

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, November 14, 2016

Meeting Minutes**I. Welcome & announcements**

Oct. 10 meeting minutes were approved.

Committee members spent some time discussing their concerns about the results of the Presidential election, particularly around research and research funding.

In thinking about productive actions that the university might be able to take, ideas included encouraging those in the UC administration to exert influence in Washington and expanding UC's efforts to communicate to the government and the public about the value of research and higher education and of an open society. Another idea was to develop principles for the Academic Council to endorse.

II. Systemwide Review Items

1. [Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182](#) [Expands the charge of the University Committee on International Education into a broader range of international topics and activities.]

Some committee members felt that the changes to the UCIE bylaw were unclear and overreaching. The changes, which are the culmination of a two-year process, are meant to allow UCIE to be more involved in conversations and decisions of the Academic Senate. The current UCIE bylaws were written in a less international time that the committee felt did not reflect today's reality.

Concerns included uncertainty about situations where there is a lead committee and where there may be differing opinions between committees. Some members saw benefit in having a committee that would focus on the specifically international aspects of research.

In principle, UCORP agrees with enabling UCIE's involvement in reviews of international activities and policies.

Action: UCORP Chair Isaac Martin will draft a response that expresses UCORP support for the bylaw changes, acknowledging that they in part document what UCIE was already doing. Chair Martin will also include the concerns of some members about unnecessarily creating more work, and a suggestion for clarifying that the changes are not intended to intrude on campus-level review processes and activities.

2. [Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition](#) (comments due January 11, 2017)

The wide ranging discussion about Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) included concerns that some programs may be misclassified as "professional degree programs" and whether research is properly funded within these programs. Although not directly tied to the

systemwide review item, new concerns brought up by committee members are worth conveying to the UC administration. Some committee members noted that as the university turns to students for money, those funds are not always used to the direct benefit of students. Another worry is that any increase in supplemental tuition is tied to a decrease in state funds.

Action: Chair Martin will draft a response to circulate to UCORP members for input before the January 11 due date.

3. [Proposed Revised Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM - 015](#) (comments due January 11, 2017)

UCORP discussed the proposed revisions and has no concerns.

III. International Thinking Day

Raji Jagadeesan, Consultant, Program Management Office

UCOP, in conjunction with the campuses, is engaged in a new initiative to gauge the extent of UC's involvement in international activities across the system. There will be a one-day retreat in early 2017, now called "international thinking day."

IV. ORU and Faculty Grants Processes - Campus Reports

Discussion of results of the "homework" distributed at the last meeting is postponed until December.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

Chalfant has been asked to co-sign a letter with President Napolitano urging faculty to register their travel, especially to international locations. The third-party contractor, iJet, provides information about worldwide threats and risks. The administration understands the importance of allowing faculty to "opt-in" (except when students are involved) and to define how the data is collected, stored, and used.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy & Coordination

Academic Affairs strategic planning and priorities for the UC research enterprise

Academic Affairs is going through a strategic planning process that includes developing ways to be more strategic. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) is participating in that process in part by drafting a paper on "collective excellence." UCORP will have the opportunity to review the draft paper at the next meeting.

VP Art Ellis briefly reviewed some of the documents that were included in the agenda packet:

- The ORCID international registry for personal unique identifiers is being discussed by various groups around the university.
- A students' guide to intellectual property rights at UC (draft) includes information on where students can go for advice and resource. The guide will be posted on the UCOP website and sent to campus tech transfer offices, among other locations.

VP Ellis also mentioned International Thinking Day and a potential related initiative for Innovation Thinking Day.

UC Systemwide Research Programs and Initiatives

ORGS staff have gone through the MRU (multicampus research unit) portfolio and divided the systemwide research programs into those with persistent systemwide funding and those without persistent systemwide funding, which may or may not still be considered as MRUs. The second category of multi-campus programs includes organizations that have received systemwide funding in the past. Category two MRUs will most likely be contacted with questions about their status. A third category of multi-campus programs includes entities that are not MRUs but do get some type of systemwide funding.

ORGS staff noted that the review schedule has become out of compliance with the [Compendium](#), and asked for input on how to proceed with MRU reviews. On page 75 of the recent [State Auditor's Report on UC](#), there is a table entitled "The University of California Failed to Monitor and Evaluate Programs That Cost \$337 Million in State Funds Annually"

The UC Observatories are currently undergoing a review that is different from the Compendium review, but is considered official. Other MRUs on the list were reviewed via the systemwide Research Portfolio Review Group in 2012 and 2013.

Discussion included the notion of designated "multicampus research units" compared to "centers" or "institutes." UCORP member questions included whether anyone in the administration wants the reviews done differently, if it would be helpful to have a more generic umbrella term of "systemwide investments in research," and other options for determining how to allocate systemwide research funding. One member noted that the oversight and review process for MRUs was meant to mirror the process for ORUs on a systemwide level.

UCORP requested that ORGS staff and bring a revised list of MRUs that includes information such as the dates of past reviews, whether a review is overdue, and a proposal for how to proceed.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of the National Laboratories *Kimberly Budil, Vice President for National Labs*

Vice President Kim Budil provided some basic background on UC's involvement with the national labs, including the fact that UC has been involved the three labs since their inception.

In the early 2000s after some problems at Los Alamos National Lab and Lawrence Livermore National Lab, the federal government openly bid the management of these labs with the expectation that partnerships would be formed. UC joined with private corporations to form the LANS and LLNS limited liability companies that won the management and operations (“M&O”) contracts for Los Alamos and Livermore, respectively. The oversight structure is led by a Board of Governors, which has wide-ranging authority and must be chaired by a UC Regent. The lab directors have full control of internal operations.

The labs have dealt with some challenges in the past few years, including issues with capital construction projects and environmental management at Los Alamos. Due to the resulting bad “grades” for the LLC, the contract for Los Alamos will expire at the end of September, 2018. VP Budil is exploring potential partners should UC decide to compete for the contract. She fully believes that UC should continue to be involved in the labs as part of its public service mission, and because the historic ties are deep and enduring for both parties, but only on terms that benefit the university and promote effective relationships.

The Department of Energy has capped the total fee available for management contracts at half of what it used to be, and changed its bidding process to a “short form” of 35 pages. The evaluation based on three criteria: past performance, key personnel, and small business participation.

The next step for VP Budil is to evaluate UC’s options for re-bidding (or for a potential extension of the existing contract) for President Napolitano’s review. Based on input from the Academic Senate, she is also considering a statewide tour of the campuses to inform the faculty about the labs and UC-lab collaborations. When asked about whether UCOP had enough resources develop a new bid, VP Budil described the lean and distributed structure of UCOP’s Office of the National Laboratories, which allows her to spend time building relationships between labs and campuses, an important part of lab ecosystem.

[Note that UCORP had an extensive and wide-ranging conversation with VP Budil in April. See page 2 of the [April 11, 2016, meeting minutes](#).]

VIII. Outcomes and next steps

UCORP will consider asking VP Budil to draft an updated white paper on UC’s relationship with the labs.

Chair Isaac Martin will draft UCORP’s comments on the systemwide review issues discussed during the meeting for distribution via email to committee members for additional input.

Meeting adjourned: 4:00

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller

Attest: Isaac Martin