr. Toribio is Director of the Latino and Latin American Studies Research Center.


4. **The Center for Geospatial Sciences.**
   a. The Director is Tony H. Grubesic (faculty member in SPP), not Ellen Reese (in SEHE) who is not affiliated with the Center and, per the document, is Director of the Center for Labor Studies.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Professor of Public Policy
PLANNING AND BUDGET

May 27, 2024

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Reza Abbaschian, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

Re: [Campus Review] Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

At our May 14, 2024 meeting, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the Administration's draft of updated operating procedures and attached list of existing research centers, as it relates to “Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers.” CPB members are generally supportive of the updated “Operating Principles for Academic Research Centers at UCR.”
May 21, 2024

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Elodie Goodman
       Chair, School of Business Executive Committee

Re: Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

Please let this memo serve as an official notification that the School of Business Executive Committee welcomes the guidance on the establishment and operation of research centers and fully supports the proposed operations principles.

(We note that pages 25 and 26 of the circulated document appear to be misplaced, and should have been placed after page 3. In addition, an author should be included for the document inserted on pages 6-7.)
May 31, 2024

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Weixin Yao, Chair  
Committee on Research

Re: 23-24. CR. Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

The committee on research reviewed the proposal and had no comments.
May 24, 2024

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division
FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine
SUBJECT: [Campus Review] Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the item Consultation: Transparency in Establishment and Operation of Centers.

The Committee did not have any objections or comments regarding the item. The Committee approved the draft of updated operating procedures of UCR’s research centers.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine