The information in this handbook supplements the following resources:

**The University of California Faculty Handbook**
The University of California Systemwide Resource “The University of California Faculty Handbook.” The Handbook is for faculty members of the University of California. It is written primarily for ladder rank faculty, but many sections will be applicable to non-Senate faculty and other academic appointees. The Handbook does not replace the underlying written policies of the University, including memoranda of understanding with collective bargaining agents, but rather will provide faculty members with summary information as well as a guide to where official policies and more detailed information can be found. The handbook is accessible at:

https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/programs-and-initiatives/faculty-resources-advancement/faculty-handbook.html

**Chair’s Resource Guide**
In addition, the “Department Chair’s Guide to Administrative Resources” is a useful document that provides faculty in leadership positions with a directory of web reference sources. The main guide is accessible at:

http://www.ap.uci.edu/Guides/chair/chair_guide_cov.html

**Departmental Website:** [http://publichealth.uci.edu/](http://publichealth.uci.edu/)
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Organizational Structure

UCI Program in Public Health
PART III – APPENDICES OF THE IRVINE DIVISION
Appendix I: Bylaws of the Faculties

Chapter ____: PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH

In adopting these bylaws, the faculty members of the Program in Public Health affirm our commitment to democratic principles, fairness, inclusive excellence, and the highest ethical standards in all our operations.

I. Voting Membership

An Academic Senate Action is defined by the rules and responsibilities of the Academic Senate of the University of California, Irvine Division.

1. Voting membership on all matters involving Academic Senate action shall consist of those who hold professorial or acting professorial rank and those who hold the titles of senior lecturer with security of employment, lecturer with security of employment, and lecturer with potential for security of employment.

2. New appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate will be voted on by all Academic Senate members.

3. Personnel actions involving Merits and Promotions will be voted on by all Academic Senate members.

4. Ballot initiatives are approved by a simple majority of eligible voters.

II. Senate Faculty Executive Committee and Faculty Representatives

1. The Senate Faculty Executive Committee consists of an elected Faculty Chair, and the Chairs of all the four operational committees of the Program:
   A. COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
   B. COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH, FACILITIES AND LIBRARY RESOURCES
   C. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
   D. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ADMISSIONS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND WELFARE

2. The Senate Faculty Executive Committee represents the Senate Faculty in all aspects of the academic administration of the Program in Public Health, and makes decisions for the faculty if needed between faculty meetings.

3. The term of office for elected Senate Faculty Executive Committee members, including the Faculty Chair and Committee Chairs, shall be four years.

4. At about the time of the Irvine Division’s spring elections or as soon as possible thereafter, the Senate Faculty Executive Committee shall be elected by the Academic Senate members of the Program. The newly elected members shall take office on July 1 following their election.
5. The Faculty Chair shall serve as Program representative to the Representative Assembly of the Irvine Division and Chair of the Program’s Senate Faculty Executive Committee. The Faculty Chair shall also serve as the Program representative to other senate faculty assemblies consisting of other academic units with shared interests. If the Faculty Chair is unavailable to attend the Assembly meeting, one of the members of the executive committee shall be designated by the majority of members to serve as a voting representative to the Representative Assembly.

6. The election for Faculty Chair and the Senate Faculty Executive Committee membership shall be governed by the following procedure:

a. Election of Faculty Chair: All Academic Senate members of the Program shall be placed on the ballot, except the Program Director, Department Chair, Founding Dean, Dean, or others with equivalent administrative functions who are ineligible to serve on the Executive Committee. In the event that no candidate receives more than half the votes cast on the first ballot, a second ballot will be prepared with the names of the two individuals receiving the largest number of votes.

b. A separate election will be held for the Chairs of each of the Operational Committees.

c. Votes shall be conducted by secret ballot online, with results made available online to Senate Faculty members.

III. Faculty Meetings

1. Faculty meetings shall be held at least once each month during the academic year at the call of the Program Director/Chair, Dean, or Faculty Chair. Members of the Academic Senate may choose to meet separately for discussion and voting on Academic Senate matters.

2. Quorum

a. A quorum on matters requiring Academic Senate action shall consist of a simple majority of the Academic Senate voting membership in residence for that academic period.

b. Voting on all personnel matters shall be by secret ballot. On all other matters, upon the call of any voting member, the Program shall approve or disapprove of initiatives by unanimous consent or vote by secret ballot.

IV. Amendment of the Bylaws

The bylaws of the Program may be amended with the approval of at least two-thirds of the Academic Senate members of the Program. Motions to amend the bylaws must be made at least thirty days before a vote is taken. In the interim, the Faculty Chair shall send a copy of the motion, together with a summary of the arguments for and against it, to all Academic Senate members of the Program. Voting on bylaw revisions shall be conducted by secret ballot online, with results made available online to Senate Faculty members.
Negotiated Salary Trial Program
The Program in Public Health participates in the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP according to University and Campus guidelines:

http://ap.uci.edu/compensation/nstp/

The Negotiated Salary Trial Program ("NSTP") allows eligible ladder-rank faculty in participating schools to contribute external funding resources toward their total University of California (UC) salary. The NSTP, like the well-established Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), allows faculty to utilize external fund sources to support a portion of their total compensation.

Please visit the website of the Office of Academic Personnel for annual updates and deadlines.
Academic Year Schedule
Proposed Teaching Plan*

Faculty Member Name: ____________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Designation:</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R = Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professor series instructional workload equals three courses. SOE series instructional workload is nine courses.
Are you requesting leave or course buy-out for next academic year? YES_______ NO_______

If YES, please complete and submit with this form, the UC Irvine Academic Personnel Leave Form (UCI-AP-75) and/or Public Health Buy-Out Request form.

Signature ________________________________

Please submit this form no later than the beginning of Spring quarter to the Department Administrator.
Faculty Salary Exchange Policy
Program in Public Health
Salary Exchange Program

Purpose:
The Program in Public Health will institute a salary exchange program for ladder rank senate faculty. The establishment of this program will permit an individual faculty member the opportunity to charge a component of his/her salary to extramural funding awarded to him/her as PI. This program will create salary savings from the state-funded provision by the salary component funded by extramural awards, the Department of Program, and the P.I., to support temporary commitments.

Program Participation:
Faculty participation in the program is voluntary. A request must be sent to Department Chair for prior approval before the effected period of the salary exchange. Teaching, research, and service requirements will be met in full, as prescribed by the professorial title, and participation in the program will not result in a reduction of these commitments.

Use of Funds:
Funds released through participation in the program will be retained in the Program and will be used in support of temporary commitments.

Percent Effort Funded by Extramural Funds:
The compensated effort supported by extramural funds will not exceed 33 percent of a faculty member’s time in any given academic year.

Sabbatical Credit:
As teaching, research and service requirements will be met in full, sabbatical credit will not be affected. The P.I. will be expected to complete his/her full component of course offerings (teaching load) and service commitments to the department/program during the academic year. Participation in the program will not result in a reduction of these commitments.

Program Guidelines:
The program will be implemented in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Graduate student support will continue to be a high priority expense and should be included in contracts and grants proposals submitted by the Program in Public Health and Dept of Population Health and Disease Prevention PIs.
2. In order to be considered for the Salary Exchange Program, PI academic year salary must be budgeted in the grant proposal.
3. Only PIs and formal Co-PIs listed on a particular award will be eligible for
a salary exchange on that funding source.

4. The PI will be expected to certify the appropriate Personnel Activity Report (PAR) following the period the salary is charged against an extramural award. Through this, the PI verifies that he/she expended a specific percent of effort on the research project/activities funding the salary during the period.

5. This program is not associated with the course buyout program and will not function as such.

6. Consistent with good and standard accounting practices, an approved Salary Exchange will be processed if approved by the 1st of the month in which it is intended to begin. No retroactive transactions will be processed. Salary Exchanges will only be approved consistent with academic quarter payroll dates. (NOTE: Payroll dates for the academic year are as follows: Fall Quarter, July 1 – October 31; Winter Quarter, November 1 – February 28 (or 29th in a Leap Year); Spring Quarter, March 1 – June 30.)

7. Benefits and overhead costs associated with the percent of effort charged to extramural funding will be charged to that funding source. Salary savings do not include the benefit portion paid by the state.

Distribution of Salary Savings:
The Program intends to distribute the salary savings generated by this proposed plan in the following manner:

- 70% Faculty Member
- 30% Program/Department

Funds will be distributed in arrears on a quarterly basis and will be placed into a departmental account. Any unexpended funds may be carried forward at the end of each fiscal year with a three-year time limitation. If the faculty member leaves the University, unexpended funds will revert to the Program in Public Health to support temporary commitments across program areas.
Extramural Grants
Overhead Cost Recovery

Faculty Incentive Policy
Incentivizing Faculty Research and Extramural Awards

Preamble

Extramural funding is essential for academic activities of our faculty. The university charges “overhead” costs for Facilities and Administration (F&A) based on modified total direct costs of a project. The federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance entitled Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements, defines F&A costs as "those incurred for common or joint objectives and therefore not identified readily and specifically with a particular sponsored project, an instructional activity, or any other institutional activity." UC Irvine Office of Research oversees policy on F&A costs. Please see: https://research.uci.edu/sponsored-projects/rates-fees/fa-cost-rates.html

UCI policies are further subject to UC Office of the President’s guidance with advice from the Academic Senate. Relevant documents are included in this departmental policy that incentivizes faculty to seek extramural awards and to seed research activities by all faculty.

Departmental Policy

Each year, we receive from the UCI Budget Office funding allocations based on the F&A portion of the amount of extramural grant expenditure in the department in the previous year. Our policy is to allocate $500 to every academic senate faculty member with appointments in the department, and who operate discretionary accounts and submit their grant proposals through the department’s business office. Of the remaining amount, 30% is distributed to faculty members who generate the extramural grants, and 70% is retained in the department to support research activities, facilities development, set-up funds, and other incentives to increase faculty scholarly productivity.

Review

This policy will be subject to review in response to any changes made to university policies regarding F&A, and at least every five years by the department’s committee on research and committee on faculty affairs. Modification to departmental policy must be approved by majority of the faculty before implementation.
PRESIDENT YUDOF
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Report on UC’s Indirect Cost Recovery Practices

Dear Mark:

At its meeting on April 28, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed the recommendations of a joint UCORP-UCPB report on the University’s indirect cost recovery practices. The report recommends that UC review its current ICR model and make changes to it, including negotiating higher rates with federal agencies, reexamining the University’s waiver policy for other funding sources, and increasing efficiencies.

I believe that you will find this report to be valuable. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Powell, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.
HARRY POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: UCORP-UCPB joint subcommittee on Indirect Cost Recovery

Dear Harry,

The University Committees on Planning and Budget and Research Policy (UCPB and UCORP, respectively) have worked together this year through a joint subcommittee to re-investigate UC’s indirect cost recovery (ICR) practices, the third such Senate investigation this decade. We conclude, as did our predecessors, that ICR practices are perennially confusing because they are habitually obscured and each new committee membership must re-educate itself about cumbersome and technically challenging bureaucratic processes. Clear ICR accounting and explanations would serve both faculty and administrators well.

We found that ICR funds are increasingly important to the UC budget, and that they are increasingly spread thin. When UC is unable to recover the true costs of research, it strains other funding sources and the campus community.

We recommend renewing efforts to raise UC’s negotiated rates, revisiting UC’s waiver policy, and examining ways to increase efficiencies. We ask that the Academic Council endorse these recommendations and forward them to the President for adoption.

Sincerely,

Greg Miller, Chair
UCORP

Peter Krapp, Chair
UCPB

cc: UCORP
UCPB
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

Encl.
According to the 1960 California Master Plan for Education, UC is designated “the State's primary academic research institution”. Research is one of UC’s hallmarks, and one of its greatest benefits to the state. But conducting research costs the University a considerable amount of money. In addition to direct costs of each project, these include real and necessary expenses not attributable to any one project. They include laboratory space and utilities (heating, lighting, water, ventilation), hazardous waste disposal, campus security and fire protection, libraries, radiation safety, occupational safety, disaster preparedness, liability insurance, compliance with rules and laws, and administrative services. Thus Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) is a topic at the heart of our university: it touches on the general ledger, payroll, space planning, plant assets, debt management, equipment management, research support, environmental health and safety, janitorial services, books, etc. Research comprises about 25% of the UC budget. Each year, UC spends $5.2 billion on research and recovers about $700 million in ICR. Though ICR is a considerable source of funding, long-term reductions in state support had deleterious effects on UC's research mission, forcing it to cover from operating funds a growing share of its facilities and administrative costs related to research. In its periodic observation of ICR, the Academic Senate has grown uneasy with the gap between funds available to support research facilities and administration, and actual indirect costs of research. UCPB also notes a simultaneous increase in reliance on ICR funds to support activities that are associated less with research. Thus it is crucial to establish a better understanding of a) how reimbursements for overhead are generated and allocated, and b) the true cost of research at UC.

The impetus for this update and summary of earlier Senate reports on ICR comes from a continuing dissatisfaction among faculty with respect to the opacity of the process by which ICR is generated and distributed, coupled with a sense that research infrastructure is not being supported effectively. The net recovery of indirect costs is well below the actual overall cost of supporting research at UC (see appendix). The lack of transparency in the allocation processes on the campuses is partly due to the fact that every grant is different and places different demands on institutional resources. During 2007-08, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCROP) initiated an ICR investigation recommended by the previous UCROP and approved by the 2006-07 Academic Council. To this end, UCROP agreed with the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) to create a joint subcommittee.

However, the 2007-08 joint subcommittee of UCROP and UCPB was unable to complete its report; although ICR funds are categorized according to formula, the data provided were neither comprehensive nor conclusive. After the work of that prior joint subcommittee stalled, annual reports for both committees
recommended that ICR be taken up again. The present overview is the result of collaboration between UCORP and UCPB during 2009-10.

**Indirect Cost Recovery**

UC Core Funds come mainly from the state legislature (State General Fund), educational fees, and the general fund component of indirect cost recovery; the last category comprises reimbursements by research sponsors for expenses known as indirect cost, overhead, or facilities and administrative cost (F&A). Federal research sponsorship obeys rules laid out in the Office of Management and Budget Circular OMB A-21, *Cost Principles for Educational Institutions*.\(^1\) Financial basis for ICR is a set of audited data for nine cost pools in two categories: facilities (buildings and improvements, interest, equipment, operations and maintenance, and library) and administration (general, departmental, sponsored projects, and student services). The latter category is capped: regardless of actual cost, the four administrative pools together cannot collect more than 26 cents of ICR for every dollar of direct grant costs.

After the federal government, universities themselves are the second leading sponsor of research conducted on their campuses, funding a share that equals the combined total of state, industry, foundation, and other non-federal support. Within UC, federal ICR follows a path that varies somewhat on a campus-by-campus basis. In 1990, the state approved legislation authored by Senator John Garamendi, authorizing the use of indirect cost reimbursements for the construction and maintenance of certain research facilities; “Garamendi Funds” service bonds used to build research infrastructure. The remaining funds are distributed according to a formula established by UCOP and the campuses in the 1990's. Approximately 20% of the federal ICR remaining is classified as Off-the-top Funds (OTT), to be used mainly for proposal and financial support services. Another 35% is classified as Opportunity Funds (OF) and the remaining 44% is classified as UC General Funds (referred to in some older documents as Offset to State Support). UCOP retains 6% of some of the funds classified as OTT, OF, and/or UC General Funds. ICR on state grants and contracts follows varied pathways, and in general is assessed at a lower rate than that for federal grants. At the Chancellor, Provost, Dean and Department levels on campus, some ICR is retained for infrastructure use and some is passed on. Uses of ICR include commonly used infrastructure, services, and equipment; recruitment and retention, especially start-up expenses; cost-sharing and operating costs for multi-disciplinary units; and supporting the research infrastructure with accounting, human and animal review, telephones, and other expenses "unallowable" on direct costs. The history of indirect costs over the past decades has been one of increasing decentralization, with control of these funds delegated from OP to

---

\(^1\) http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/rewrite/circulars/a021/a021.html
the campuses, and from central campus administration to divisions or departments. How recovery is
distributed is a matter not of Federal regulations or accounting, but of campus governance.

It strains other funding sources when UC is unable to recover the true costs of research. This leaves
UC with a limited number of unappealing options: refusing to accept research awards that require
significant institutional subsidy, deterioration of research facilities as the risk becomes too great to invest
institutional funds, a substandard compliance environment if UC cannot afford to pay for mandated
compliance costs, and increases in tuition rates to cover costs that have been shifted to the institution. Due
to the long-term decline in state contributions, per-student support from State General Funds dropped in
real dollars (corrected for inflation) during a time of considerable enrollment growth. At the same time, UC
student fees rose, but not enough to close the gap. Because a significant fraction of federal ICR is placed in
the UC General Fund pool, some of the increase in UC General Fund spending on a per student basis is
attributable to ICR; at the same time, however, the cost for grant administration and research facilities has
also continued to grow. In short, ICR funds are increasingly important to the UC budget, and they are
increasingly spread thin.

Without transparent accounting throughout UC, it is difficult to evaluate how much ICR funds
actually support the research enterprise, or how this number may change over time (in real dollars or as a
fraction of ICR). The previous UCORP-UCPB subcommittee set out to test two hypotheses. Given that UC
student population has grown considerably in recent years, in times of large reductions in per-student
funding provided by the state, one possibility is that some ICR funds are being used to make up for
reductions in state support of UC's non-research mission. An alternative interpretation is that ICR is
actually insufficient to cover the true F&A costs of research. These hypotheses are not incompatible; the
present report will try to clarify as much as is possible with the limited resources of the Academic Senate.

Arguably, the issue is not that ICR accounting is too complex. UC gathers information on ICR in
order to enter into periodic negotiations with the federal government, so there is reliable, quantitative
information available. The University must also be prepared for financial audit of its research activities at
any time. Indeed, every Principal Investigator (with assistance from a team of financial analysts) tracks
both direct and indirect research expenditures. Thus it is possible to do so with all of UC’s ICR
expenditures in the General Fund and Opportunity Fund categories.

Maintaining a high degree of flexibility in the use of ICR funds may have had some short-term
benefits, but this policy may place the UC research enterprise at risk over the long term. ICR is
reimbursement for costs after they are incurred. Increasing ICR income implies associated increases in
costs related to conducting research rather than a net gain in revenue. The university gains flexibility by
putting ICR into the General Funds and Opportunity Funds categories, without tracking their use, but using
any of these funds for non-research purposes reduces the availability of ICR to support the research for which it was obtained. As prior Academic Senate reports noted, this contributes to the continued deterioration of the environment for conducting research at UC. Moreover, if UC continues to build facilities, then more of any given revenue stream, certainly including ICR, goes to cover debt, which means less ICR can go to support other facilities and administration costs, forcing academic departments to get state funds from their Deans to pay for F&A. Deans do this, for example, by not filling approved and allocated faculty lines so as to redeploy the cash equivalent.

Prior to 1982, UC negotiated and used a single system-wide overhead rate; after that year, rates have developed differently at each UC campus – e.g. in 1985, UCB charged 45.6%, UCD 39%, UCSF 32.6%, etc. – for a UC average of 42.2% (median 43%). By 2002, the average in UC was 50.1% (UCD was at 48.5%, UCB at 51.2%, UCSF at 50.5%). UC campuses currently charge between 50% and 55%. As an example, look at federal cost recovery: Once Garamendi funds are taken off the top, OP splits about 20%, returning 94% to campus and keeping 6% of the 20%. The remaining 80% are split as 55% general funds (i.e. 44% of total) and 45% opportunity funds (i.e. 36% of total). The opportunity funds are again taxed 6% by OP. Each campus gets to keep all of its clinical trial recovery dollars. But with private and local government recovery, a campus receives a base allocation plus an inflation rate; OP keeps an amount set in 1995-1996, when it initiated a policy to distribute all incremental overhead to campuses.

At the school level, take the example of a school that generates, in a given year, $8m in indirect cost recovery. Of that, $4.2 come back to campus, $3.8 go to UCOP and state. UCOP takes $1.5m, the state takes $2.3m. The state funds come back as 199xx funds ($1.5m) and as research-admin 19900 funds ($800k). Garamendi debt subtracted from the campus allocation is $45k, leaving a bit more than $4.1m, minus debt service and leases of $1.5m. The remaining $2.65m are divided between school ($1.3m) and campus ($1.35m), and the latter share largely benefits startup funds for hires. At first glance, this may look like the school is not getting a lot: but consider that the Garamendi debt, debt service and leasing, the substantial start-up funds for faculty research, and the return of funds to the school (for its own administrative efforts in grants and in labs) in sum amount to $10.25m, or actually more of a benefit than the school can claim a direct responsibility for in that year. In addition, it is important for all faculty members to understand that the considerable start-up costs and laboratory expenses are amortized only over many years, or even decades, due to low actual recovery rates and due to the fact that mandatory expenses such as building debt and utilities tend to consume the bulk of ICR. In order to achieve this goal, both UCORP and UCPB also wish to renew the call for improved transparency in ICR, at both OP and Campus levels.
Funding Research Excellence
UC has no legal obligation to spend indirect cost recovery dollars on research; they are reimbursements for facilities and administrative expenses. This is one reason why ICR funds are so highly valued: once UCOP takes its share and a campus subtracts Garamendi and Off-the-Top funds, the remaining ICR funds (Opportunity Funds and General Funds) are fungible. Slightly different ICR rates are determined within UC on a per-campus basis, negotiated periodically with representatives of the federal government. Campuses routinely argue for ICR rates that are 10-20% higher than agreed upon by federal representatives. Regulatory compliance and other factors made research increasingly expensive. UC's negotiated federal ICR rate brings UC less overhead than is needed to support the associated research. Actual indirect cost recovery from all research sponsors is closer to 25% than the actual negotiated rates on each campus – a dramatic shortfall, as true costs appear to be in the 65-70% range. This gap applies not only because the net overhead recovery rate is insufficient to cover real facilities and administrative costs; UC also increased support deficits as research programs continue to grow, for even at full recovery rates the actual indirect
cost of research is not covered. That remains true even if every penny of ICR were used exclusively in support of research. Long-term reductions in state support made this accumulating deficit larger.

Increasing private research sponsorship is a highly ambiguous response to the problem. UC’s comparatively low ICR rate is framed by the assumption that the state provides a sizeable subsidy to its public university, though corporations do not provide that subsidy. Federal ICR rates are a ceiling for private grants and contracts; corporate sponsors negotiate lower overhead rates. Indeed, given the competition for research funding, UC may see itself forced to accept lower overhead rates to stay competitive in a race to the bottom for private sponsorship of research. This negative spiral may explain why an increasing share of UC research support is declared as gift rather than as grant or contract, subject only to flat-tax foundation fees but not to appropriate overhead assessments (5% or 10% rather than around 1/3 of total support granted). If state resources are being diverted from teaching and other campus needs to development offices in the hope of bringing private funds to campus and to manage complex projects, then accepting research sponsorship that covers little or no share of the associated effort in administration, space, equipment, and utilities, will continue to take more resources from the UC budget than it brings in.

As a result of a number of long-standing challenges for public research universities, UC fails to recover an estimated $600 million of ICR annually. It is not just that federally negotiated overhead rates fall short of the true costs of research. By policy, UC accepts lower rates (called class waivers) from many sponsors (other than for-profits) that have uniform policies of not paying full overhead. UC accepts "Vital Interest" waivers on a case-by-case basis when, in the judgment of the campus Vice Chancellor of Research and the UCOP Office of Research, such a waiver is in the best interests of UC. UC now waives overhead on 18% of federal grants and 72% of foundation grants. Some external agencies see the fact that they do not provide full reimbursement for indirect costs as a form of cost sharing, justified by the view that they are assisting a public university in its research mission.

This report does not depart from conventional wisdom when it suggests that UC a) reconsider its policy for approving class waivers, b) review the “vital interest” waiver policy, and c) stop automatic approval of waiver requests. The same recommendations were made by the Academic Senate in 2003 (Binion to Atkinson, August 7, 2003). That memo also requested that every campus incorporate allowable direct costs of administrative or clerical support and general supplies into proposal budgets, wherever this is not explicitly prohibited or already incorporated into indirect costs billed to sponsors (e.g. the federal government). An important goal would be to achieve an ICR rate equal to or greater than the rates at similar research universities. UC needs to make the strongest case possible to the federal government to raise the cap on the administrative component of ICR; and together with other leading research universities,
UC should work with major foundations to request that they provide funding that covers indirect costs, or allow overhead costs to be represented as direct costs of conducting research.

On some campuses, too little ICR money seems to return to PIs to cover their local share of overhead. While the main goal of this report is to foster better understanding of ICR, past Senate reports have recommended tracking ICR on each campus through the accounting system, though nobody has yet figured out how to do that efficiently, and some believe it could do more harm than good. It is clear, though, that administration at both campus and OP levels must continue to improve ICR transparency.

Furthermore, this report is not breaking new ground when it endorses a systematic inquiry into factors that contribute to driving up overhead costs. This is not merely a matter of proliferating environmental health and safety regulations. UC campuses must make a concerted effort to control expenditures on grant processing and accounting, and to create clarity about space metrics and utilities, especially since it has become clear that ICR is not sufficient to cover these expenditures. If the university cannot recover its indirect costs, it will be forced to cut services and staff, reduce research space, and trim other expenses. The university subsidizes sponsored research to an increasing extent, although fungible sources for doing so are limited.

It is important to note, however, that disciplines rely on foundation grants to different degrees. Should UC require full overhead on all sponsored research and discourage accepting foundation grants that do not cover full indirect cost, it might adversely impact research in social sciences and humanities that rely to a greater extent on foundations rather than on state or federal agencies. Universities have perverse incentives to minimize research expenditures in high-enrollment departments in the humanities and social sciences: the revenue surplus generated there from enrollments can support indirect costs in science, engineering, and medicine only if little of the surplus is absorbed by research in high-enrollment departments themselves.

The difference in ICR rates between UC and its peers and competitors is not a factor of UC’s particular research mix. UC’s peers have policies and practices that allow them to negotiate higher ICR rates more successfully. They have more permanent staff positions devoted to proposal development and negotiation; a high level of engagement and commitment from senior administrators; an educated and committed faculty; and they conduct careful surveys of space functions used to set a facilities rate. Some competing institutions allow departments to decide whether to waive overhead, and ask departments that do to make up the difference between the actual rate of the award and the Federal overhead rate by using departmental funds. Some competitor institutions have permanent government costing staff devoted to proposal development and negotiation; others supplement their staff by outside consultants.
By way of conclusion, UCORP and UCPB assert that UC’s indirect cost recovery model must support the campus research enterprise; direct adequate recovery funds to research infrastructure such as research administration, contract & grants accounting, environmental health and safety; acknowledge overhead recovery generated by individual units; provide central funding for existing and new research opportunities and for shared facility and equipment needs; account for all debt and lease costs; and be transparent and easily understood by the campus community. Transparency at all levels of administration is critical to allay the faculty concerns that motivated this reinvestigation. Policy changes to increase ICR may be viewed as a disproportionate “tax” on performing the research mission if these rates are not visibly linked to research-related costs.
Facility & Administration (Indirect) Rate Calculation, Recovery and Distribution

University of California, Irvine
Budget Office
August 22, 2007
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Topics of Discussion

- Definitions:
  - OMB A-21 definition of Direct costs
  - OMB A-21 definition of Facilities and Administrative (Indirect) costs
- F&A rate calculation
- F&A recovery
- F&A distribution
Definition - Direct Costs

Direct costs are those costs that can be identified specifically with a particular sponsored project, an instructional activity, or any other institutional activity, or that can be directly assigned to such activities relatively easily with a high degree of accuracy.

Examples:
- Salaries & FB of PI and technical support staff
- Lab supplies
- Telephone toll charges
- Travel costs
- Animals & Animal Care charges
- Scientific computer software
- Equipment (proj. spec.)
- Equipment maintenance Contracts
- Rental of space
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Definition - F&A (Indirect) Costs

Facilities & Administrative (Indirect) costs are those that are incurred for common or joint objectives and therefore **cannot** be identified readily and specifically with a particular sponsored project, an instructional activity, or any other institutional activity.

Examples:
- Administrative & clerical salaries & FB
- Memberships & subscriptions
- Office supplies
- Local telephone & line charges
- Postage
- General computing costs, e.g. networks, network services & LANS
- Pagers
- General purpose software, diskettes, paper & toner
Data Sources of F&A Rate Proposal

- General Ledger
- Payroll System
- Space System
- Plant Asset System
- Debt Management System
- Equipment Management System
**Direct Cost Functions:**
- Instruction
- Organized Research
- Other sponsored Activities
- Other Institutional Activities

**Indirect Cost (F&A) Pools:**
- Facilities: Bldg use (Dep + I), Equip Dep, OMP, Library

**Indirect Cost (F&A) Rate Calculation**

1. **Exclude Unallowable Costs**
2. **Establish Modified Total Direct Cost Bases (MTDC)**
3. **Negotiate with DCA/DHHS**
4. **Each Indirect Cost Pool divided by appropriate MTDC Base equals F&A rate by Cost Pool Category**

**Allocated Indirect Costs to Direct Cost Functions with Space Survey Details**
Unallowable Costs

OMB Circular A-21, Unallowable Activities:

- Organized fund raising
- Lobbying
- Commencement/convocation
- Public relations or alumni activities
- Student activities
- Managing investments solely to enhance income
- Prosecuting the government
Unallowable Costs

OMB Circular A-21, Unallowable Expenses:

- alcoholic beverages
- Advertising
- Entertainment
- Fines and Penalties
- Promotional materials (unless used for employee morale)
- Certain recruitment costs, first class travel
- Cash Donations to other parties
Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC)

- **Modified Total Direct Costs, consisting of:**
  - all salaries, wages and benefits
  - materials, supplies and services
  - travel
  - subgrants and subcontracts up to the first $25,000

- **Modified Total Direct Costs, excluding:**
  - Equipment and capital expenditures
  - Charges for patient care and tuition remission
  - rental costs
  - scholarships and fellowships
  - portion of each subgrant and subcontract in excess of $25,000
## Indirect Cost (F&A) Rate Information

### FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Interest</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation &amp; Main.</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building depreciation is based on useful life of 50 years (exclude federal funded portion)

Non-Capitalized Interest Expenses (additional 7% interest for new buildings not included)

6 2/3% of Equipment depreciation (exclude federal funded portion and recharge equipment)

Building maintenance, utilities, janitorial serv. EH&S, Security, dept paid OMP

Library Operation costs - books, library materials etc.

### ADMINISTRATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Admin</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Admin</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spon Proj Admin</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Serv. Adm</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pres’ office, Chanc’ office, Budget Office, HR, Acctg, Admin. Computing, General Counsel, etc.

Dept & Dean’s office S&W, 3.6% MTDC for faculty admin effort, other admin. & support exp.

Office of Research Admin. C&G Accounting, Human Subject

Student Health, Dean of Students, Admissions, Registra, etc.

### Capped Admin. Rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capped Admin. Rate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F&A RATE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F&amp;A RATE:</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* additional interest costs for future new buildings are also considered when rate is negotiated

### Five-year Newly Negotiated Rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate year</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F&A (Indirect) costs recovery

F&A recovery is the income generated when the approved F&A (indirect cost) rates are applied to the eligible direct expenses of contracts and grants. It represents reimbursement for costs already incurred by the University, in support of research.
OP Allocation policy

- **Federal Recovery:**
  - Campus to receive 100% of justified Garamendi recovery
  - Campus to receive 94% remaining Federal overhead recovery (OPP, OTT, 19933 fund and General fund)

- **Private Recovery (excluding Clinical Trial Recovery):**
  - Base Allocation
  - 50% of inflation amount (example: 3% of total recovery)
  - 100% of increment /decrement of current year and prior year private recovery excluding inflation

- **Clinical Trial Recovery:**
  - Campus to receive 100% of Clinical Recovery
Division of Federal F&A recovery dollars between State & University

Federal Dollars Recovered

- **Garamendi Pre-Off-The-Top to campus**

19.9% Off-The-Top (OTT)

- 94% to campus (69750 fund)
- 6% to OP

80.1% Remaining

- 55% to State (44.1% of total)
- 45% to Campus (36% of total)

- 94% to campus (OPP fund)
- 6% to OP
Division of Private & Local government recovery (including Clinical Trial recovery)

Clinical Trial recovery

100% to campus

Private dollar recovered

Campus portion: three components

1st component: Base allocation (prior year allocation) (95-96 is the base year)

2nd component: 50% of inflation (prior year recovery X inflation rate)

3rd component: campus increase less inflation

OP portion: Total private recovery less campus portion
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Overhead recovery distribution

Fund 19933 to campus

State Share $18,361,817

Less Campus Prior Commitment (based year 94/95) $10,712,782

2005-06 Campus total Overhead recovery $54,648,604

Less Garamendi $3,497,548

Overhead incremental available for distribution: $18,196,356

Campus Share $29,430,689

OP Share $3,358,550

Academic Units $6,098,178

Research Infrastructure $3,658,907

Administrative Needs $2,439,271

Reserve for Debt payment $6,000,000
Overhead Recovery Incremental Distribution Policy

- 30% for RGS for research infrastructure
- 20% for Administrative use
- 50% to Academic Units
  - Example:

  2006-07 allocation is based on 2005-06 overhead recovery incremental (total overhead generated in 2005-06 less 94-95 base year commitment) and distribution percentage is based on total overhead generated by each school in 2005-06
F&A (Indirect Cost) Rate calculation, recovery and distribution

Confused?
Any Questions?
Course Buyout Policy

Program in Public Health

Purpose

The Program in Public Health procedure for course buyout will permit full-time faculty to reduce their course assignments by charging a component of academic-year salary to alternative funding sources such as extramural grants. The goals of this policy are 1) to allow faculty supported by extramural funding to dedicate additional time to research and 2) to generate additional departmental revenue to enhance course offerings.

Buyout Cost

The cost to buy out of one course shall be equal to 1/8 or 12.5% of the faculty member's annual base salary plus commensurate fringe benefits during the quarter of buyout. For example, for a faculty member whose annual base salary is $89,500 (the 2012-2013 scale salary for Professor Step I) the cost is $11,188 plus benefits (and F&A charges for extramural grants).

Participation

In order to allow sufficient time to find a replacement instructor and for course scheduling, a faculty member who wishes to participate in the program should submit a request to the Chair (Oladele Ogunseitan) at least six months prior to the start of the quarter in which buyout is requested. If a replacement instructor is found and the Chair approves the request prior to the payroll deadline, the personnel office shall implement the changes to payroll and personnel systems. Faculty participation in the program is voluntary and shall not be a precondition for merit increases or promotions.

Replacement Instructors

A program applicant may be required to chair a search for a qualified replacement instructor if the Chair cannot identify a replacement. For buyout of elective courses, the Chair may opt to pay a lecturer to offer an alternative course instead of the bought-out course. Instructors for core MPH courses shall not be released from writing comprehensive exam questions as a result of

Version 2017
buyout. To ensure continuity, a replacement lecturer for a core course is expected to use the syllabus of record. Each MPH core course instructor shall confer regularly with his/her replacement prior to and during the buyout quarter to ensure that course content is similar and subsequent comprehensive exam questions are appropriate.

Salary Savings and Program Review

Salary savings shall be retained by the department and used to hire replacement instructors. If the savings are higher than the costs, extra funds should be used to sponsor additional elective courses. The Chair shall report annually to the Curriculum Committee on the expenditure of these funds, listing courses that have been bought out and replacement/additional courses, so that the committee can evaluate the program. The Curriculum Committee shall report annually to the department on the buyout program’s impact including the percentage of department courses taught by full-time faculty.

Additional Requirements

Any proposed course buyout charged to an extramural funding source must be allowable by the granting agency and consistent with the terms of the sponsored project; major budget changes may require pre-approval by the agency’s project officer. During the first year of the program (AY 2013-2014) each faculty member was limited to one course buyout. In subsequent years the Chair may approve buyout of more than one course per faculty member if it does not adversely affect the teaching program. This program may be modified or discontinued at the discretion of the Department Chair.
The buyout cost per course will be 12.5% of the faculty members’ 9/12 annual rate during the buyout quarter plus commensurate fringe benefits.

Name: ___________________________ Department: Population Health and Disease Prevention

Quarter of Release: [ ] FALL, 20___ [ ] Winter, 20___ [ ] Spring, 20___

Was a buyout approved for the prior academic year?

Please list your teaching load for the academic year in which the Course Buy-Out will take place.
The standard teaching load is 3 courses per year as determined by the department.

Teaching Load BEFORE Course Buy-Out Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Course Number/Name</th>
<th>(include cross-listed course information)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course being proposed for Buy-Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Course Number/Name</th>
<th>(include cross-listed course information)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments: (If requesting an exception, please attach the request and justification)

Fund Source to Pay Salary and Benefits:

Agency Name: ___________________________ Account/Fund: ___________________________

Project Code: ___________________________ KFS #: ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Dates</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Monthly Salary</th>
<th>% time per quarter dates</th>
<th>12.5% of Faculty Annual Salary Per Course</th>
<th>Cost per month</th>
<th>Indirect Cost (based on funding)</th>
<th>Benefit Cost to Grant *</th>
<th>Total Cost to Grant</th>
<th>Salary Cost to Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete all of the above cells

*Update formula to reflect actual benefit rate

Approval Signatures:

Faculty Member ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Financial Analyst ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Assistant Chair ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Chair Oladele Ogunseitan ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Curriculum Committee Acknowledgement: ___________________________

Financial Analyst to complete all calculations and obtain all signature before submitting to Personnel.
Instructional Workload
Non-Senate Faculty
INSTRUCTIONAL WORKLOAD POLICY  
Non-Senate Instructional Unit  

PROGRAM IN PUBLIC HEALTH

The full-time Instructional Workload for this unit is 9 Instructional Workload Courses (or the equivalent) per academic year.

This instructional workload assumes that the faculty-instructor may participate in governance and in professional and university service, and that routine, normal service of this type will normally carry an instructional workload course (IWC) equivalency of 0. Where such participation or service is assigned and carries a significantly heavier load, an instructional workload equivalency may be assigned.

A list of equivalencies specific to this academic unit are indicated below.

There may be Instructional Workload Equivalencies not foreseeable at this time: these will be assigned on an ad hoc basis to the extent that they appear to be one-time arrangements. Any which would appear likely to be repeated will require notification to UC/AFT and will be added to the formal Instructional Workload Policy.

1. Equivalencies for undergraduate courses assigned by Department
   a) Four unit courses: 1.0 IWC
   b) Lower-division required courses with large expected enrollments (200 or more) with unit values greater than four, substantial lab components, extended meeting hours, or more than four TA assigned: 1.5 IWC.
   c) Leading one discussion section: 0.5 IWC
   d) Two-unit courses: 0.5 IWC

2. Each assigned duty other than teaching will have an IWC equivalency determined by the Department in the range of .25 to 1.5 IWC. Value to be assigned based on amount of anticipated work necessary to complete the assigned task.

February 2015

Oladele A. Ogunseitan, Professor and Chair
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VISION AND MISSION

We envision a world where risk factors for diseases and disabilities are understood and curtailed through our mission to lead research, teach reflectively, reveal all evidence, and reform practice for public health improvements.

LUSTRUM PRIORITIES

1. Transform the Program in Public Health into a School.

2. Cultivate excellence in the graduate programs, M.P.H. and Ph.D. in Public Health, through increasing enrollment, financial endowment, accessible concentrations, and academic rankings.

3. Expand research profile through targeted recruitment of high impact faculty members, increasing success rates for extramural grant proposals and philanthropic funding.


5. Develop new self-sustaining signature programs, including for example, a certificate curriculum under our global health research, education, and translation (GHREAT) initiative as a source of revenue.
Build an Eminent School on a Foundation of Public Health Scholarship

We will successfully transform the Program in Public Health into a School. More than 50 people attended the Town Hall meeting held on 15 January 2016 at the Newkirk Alumni Center to discuss the outline for a consolidation proposal for a School of Public Health at UC Irvine. On January 4th 2016, the Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs visited the faculty meeting of the Program in Public Health to discuss visions for consolidating the strengths of Health Sciences within an empowered Health Affairs Enterprise. Since then additional meetings are being held among various constituencies to support the consolidation goal outlined by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. To meet the standards of accredited Schools of Public Health, we must recruit new faculty members to build on our research strengths and to fill gaps in our academic enterprise, including scholarship, curricula, and community engagement. We must also secure physical space and resources to accommodate the growth and stature of a School.
**Cultivate Excellence in Graduate Education**

In 2016, our M.P.H. degree was ranked 10th nationally among the best such degree programs in the country. By the Fall 2016, we will offer 4 emphases to incoming M.P.H. students: Biostatistics, Environmental Health, Epidemiology, and Sociocultural Diversity and Health. Current criteria for a School of Public Health requires five emphases. Therefore, we will develop Global Health, a priority area for system-wide UCOP-supported Global Health Institute. We expect that these five emphases within the M.P.H. will attract top-notch students including international applicants. We will seek extramural training grants for the Ph.D. in Public Health, and we will streamline interactions among the three existing Ph.D. degrees contributing to the new School of Public Health: Ph.D. in Public Health with concentrations in Global Health and Disease Prevention; Ph.D. in Environmental Health Science with concentrations in Exposure Science and Toxicology; and Ph.D. in Epidemiology. We expect these doctorate programs to be ranked highly when they debut in the National Research Council’s periodic ranking of research training programs. To accomplish this goal, we must strengthen the doctorate degrees to ensure uniform standards of excellence through peer-reviews, faculty-led seminars, increase success rates for fellowships, broadening experiences for career opportunities, and open dissertation defense.
Increase the Rigor and Reach of Undergraduate Education

Our B.A. in Public Health Policy and B.S. in Public Health Sciences degrees were recently ranked 2\textsuperscript{nd} in the nation among accredited Bachelors’ programs in public health. We are thrilled by this assessment, but we must continue to strengthen the quality of the popular degree programs and ensure a stable curriculum with permanent highly valued lecturers. The undergraduate program provides the opportunity for revenue-generating programs. We are among the trailblazers in online education, with UCOP awards to support two fully online courses (Principles of Public Health and Natural Disasters). We were also recently approved to develop an online course “Introduction to Global Health” that will be offered under the auspices of the UC Global Health Institute. We will continue to strengthen our efforts in this direction. However, we believe that resource generation will be enhanced by packaging courses into certification modules for professional workforce development. Over the next three years, we will develop a self-sustaining certification program under our global health research, education, and translation (GHREAT) initiative as a source of revenue for the Program.
Recruit and Retain Superlative Faculty
We will raise our research profile through high impact faculty recruitment. We are fortunate to have secured some of the coveted high impact faculty cluster recruitment in the area of salivary biomarkers in public health. We are also engaged in reviewing applicants to the Program in Public Health through the new mid-career faculty recruitment initiative. We will continue to build on these successes by applying independently and collaboratively to the high impact faculty recruitment initiative. We are also actively pursuing the identification of potential candidates for appointment at the level of Distinguished Professor, which comes with the award of a faculty FTE. Space is one of the limitations for faculty growth in public health, and we have to solve that problem as soon as possible. One strategy is to collaborate with other units with spare space for recruiting faculty, but this is not ideal because we are at a development phase when we want faculty members to contribute vigorously, intellectually, and by physical presence, to the realization of our mission to achieve school status, and to do with excellence in all our signature research, academic, professional and community engagement programs. Our philanthropic funding raising efforts focus on enhancing specific areas of faculty research strength, including endowed professorships, naming opportunities for laboratories and scholarships for students.
Maintain High Reputation Among Peers
We will secure full re-accreditation of the Program: We have begun the process of self-study that is required for re-accreditation of the Program in Public Health. The Council on Education for Public Health has established a date for the site visit on October 9th and 10th 2017. We expect full accreditation for 7 years (2018 – 2025). Achievement of re-accreditation requires that we meet nearly 30 criteria established by CEPH in consultation with APHA and ASPPH regarding the quality of our academic and professional responsibilities, including adequate staffing, community engagement, student-faculty ratio, and research enterprise.
Building Around the Four Pillars of Our Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILLARS OF OUR MISSION</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TACTICS</th>
<th>MEASURABLE OUTCOME(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Create knowledge that makes a difference”</td>
<td>Strengthen Research Profile of the Program in Public Health</td>
<td>Identify and cultivate “signature” research topic areas. Extramural endowment of research topics and named faculty chairs and professorships</td>
<td>Increase recruitment of senior faculty with strong, active, and funded research programs. Increase recruitment of junior and mid-career faculty to establish the broad spectrum of excellence in topical research areas</td>
<td>Pursue high impact faculty hiring. Pursue distinguished professor nominations. Raise funds to support higher set-up funds for faculty under recruitment. Identify and pursue candidates for mid-career faculty FTEs</td>
<td>Increase in number and frequency of high impact research publications. Increase in number of invention disclosures and patents. Increase in research funding per faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILLARS OF OUR MISSION</td>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
<td>TACTICS</td>
<td>MEASURABLE OUTCOME(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLECT</td>
<td>“Recruit and retain top-notch students”</td>
<td>Provide structured research opportunities for doctoral students</td>
<td>Increase national competitiveness of applicant pool of Ph.D. students</td>
<td>Receive pre-doctoral training grants from extramural agencies or development sources.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of public datasets, programs, etc. and promote their use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare doctoral students for research careers post-graduation.</td>
<td>Raise expectation of research productivity in first year for doctoral students</td>
<td>Brand faculty research, and our program’s unique foci, more clearly to target high-level applicants to the Ph.D. Program.</td>
<td>Mandatory doctoral seminar to replace weekly PH seminar speaker series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote a culture of excellence regarding expectations of routine peer-review and constructive criticism for doctoral students’ research.</td>
<td>Connect undergraduate major pool of applicants to our graduate degrees through invitations to information sessions held early in the admissions cycle and and frequently thereafter.</td>
<td>Connect doctoral seminar (2 units) would have each student present their work.</td>
<td>Doctoral seminar (2 units) would have each student present their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase number and frequency of high impact research publications, co-authored with doctoral students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incentivize faculty application to pre-doctoral training “centers”</td>
<td>Stronger admission metrics of entire graduate applicant pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced yield of top applicants to the graduate programs</td>
<td>Consider a direct BA-PhD transition, or incentivize a 4+1 BA/MPH (less preferable)</td>
<td>Offer favorable (GSR) financial packages to admits that are on par with top-tier PhD programs</td>
<td>Enhanced yield of top applicants to the graduate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILLARS OF OUR MISSION</td>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
<td>TACTICS</td>
<td>MEASURABLE OUTCOME(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVEAL</td>
<td>Increase productivity and impact of faculty research through high impact journals coverage of Program discoveries and reports.</td>
<td>Encourage peer-nominations to editorial boards; nationally visible honorary awards and fellowships.</td>
<td>Create a database of nominations and applications for honorary and prestigious fellowships and memberships</td>
<td>Identify priorities and target annual number of nominations processed by Committee on Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Increase in the number of faculty awards and memberships of prestigious editorial boards and honorary societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase faculty representation on editorial boards</td>
<td>Implement inaugural lectures for all tenured faculty</td>
<td>Reserve specific dates per quarter in our seminar series for our own faculty members to present their research</td>
<td>Make research faculty more visible to undergraduates in terms of teaching courses; PH-199s; public announcements to incoming majors (e.g., Fall of Freshman, Junior years)</td>
<td>Increase in the number of invitations to deliver keynote addresses, to contribute editorials, and host symposia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase visibility of faculty research to the community and our campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider implementation of working paper series for both faculty and graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the number of undergraduate students who are admitted to our graduate programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILLARS OF OUR MISSION</td>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
<td>TACTICS</td>
<td>MEASURABLE OUTCOME(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFORM</td>
<td>“Create Change and Demonstrate Positive Impacts”</td>
<td>Partner with local agencies and philanthropists to co-develop research agenda. Increase opportunities for faculty to serve on government advisory boards, give congressional testimony, and write meta-analysis reports.</td>
<td>Financial self-sustainability Salience of UCI Public Health to Orange County. Impact of translational research. Create database of opportunities and representation of faculty and students on influential boards</td>
<td>Development team, and modest involvement of PH faculty via talks and meetings. Assign responsibility and priorities to the Committee on Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>Host regional and nationally visible conferences. For example, Ebola Forum; Forum on Flint Michigan Polluted Water; Forum on Earthquake Preparedness. Differentiation of the Public Health “product” from other College of Health Sciences units, medicine, nursing science, and pharmaceutical sciences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCI Program in Public Health

Framing the Future
ASPH