

**Minutes of Meeting
April 14, 2014**

I. Announcements

Bob Clare, UCORP Chair

Update: Chair Clare updated the committee on several items from the Academic Council meeting of April 2, 2014:

- The Assembly will be asked to accept the Council nominee for the next Vice Chair at its meeting this Wednesday. The Assembly will also be asked to accept the nominees for the Oliver Johnson award for Outstanding Senate Service, and the next nominee to be the faculty representative to the University of California Retirement System Advisory Board.
- The Council will form an ad hoc group with three chancellors to investigate further options for Composite Benefit Rates. Final proposals are due to the Council of Chancellors for their May 7 meeting; after that meeting, the President will make a decision.
- The Academic Planning Council is revising guidelines for self-supporting programs. The new language is expected to ask units that want to move to self-supporting status to demonstrate why they should not be state-supported and how their conversion will not negatively impact any state-supported programs. To seek additional revenue will not be considered an acceptable justification.
- The March Regents meeting included:
 - Release of the Climate Survey;
 - No new budget news, as the May revise is the next event on the fiscal calendar;
 - Discussion of asking the state for more funds dedicated to UCRP;
 - Approval of the thirty-meter telescope project;
 - A report from Health Sciences and Services that suggested it could be in an operational deficit by 2017, which would jeopardize unofficial support to the academic enterprise. It is unclear what is driving this shift in operations, but it appears to be part of a national trend.
- The Blue Ribbon panel evaluating UC's online education efforts issued a scathing report, and it is unclear how the project is intended to move forward.
- A survey on open access textbooks from the California Open Education Resource Council is open until April 25. Members should spread the word widely.
- UCORP was asked to work with UCPB to expand our letter on research support funding to set a benchmark for a minimal level of central research support funding going forward.
- UCAF reported concerns about Public Records Act requests that arose after recent increases in animal rights activists' renewed targeting of animal researchers, particularly at UCLA. There is no university exemption; personnel actions are exempt, but research records are not.

II. Consent Calendar1. DRAFT Minutes of March 10, 2014

Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III. Campus Updates

Davis: No new information to report.

Irvine: Irvine COR funding is among the lowest in the system. How local research funds are dispersed is under scrutiny. It would be useful to know how much of a role other CORs have in setting these priorities, or if all decisions are made by the VCRs.

Los Angeles: Grant reviews continue.

Riverside: No new information to report.

San Diego: ORUs are still under review.

Santa Cruz: Investigation continues into the use of opportunity funds at the local level. The goal is to derive best practices and principles for usage of said funds.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Revisions to SBL 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)

Action: The draft response was approved as noticed.

2. UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

Action: The committee elected to support the revisions as noticed.

3. Proposed Revised Whistleblower Protection Policy and APM 190, Appx A-2

Note: Item deferred.

4. Proposed Revised Policy on Supplement to Military Pay

Note: Item deferred.

5. Compendium Revisions

Issue: This round of revisions includes the UCORP-authored modifications to Section V, B governing MRPIs. Other proposed revisions include updating personnel titles and program name changes.

Action: Members will review in detail the proposed revisions, especially Appendixes I and J (MRUs and ORUs), and continue discussion at the May meeting.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

1. Composite Benefit Rates

Issue: This discussion now includes the chancellors, and a joint Senate-Chancellor work group is forming to develop alternate proposals for consideration. A more nuanced analysis of how best to combine multiple groups with multiple funding sources is sought.

2. Central Support for Research

Issue: The Senate will need to articulate carefully its vision in this area; some in the administration see one-time challenge grant funding as adequate to address this concern. Given that OP funding has been capped, and given that other programs' costs continue to grow due to contractual obligations or simple over-runs, protecting a minimum amount of funds for mission critical research is more important than ever. UCORP should work with UCPB to draft a joint letter that calls on the administration not to restore previous cuts but to establish a minimum threshold tied to an external or independent benchmark.

3. Doctoral Student Support Conference

Issue: This conference will convene tomorrow in Irvine. Five representatives from each campus will attend; attendees will include graduate deans, VCRs, students, and Senate

faculty. Topics will include non-resident tuition, professional development, academic competitiveness, and diversity issues.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1. Draft MRPI RFP

With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Discussion: The RFP draft has been sent to campus officials for their feedback, too; a final version will be circulated in early May. Chair Clare asked if “double-dipping” were a concern, wondering if one program could receive support from multiple central sources. Director Erwin indicated that no such exclusions were included explicitly in the guidelines, but reviewers will consider the disclosure of other system funds requested in the application.

2. Portfolio Review Group Next Steps

Issue: Vice President Beckwith reported that the PRG process was successful insofar as thoughtful deliberations occurred and the campuses were involved in the research discussion in a new manner. The recommendations were bold, while being revenue-neutral. Some of the recommendations, however, involve politically protected or otherwise contentious areas, and any changes will have to overcome Office of the President and other internal stakeholders, too. President Napolitano will make the final decision, but her thinking on research is not yet widely known.

Discussion: Members noted that the current discussion on Composite Benefit Rates seem to reflect an overall perspective that views research funds, particular indirect costs, as free money to be raided as needed. This practice, however, could lead to a “death by 1000 cuts”, unless a threshold of research funds is established. A “matching” percentage from the state general fund of federal research funds spent at UC, or a reserved percentage of external dollars for central research support was mentioned. VP Beckwith noted that the federal government’s goal is to spend 3% of GDP on research.

Members asked what the return on investment in the MRPI program has been. Director Erwin noted that the program is only 3 years old, so data are not robust; nonetheless, the average seems to be about 7:1. She added that other research programs may fare better or worse, depending on their discipline and goals. How research programs add value to the campuses should also be quantified. EVCs support MRPIs, but not new “taxes” or mandated internal funding shifts to support them.

Members asked if the zero-sum and zero-growth funding restrictions applied to all centrally supported research, noting that UCO has contracts with risers, and wondering what, when contracts expire, happens to the funding pools that supported them. VP Beckwith noted that the future of UCO funding continues to be discussed at the Office of the President, especially since the Regents approved the thirty-meter telescope (TMT) project at their March meeting. The UCO Advisory Board recommendations were not well-received in some quarters. Decisions on strategy and budgeting on this issue will occur at the Provost and Presidential level.

VII. Portfolio Review Group Recommendations

Discussion: Some members were concerned about the process since not all campuses had Senate representation. One campus COR met with their administration participant for more detail. Members asked for access to the materials considered by the PRG in order to place their recommendations in greater systemwide context and to better evaluate opportunity costs in local contexts. Chair Clare reminded members that the PRG was tasked to evaluate the best use of existing research dollars, not to make a case for more research dollars. Members wryly observed that the best treatment of research dollars would be to protect them from being poached simply because they are “green.” Funding stability is needed for many research projects, and current talk about increasing reliance on philanthropy worries many, despite high variance recently in state support.

Action: Discussion will continue next month.

VIII. Research Profile and Funding

Issue: The committee should decide if there is a minimum level of central support for research, and if so, how it is collected and spent.

Discussion: Members sought clarification as to what funding sources were “on the table” – endowments, federal and/or state ICR, funds currently in contracts, philanthropic funds? Members also sought clarification as to who the administration voice would be, especially behind closed doors? It is not yet clear what types of arguments are persuasive to President Napolitano, or who has her ear. Some wondered if a minimum threshold would soon become a cap. All agreed that many voices were needed to achieve maximum impact.

Action: Discussion will continue next month.

IX. New Business

1. **Issue:** UCORP needs a new representative to the Technology Transfer Action Committee (TTAC).

Action: Chair Clare will contact members off-line to solicit a volunteer.

2. **Issue:** UCORP needs a representative to the Chemical Safety and Security Initiative. The group will focus on anti-theft and storage, not accident prevention, so “wet” lab experience is not needed.

Action: Chair Clare will contact members off-line to solicit a volunteer.

Meeting adjourned at 4 o'clock p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Bob Clare, UCORP Chair