

Reza Abbaschian

To: Tim Willette
Subject: RE: Weekly Reminder: EBI Engineering Exit Assessment Select 6

-----Original Message-----

From: EBI Service Center [mailto:helpdesk@webebi.com]
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2008 10:01 PM
To: Tim Willette
Subject: Weekly Reminder: EBI Engineering Exit Assessment Select 6

Hello,

It is now time to select your six comparison schools (Select 6).

1) Login to MyEBI using the information below. To access MyEBI, use the link below:

<https://order.webebi.com/myebi/>

2) Click on the "Select 6" link on the left in the box with links pertaining to each order. If you have more than one order, you will need to enter Select 6 for each order since the participant lists will be different.

3) View the Participant List, Methodology, Selection History and Profile Report (some assessments do not have profile reports).

4) Click "Choose Your Select 6" then when finished click the "Save Selections" button.

Select 6 Methodology

One set of 6 comparison institutions (Select 6) is included in your Standard Analysis. There can be many rationales in choosing your Select 6. Regardless of the criteria used, we encourage you to choose your Select 6 consistently. You will find it of value to look more closely at a group of institutions in your direct geographic area, an aspirant group, institutions your admissions staff identifies as the direct competition and/or a grouping of institutions within your region. It would not be in your best interests to use a mixture of rationales when choosing your institutions. While detailed data will be reported for each of the six comparison institutions, individual institutions will not be specifically identified so as to maintain the confidentiality of data.

Here are the most common criteria:

Peer Institutions: If you are most interested in having your performance measured against institutions that are your peers (i.e. same size program, same type of program, consistency in curriculum or programming, etc.) then we suggest that you choose Select 6 institutions that mirror your program. Search the profile report by size and program type to find those institutions that are the closest match to your own.

Aspirant Institutions: If you are most interested in having your performance measured against institutions that are performing at a level your institution aspires to (i.e. innovative programming, larger program, unique curriculum, etc.), then we suggest that you sort the profile report by the area that most interests you and choose institutions with programs that model your aspirations.

Competitor Institutions: If you are most interested in having your performance measured against institutions that are seen as your competitors, then we suggest that you submit the list of participants to your administrators and ask for recommendations.

When entering your Select 6, you will be asked to verify the number of people you attempted to survey.

You will be sent reminders weekly until your Select 6 has been chosen.

We will email you when your comparative reporting becomes available.

Thanks,

EBI Service Center
1630 W. Elfindale St.
Springfield, Mo 65807
info@webebi.com
417-831-1810

**EBI Engineering Exit Assessment
Institutional Comparison Selections**

Institute	08	07	06	05	04	03	02	01
University of Delaware	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
University of Utah	x	x	x	x				
University of Virginia	x	x	x	x				
University of Wisconsin-Madison	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
University of California-San Diego	x	x						
University of Rochester		x						
Vanderbilt University	ALT	ALT	ALT	ALT	ALT			
University of Notre Dame	ALT	ALT	ALT	ALT	ALT		x	x
Northeastern University			x	x				
University of Illinois at Chicago	x		x	x	x	x		
University of Texas at Austin				x	x	ALT		ALT
University of Houston					x	x		
University of Connecticut					x	x	x	x
University of Rhode Island						x		
University of Arizona						ALT	ALT	
University of Illinois at Urbana							x	x
Stanford University							x	
University of Southern California							ALT	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology								x
Carnegie Mellon University								ALT
Total Institutions Participating	67							

April 9, 2008

Dean Reza Abbaschian
Vice Chancellor Gretchen S. Bolar
Dean Steven Bossert
Dean Craig V. Byus
Chair Thomas E. Cogswell
Interim Dean Donald A. Cooksey
Dean Stephen E. Cullenberg
Vice Chancellor Al V. Diaz
Interim Dean Sharon A. Duffy
Vice Provost David H. Fairris
University Librarian Ruth Jackson
Vice Chancellor Charles F. Louis
Dean Dallas L. Rabenstein
Associate Vice Chancellor Charles J. Rowley
Vice Chancellor James W. Sandoval
Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Carolyn M. Stark
Dean David W. Stewart

Dear Colleagues:

The campus policies on Gift Service Fee, Administrative Service Fee, and STIP (Short Term Investment Pool) have been under review over the last several months. The reviews are now completed and have resulted in updated Gift Service Fee and STIP policies, adoption of a new Administration Cost Recovery Fee Policy, and elimination of the Administrative Service Fee Policy effective July 1, 2008. Copies of the updated/new policies are attached.

UCR Administration Cost Recovery Fee Policy

In compliance with California trust law which allows the recovery of reasonable and actual administrative costs from (endowment) fund payout, the UCR Administration Cost Recovery Fee Policy is being adopted to recover funds to help defray the costs associated with administering endowment and endowment related funds. This policy replaces the current UCR Administrative Service Fee Policy. This change reduces the fees charged from 1.5% to 0.5% thereby bringing UCR into alignment with policies already in place at other UC campuses.

B12977

Policy on Gift Service Fee

The existing UCR Policy on Gift Service Fee has been updated to reflect changes in applicable terminology.

STIP (Short Term Investment Pool) Policy

The current STIP policy has been revised to allocate STIP income generated on all Gift funds to an account under the control of the Chancellor to meet funding needs of the campus. Similar treatment will be instituted on ordinary income generated by UCR Foundation current restricted gift funds and endowment/endowment-related distributed payout funds.

Fund Functioning as an Endowment

The Delegation of Authority and Administrative Guidelines for Allocation and Reallocation of Gifts and Bequests to The Regents and Campus Foundations that govern the establishment of fund functioning as an endowment can be viewed at www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/PP091106-Guidelines.pdf.

If you have any questions regarding the Policy on Gift Service Fee, the Policy on Administration Cost Recovery Fee, or the establishment of a Fund Functioning as an Endowment, please contact Executive Director Wottring at 26389, email elizabeth.wottring@ucr.edu. Questions regarding the STIP Policy should be addressed to Assistant Vice Chancellor Matthew Hull at 23243, email matthew.hull@ucr.edu.

Sincerely,



Robert D. Grey
Acting Chancellor

Attachment

xc: Executive Vice Chancellor Wartella
Assistant Vice Chancellor Hull
Executive Director Wottring
Acting Vice Chancellor Harlow

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
POLICY ON ADMINISTRATION COST RECOVERY FEE
JULY 1, 2008

1. An Administration Cost Recovery Fee will be charged against all existing endowments and endowment-related gift funds at an annual rate of .50% (50 basis points) of the average rolling market value of funds eligible invested assets as calculated per the spending policies of the UC Regents or the UC Riverside Foundation as applicable.

The funds recovered defray the cost of administering and carrying out the terms of the campus' endowments and endowment related funds held by the UC Regents and the UCR Foundation, as permitted by California trust law.

The administration cost recovery program will be periodically reviewed. Recommendations for change will be submitted to the Chancellor.

2. For Endowments and Endowment-Related funds held by the UCR Foundation, the .50% charge will be calculated and collected as follows:

The Administration Cost Recovery Fee will be assessed based upon the average rolling market value of the fund as calculated per the applicable spending policy of the UCR Foundation. The fee will be collected from the payout of each fund (after it has satisfied the 5% Gift Service Fee requirement).

3. For Endowments and Endowment-Related funds held by the UC Regents for the Riverside campus, the .50% charge will be calculated and collected as follows:

The Endowment Administration Cost Recovery Fee will be assessed based upon the average rolling market value of the fund as calculated per the endowment spending policy of the UC Regents. The fee will be collected from:

- a) The Endowment Cost Recovery Fees collected by UC systemwide on behalf of UCR per the UC endowment administration cost recovery policy, and if the full UCR cost recovery fee amount has not been satisfied the residual amount will be collected from:
 - b) The payout of each fund distributed by UC systemwide to the campus (after it has satisfied the 5% Gift Service Fee requirement).
4. Endowment and endowment-related income that has been distributed to current use funds is not subject to this policy.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
POLICY ON GIFT SERVICE FEE
APRIL 1, 1996
REVISED JULY 1, 2008

1. All gifts directed to the Riverside campus will be recorded in their entirety.
2. All cash gifts, regardless of the amount, including gifts for the purpose of establishing endowments or non-cash gifts converted to cash, will be charged a onetime Gift Service Fee of 5% based upon the principal value of the gift. The principal value of the gift is defined as the amount of the new gift fund as recorded in its entirety, the amount of incremental additions made to existing gift funds, or actual cash realized upon conversion of non-cash gifts.
3. The Gift Service Fee provides essential support for UCR's Advancement program.

All proceeds from the Gift Service Fee will become a Chancellorial resource to partially defray development and related program costs.
4. The 5% Gift Service Fee will be collected in one of the following ways for current fund gifts:
 - a) 5% collected directly from the gift principal, after which the gift will be released to the recipient.
 - b) 5% collected from the initial ordinary income earned by the gift.
The gifts will initially be sequestered and held by the Foundation for gifts made to the UCR Foundation or by the Campus Accounting Office for gifts made to the UC Regents for the Riverside campus. During this period of sequestration, the ordinary income earned by the gift will be directed to the Chancellor to pay the fee assessment. After the 5% Service Fee has been satisfied, the gift will be released to the recipient.
 - c) In the event that option a) or b) are neither preferred nor possible, the recipient of the gift may provide the fee from another acceptable fund source within the unit, after which the gift will be released to the recipient.
5. The 5% Gift Service Fee will be collected in one of the following ways for endowment and endowment related gifts:
 - a) The first 5% of ordinary income earned will be directed to the Chancellor to cover the 5% Gift Service Fee. After the 5% Gift Service Fee has been satisfied, the income stream from the endowment will be directed to the recipient.
 - b) 5% collected from the gift principal, after which the remaining gift principal will be invested.
 - c) In the event that option a) or b) are neither preferred nor possible, the recipient of the gift may provide the fee from another acceptable fund source within the unit, after which the gift principal will be invested.

*Campus Policy Number: 200-78
(Revision to Policy dated 2/1/83)*

Short Term Investment Pool (STIP)

Policy Owner: *Academic Planning and Budget*

Effective Date: *07/01/08*

Purpose

This policy sets for the guidelines for the distribution of Short Term Investment Pool income funds within the campus.

Definitions

Short Term Investment Pool (STIP): an investment pool consisting of assets remaining in The Regents' central bank accounts after disbursements, which are invested by the Treasurer of The Regents in short-term securities.

Background

The Treasurer of the Regents maintains a central bank account in which all monies received by the University are deposited. Monies received by the campuses are deposited into campus depository bank accounts and are transferred daily from the depository accounts into this central account. Disbursements are made from the central bank account to reimburse campus revolving funds for payroll and vendor disbursements made by the campuses, and to pay for the purchase of securities for UCRS. The General Endowment Pool (GEP), and other specific funds.

Any cash balance remaining in the central bank account not needed to cover the above disbursement is invested in short term securities. These short-term securities plus any remaining uninvested balance in the central account constitute the assets of the Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP). The participants or "customers" of STIP are those University funds which own the cash which is invested in these short-term securities.

A record of the cash balances of major participants in STIP is maintained by UCOP. This computerized record provides daily cash balances of UCRS funds, GEP, endowment corpus funds, net revenue funds, and campus and other Systemwide funds (as a group).

At the end of each quarter, investment income which has been earned by STIP is distributed to the customer funds described above by prorating income on the basis of dollar-day investment. This distribution results in the assignment of an amount of income to campus funds as a group.

Since the detail of the campus funds which are comprised of thousands of individual funds is recorded in the campus General Ledgers only, the computerized record system cannot provide a daily cash balance of each individual fund. The amount earned by the campus funds, therefore, is distributed to individual campus funds based on their average

cash balances as recorded in the end month General ledger for each month during the quarter.

Policy

The procedures for distributing the STIP income earned each quarter by campus funds include grouping funds for this purpose, and then prorating the available income to the three-month average cash balances of these groups. These groups are as follows:

I. Group I – University-wide Basis Funds

Because of budgetary/accounting considerations, the cash balances of certain funds are determined on a consolidated, University-wide basis, and the income earned by these funds are credited to these individual funds on the Systemwide General Ledger. This category of funds includes:

A. Current Funds

1. Educational Fee Fund
2. General Fund and Special State Appropriations
3. Endowments
4. Bond-Financed Auxiliary Enterprises
5. Self-Insurance Reserve Funds

B. Plant Funds

1. State Appropriations
2. Regents' and President's Funds
3. Transfers from Net Revenue Funds
4. Bond-Financed Construction Projects
5. Regents' Advances

II. Group II-Gift Funds (Includes All Current Private Gifts, Private Grants, & Interest on Endowment Income)

Includes fund ranges 34100-39999, 40001-56999, 57092-57579. On a quarterly basis, STIP income generated for funds with a surplus balance will remain in an account under the control of the Chancellor to meet funding needs of the campus. Funds with a deficit balance will be charged STIP.

Ordinary income generated by UCR Foundation current restricted gift funds and endowment/endowment-related distributed payout funds will be collected by the Foundation and transferred to the Chancellor to meet funding needs of the campus.

If donor designation on gifts or grants requires that interest must be available to the recipient, the Organization affected will be charged an amount of unrestricted money, equivalent to the interest, from another appropriate fund.

In keeping with legal obligations, under established charitable laws, donors will be informed of this policy.

III. Group III-Medical Compensation Plans and Hospital Funds

Not applicable to UCR campus.

IV. Group IV-Federal, State, Local Contracts & Grants and Private Contracts

This category includes fund ranges 18028-18999, 20605-20799, 20900-20999, 21000-33999, and 59000-59999. All cash deficits are covered by the cash balance in the Campus Unrestricted Funds (Group V). In the rare event that a campus has a positive Federal cash balance, Federal regulations require that interest be paid to the appropriate agency. It is important that cost reimbursement contracts and grants not funded by advance payment programs be reviewed periodically to determine whether the financing of these contracts and grants can be converted to advance payments programs.

V. Group V-Campus Unrestricted Funds

All campus funds which have not been assigned to Groups I, II, III, or IV are included in this group. After making the adjustments referred to in the above paragraphs, the net cash balance of Campus Unrestricted Funds is used for prorating STIP income.

As a general rule, and on a quarterly basis, STIP income for funds with a surplus fund balance will remain in an account under the control of the Chancellor to meet funding needs of the campus. Funds with a deficit balance will be charged STIP.

In the case of mandatory Student Fees and Student Loan funds, STIP Income and charges will be retained by the fund.

References and Related Policies

- July 1, 1982 UC Business and Finance Bulletin A-60, Short-Term Investment (STIP)-Distribution of Income
- November 15, 1996 UCOP memo to campuses from John Plotts, Director Business and Finance regarding Allocation of STIP Income to Private Grants
- January 14, 1997 UCOP memo to campuses from John Plotts, Director Business and Finance regarding Allocation of STIP Income to Private Gifts-Clarification

Summary Recommendations

Enhancing Accountability and Resolving Sponsored Programs Noncompliance

BACKGROUND, APPROACH AND IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

The audit and regulatory environment has changed significantly over the last several years with an increased emphasis on transparency and accountability, especially in the area of sponsored programs administration. Recently, the Government Accountability Office incorporated the Statement of Auditing Standards (SAS) 112 in the Government Audit Standards, thereby making SAS 112 an audit standard applicable to federal audits, including A-133 audits.

While SAS 112 does not change compliance thresholds for sponsored programs administration, it has changed the standard for determining when a control issue is a control deficiency, significant deficiency or materials weakness. It has also created greater transparency by changing the standard for reporting such findings to senior management and The Regents. With this greater level of transparency and continued efforts by the NSF and PHS Offices of Inspector General to conduct audits of high risk areas for grantee systems, policies and procedures, it is important for UCR to consider internal control options that are designed to help reasonably lower/minimize risk, demonstrate its stewardship commitment, why also facilitating the conduct of sponsored programs.

The below recommendations were developed after having gathered information from UC campuses and other universities. The recommendations outline a general approach for promoting responsible management and administration of sponsored programs and resolving non-compliance issues. They also focus on specific actions that can be taken to help reduce UCR's audit exposure with respect to the high risk areas identified by the NSF and PHS Offices of Inspector General.

If it is decided that one or more of the below recommendations is/are selected for implementation, a thorough review of the recommendation and development of an implementation plan by a workgroup would be the appropriate next step. A workgroup comprised of representatives from Fiscal Services, the Office of Research, Academic Planning & Budget, and Internal Audit & Advisory Services, and including representatives from the faculty and unit administration (department and college levels) may best serve the interests of the campus. This workgroup might be further divided into subgroups to address the planning and implementation of specific recommendations. Such subgroups might also involve subject matter experts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General

1. **General Process for Achieving Compliance** – UCR lacks a formalized approach within its policies and procedures for resolving instances of sponsored programs non-compliance. This may be viewed by external auditors as a significant deficiency or material weakness in the context of SAS 112.
 - a. **Recommendation:** Establish a procedure for implementing UCR policies and procedures that outlines the steps to be used to resolve non-compliance.

- b. **Recommendation:** Implementation procedures should reflect individual and organizational responsibility and accountability and include four phases:
- Phase 1 should involve an administrative review to identify and confirm instances of non-compliance.
 - Phase 2 should focus on achieving compliance by working with the PI and/or department administrator and escalating to the department chair, Organizational CFAO and dean if resolution is not achieved.
 - Phase 3 would escalate the matter to the Vice Chancellor for Research for determining equitable financial or administrative sanctions.
 - Phase 4 would escalate the matter to the EVC/Provost for implementation of the equitable financial or administrative sanctions. ***UC Berkeley, UC Irvine, UC Santa Barbara, Oregon State University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Virginia Tech all engage in a similar practice of escalating non-compliance matters for resolution.***
- c. **Recommendation:** The implementation procedures should include specified time frames for response and/or achieving resolution so that a response that does not achieve resolution results in escalating the matter to the next level.
- d. **Recommendation:** The implementation procedures should also include a list of possible sanctions for non-compliance, such as not setting up an award or blocking access to one or more enterprise systems until the non-compliance issue is resolved. Other consequences for non-compliance related to high-risk issues are addressed in the High Risk area below.
2. **Reporting lines** – Deans are responsible and accountable for ensuring department chairs comply with sponsored programs management requirements and regulations set forth by the government and the University of California. However, the opportunity for control weaknesses exists due to the revolving nature of the department chair position and the reporting relationships of departmental financial managers. In general, department financial managers do not have direct reporting relationships to the College/Org CFAO, and the CFAO does not have appropriate input regarding the hiring, performance evaluation and professional development/training of department financial managers.
- a. **Recommendation:** Expand the role of College/Org CFAOs to include assessing the ability of a chair and department financial manager to appropriately monitor sponsored programs administration and management activities within their unit. Such an assessment should occur on a regular basis. In addition, College/Org CFAOs should have greater input regarding the hiring, performance evaluation, and professional development/training of department financial managers.
- b. **Recommendation:** Deans should empower department chairs/unit directors to be responsible and accountable for the overall management of sponsored programs in their departments (see Recommendation 3.b.). In the case of

clustered departments/units, the department chairs/unit directors should have equal responsibility and accountability for ensuring that the cluster MSO/FAO has implemented procedures to ensure appropriate oversight and administration of sponsored programs. At the same time, department chairs/unit directors within a cluster should be responsible and accountable for ensuring that the faculty members of their respective department/unit comply with government and UC sponsored programs administration regulations and policies.

- c. **Recommendation:** Develop a cadre of Certified Approvers. These individuals would have to pass a certification exam and would need to be recertified on a regular basis (e.g., every 2 – 3- years). Certified Approvers would typically hold positions where they regularly apply their proven ability to understand the complexity of sponsored funding regulations and University of California policies and procedures. In their position, they would be expected to use their knowledge and experience in the review and approval of a wide variety of higher-risk financial transactions on sponsored accounts. Certified Approvers would handle financial planning, accounting transactions, and record keeping on sponsored programs awards and would be an important part of the sponsored programs management team; working with faculty, staff, department heads, college deans, and Sponsored Programs Administration to effectively manage sponsored funds.
3. **Training** – a robust training and awareness program is an essential foundation for lowering/minimizing risk and demonstrating UCR's stewardship commitment in response to the new audit environment. It is also essential for developing knowledgeable and experienced support staff for UCR's researchers, developing the recommended cadre of Certified Approvers and informing faculty and department chairs of their roles and responsibilities related to sponsored programs administration.
- a. **Recommendation:** Develop a certification module to inform Principal Investigators of their role and responsibilities in the administration and management of sponsored programs. Completion of this module should be a prerequisite for PI eligibility and PIs should be required to be recertified every two to three years.
 - b. **Recommendation:** Develop a certification module for Department Chairs to inform them of their role and responsibilities in the management and administration of sponsored programs. Completion of this module should be required as part of any campus-wide training for new Department Chairs. In addition, current Department Chairs should be required to complete the module during the initial roll out.
 - c. **Recommendation:** Develop a robust training program (utilizing multiple delivery methods) for staff involved in the administration of sponsored programs that results in certification after administration of multiple knowledge assessments, and where such certification is essential to perform certain job functions (e.g., proposal budget development, basic sponsored programs financial management/analysis, etc.)
 - d. **Recommendation:** Develop a training program and certification exam in support of the recommendation to develop of cadre of Certified Approvers.

High Risk Areas

4. **Effort Reports** - are an essential part of a three stage process designed to substantiate and document appropriate salary expenses against sponsored programs. Effort reports must be certified by the employee or responsible official and returned to the Extramural Funds Accounting office. Salary expenses that are not supported by certified effort reports are considered by the federal government to be unallocable to sponsored awards and thus unallowable.
 - a. **Recommendation:** Apply the general process described above (1.b - d). In addition to or in lieu of any equitable sanctions, salary expenses related to uncertified effort should be promptly transferred to unrestricted funds under the control of the dean, department chair or unit head. ***UC Irvine, Harvard, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and University of Minnesota have similar practices.***
5. **Cost Transfers** – UCR has policy and procedure related to cost transfers. The UCR Financial System (UCRFS) has imbedded business rules prohibiting certain cost transfers from occurring (e.g. cost incurred before or after the award effective dates). However, there are not sufficient resources to centrally monitor and approve all cost transfers. Thus, UCR relies on its Principal Investigators and department administrators to ensure appropriate and timely cost transfers.
 - a. **Recommendation:** Conduct post-transaction reviews of high-risk cost transfers samples and where insufficient justification and/or documentation are provided apply the general process (1.b – d). In addition to or in lieu of any equitable sanctions, these expenses should be transferred to unrestricted funds under the control of the dean, department chair or unit head. ***UC Irvine, UC Berkeley, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, University of Minnesota and Purdue University have similar practices.***
 - b. **Recommendation:** Revise campus policy and financial systems to prohibit the transfer of costs that were previously transferred. ***Oregon State University has a similar policy.***
6. **Award Close Out: Overdrafts (i.e., Over Expenditure of Sponsored Programs Funds)** – Some departments continue to expend funds in excess of the original budget allocation and beyond the expiration of the current budget period when continuation funding is expected, even though UCR has an established Preaward policy and procedure. UCR continues to have a large number of unauthorized overdrafts which increase sponsored programs fiscal accountability risks, as well as delaying submission of financial reports. In addition, funds in an overdraft status result in lost interest earnings to the campus.
 - a. **Recommendation:** Implement a procedure whereby overdrafts are prevented by a) not allowing additional expenses to accumulate on sponsored programs with a balance of \$0 (***similar to Purdue University***); and/or b) automatically transferring expenses charged to sponsored programs with a \$0 balance to unrestricted funds under the control of the dean, department chair or unit head. ***A policy similar to option b exists on the UC Davis campus (UCD P&P 300-31).***

- b. **Recommendation:** Apply the general process (1.b – d) to those PIs and/or departments who have established a demonstrated pattern of overdraft conditions.
7. **Award Close Out: Unexpended Balances** – Unexpended balances also present financial risk to UCR. Departments use unexpended balances to continue to incur expenditures against expired funds without the benefit of pre-award approvals when continuations or extensions are anticipated. This practice may result in “unallowable expenditures”. In other situations, unexpended balances may result in excessive cost transfers at the end of the award period to “use up” remaining balances.
- a. **Recommendation:** Implement procedures whereby unexpended balances are budgetarily removed from the ledgers unless expenditure of such balances has been approved (e.g., pre-award, No-Cost Extension, and/or sponsor or institutional approved carry forward request). ***A similar policy exists at the UC Davis campus (UCD P&P 300-31).***
- b. **Recommendation:** Apply the general process (1.b – d) to those PIs and/or departments who have established a demonstrated pattern of unexpended balances.
8. **Submission of Programmatic Deliverables** – Failure to submit interim and final technical reports, patent reports and other programmatic deliverables as required by the terms and conditions of a sponsored award may lead to consequences imposed by extramural sponsors, up to and including debarring UCR from receiving federal funds.
- a. **Recommendation:** Develop and implement campus policy that clarifies campus expectations regarding the timely fulfillment of reporting obligations.
- b. **Recommendation:** Develop and implement a procedure that defines the standard process for ensuring the timely fulfillment of reporting/deliverable obligations.
- c. **Recommendation:** Apply the general process (1.b – d) for resolving delinquent reports. ***UC Irvine, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Barbara, Oregon State University, Virginia Tech, University of Minnesota and Purdue University all have similar practices.*** Sanctions might include not setting up new awards or making the PI ineligible to receive matching funds from the VCR, ***similar to UC Santa Barbara.***
- d. **Recommendation:** In addition to or in lieu of any equitable sanctions, when a sponsor is withholding payment because of a delinquent report, after applying the general process, unreimbursed expenditures should be moved to unrestricted funds under the control of the department chair, dean or unit head. ***UC Irvine and Virginia Tech have similar practices.***
- e. **Recommendation:** Develop an electronic tool within PAMIS to remind PIs of interim and final reporting/deliverable requirements and document PI certification that such deliverables have been submitted. ***UC Irvine is at the beginning***

stages of developing an eCloseout tool that will interface with their sponsored programs database.

9. **Preaward Expenditures** - UCR has a policy and process for approving preaward expenditures. However, the process is not consistently used or understood by departments, as the policy addresses some but not all of the instances for which it is appropriate to incur preaward expenditures. In addition, the practice of incurring preaward costs for one sponsored project and accumulating those costs on a different sponsored award is not consistent with UC's cost principles and results in excess cost transfers.
- a. **Recommendation:** Review and revise the Preaward Policy to clarify all instances where prior approval (either by the Office of Research or the Sponsor) of preaward expenditures is appropriate and/or required.
 - b. **Recommendation:** In the event that a department/unit incurs preaward expenditures in the absence of prior approval to incur such expenses, apply the general process (1.b – d).
 - c. **Recommendation:** In addition to or in lieu of any equitable sanctions and in the event that a department/unit incurs preaward expenditures in the absence of prior approval, the preaward expenses should a) remain on the unrestricted fund source; or b) be transferred to unrestricted funds under the control of the dean, department chair or unit head if such expenses were accumulated on a sponsored program fund.

MAJOR	APPLICANTS		ADMITTED		ACCEPTED		YIELD	
	5/18/2007	5/19/2008	Difference	5/18/2007	5/19/2008	Difference	5/18/2007	5/19/2008
Bioengineering	368	399	8%	349	367	5%	43	60%
Chemical_Engineering	212	322	52%	188	287	53%	33	24%
Computer_Engineering	470	572	22%	379	441	16%	57	84%
Computer_Science	488	541	11%	418	433	4%	68	15%
Electrical_Engineering	378	433	15%	346	363	5%	41	49%
Environmental_Engineering	97	140	44%	85	130	53%	17	88%
Information_Systems	43	65	51%	38	54	42%	7	-29%
Materials_Science_and_Engineering		317			297			
Mechanical_Engineering	958	908	-5%	859	814	-5%	114	30%
TOTAL_FRESHMEN	3014	3697	23%	2662	3186	20%	380	48%
CNAS (Freshmen)	8545	9071	6%	7594	7781	2%	1429	17%
CHASS (Freshmen)	15267	17387	14%	12920	14369	11%	2153	19%
UCR (including transfers)	31182	35522	14%	26255	29241	11%	4444	21%

BCOE GRADUATE STUDENT RECRUITMENT STATUS: 2008-09 COHORT

Graduate Division Data as of May 19, 2008

Program	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Target	% of Target
BIEN	59	22	10	15	66.7%
CEE	116	47	24	22	109.1%
CS	453	120	60	52	115.4%
EE	468	103	45	40	112.5%
ME	117	23	8	22	36.4%
Total	1213	315	147	151	97.4%

Unit	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Target	% of Target
BCOE	1213	315	147	120	122.5%
CHASS	1154	312	179	194	92.3%
CNAS	1340	325	141	227	62.1%
DBS	36	10	1	4	25.0%
GSOE	201	86	59	16	368.8%
Total	3944	1048	527	561	93.9%

Graduate Division Data as of June 18, 2007

Program	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Target	% of Target
BIEN	39	14	8	8	100.0%
CEE	113	44	23	20	115.0%
CS	335	86	40	35	114.3%
EE	314	91	45	35	128.6%
ME	98	54	36	23	156.5%
Total	899	289	152	121	125.6%

Graduate Division Data as of May 19, 2008

Program	International Students				
	2007		2008		
BIEN	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Apps	Admits
	17	5	4	27	8
CEE	84	26	16	85	25
CS	271	57	23	407	93
EE	277	77	33	424	84
ME	76	42	26	92	15
Total	725	207	102	1035	225

Domestic Students

Program	2007			2008		
	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Apps	Admits	Accepts
BIEN	21	9	4	32	14	5
CEE	28	17	7	31	22	10
CS	57	26	13	46	27	18
EE	36	14	11	44	19	11
ME	21	11	7	25	8	2
Total	163	77	42	178	90	46

All Students

Program	2007			2008		
	Apps	Admits	Accepts	Apps	Admits	Accepts
BIEN	38	14	8	59	22	10
CEE	112	43	23	116	47	24
CS	328	83	36	453	120	60
EE	313	91	44	468	103	45
ME	97	53	33	117	23	8
Total	888	284	144	1213	315	147