

**Minutes of Teleconference****April 8, 2013****I. Chair's Announcements***Mike Kleeman, Chair***Update:** Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:

- Academic Council meeting of March 27:
  - Open Access: UCOLASC has updated its proposal in response to systemwide feedback, but discussion continues regarding potential burden to faculty, the value-added to UC of being an early adopter in this area, and on-going support for libraries. A newly proposed state law is similar to the new federal regulations, but the possible overlaps are still to be determined.
  - Composite Benefits Rate: Previous agreements to assign a 0% rate to summer salary seem to be in jeopardy, and opinions among campus administration are split. Council Vice Chair Jacob added that auxiliaries could also be negatively impacted by the switch, as well as funds for post-doctoral scholars. Chair Kleeman observed the tension between the desire to federalize CBR administration and the goal of unifying payroll practices under UC Path.
  - Online Education: A newly proposed bill in Sacramento would require UC to recognize courses at the direction of the legislature. Council Vice Chair Jacob reminded members that Council Chair Powell and he co-authored an op-ed piece opposing the proposal, and he reported that at the most recent ICAS meeting, Senate leaders from each of California's higher education segments lobbied against the bill. Separately, a weekend workshop for UC's own online education program is being held.
- Sacramento Follow-up: Council Vice Chair Jacob congratulated the committee on a successful meeting with the legislative aides in Sacramento last month. He added that next year's meeting is already under discussion.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. DRAFT Minutes of February 11 Teleconference:  
**Action:** The minutes were approved as noticed.
2. DRAFT Minutes of March 11 Meeting:  
**Action:** The minutes were approved as noticed.

**III. Campus Updates**

Berkeley: The local COR has been asked how to allocate 10% of recovered indirect costs, and preliminarily, many favor 4% to PIs, 3% to departments, and 3% to COR.

**Discussion:** Chair Kleeman noted this is one positive outcome of the new funding streams model; at Davis, money is being set aside for "bridge" funding for graduate students.

Davis: A new policy disallowing carry forward balances has caused concern over the need to save funds for recruitment packages and other, long-term initiatives. The COR budget is unchanged from last year.

Irvine: Consolidated, interdisciplinary academic goals are being set to best leverage campus centers. For example, the Anza-Borrego NRS site has spurred renewed interest in environmental research and how disparate campus efforts can come together to best utilize the facility in a joint fashion.

Los Angeles: (no update)

Merced: Building on the Sacramento meeting, greater local outreach emphasizing undergraduate research is being explored.

Riverside: A joint Senate-administration committee is forming to lobby the chancellor on Composite Benefits and summer salaries. The local fellowship policy is being revised to allow for leaves, among other changes, but this is expected to be a lengthy process.

San Diego: There has been much local discussion on online education, but no resolution yet. How best to use COR funding for course relief is also under discussion.

San Francisco: Space usage continues to be a topic, as the campus is moving to an “activity based” work space model; faculty are concerned about loss of privacy impacting work efficiency. Open access is being implemented, and no major problems have been reported; it is hoped that the Office of the President can provide central support for the archive moving forward.

Santa Barbara: A question arose recently as to whether LSOEs should be allowed to serve on PhD committees. The revised Open Access draft was well received.

Santa Cruz: The new VCR visited with COR; VCR operational efficiency is an upcoming topic.

**Discussion**: Chair Kleeman noted that Davis underwent a similar efficiency review recently; supporting materials can be made available.

#### **IV. Systemwide Review Item**

##### 1. APM 600 series (Salary Administration)

**Issue**: In part, the impetus for the proposed revisions comes from the need to simplify regulations for the UC Path center, and in part, it is simply overdue. The committee is tasked to distinguish editorial changes from those that could have unintended consequences. For example, the source of new language in 620-14 limiting off-scale salaries to non-HSCP faculty is not clear; neither is the impact to the NSTP.

**Action**: Analyst Feer will circulate a strike-through version of the proposed changes, and the committee will revisit the topic next month.

#### **V. Lab Safety**

*Erike Young, Director, Environmental Health & Safety*

**Update**: Director Young reported that as a result of feedback received, several changes were made to the guidelines for the new lab safety policies. On March 1, a conference of chemistry department chairs convened and drafted new guidelines for risk assessment and SOPs. On March 19-20, a PPE workshop occurred at UC Davis, with the goal of the making the guidelines more reflective of actual practices; as a result, the guidelines have changed from a threshold requirement to an activity-based one. The safety training and

minors in labs policies also received minor revisions. The new guidelines still parallel standard Cal OSHA requirements, and all labs, regardless of discipline, should follow them.

**Discussion:** Members inquired how the many required SOPs were to be developed, and Director Young indicated that “how to” primers and workshops will be available once developed; input is welcome. Chair Kleeman asked about the impetus for changing the hazardous materials requirements from a threshold basis to an activity basis. Director Young responded that ignition is a danger, regardless of amount, so an activity that uses an igniter is more dangerous than one that uses an arbitrary amount of a flammable without an igniter. He added that the first round of inspections will focus on pyrophorics, and that test inspections are being conducted to train PIs how to answer questions and set expectations for new FTE. The second round of inspections will focus on biological hazards and carcinogens.

Chair Kleeman asked how the impact of these changes will be measured. Director Young noted that catastrophic accidents are already infrequent, so a better measure might be “near misses”. Safety can be framed and marketed in student and staff recruitments. Members wondered if students would self-report “near misses”, and Director Young suggested an anonymous reporting mechanism. He added that many students go to campus health services, and so non-catastrophic safety incident reporting seldom occurs.

Director Young also reported that the cost of new lab coats for the system is estimated at \$4M/year. This year, savings from the workers’ compensation program have been earmarked for lab safety, as both programs are under risk management, but that pool will not be sustainable in the long term. Nonetheless, if faculty and administration leaders continue to emphasize safety, UC can improve still more in this important area.

## **VI. California Institutes for Science and Innovation Reviews**

### **1. California Institute for Information Technology and Telecommunications (Cal IT2):**

**Issue:** UCORP is asked to evaluate the review process, but may also comment on the findings. A team of lead reviewers has provided a draft response.

**Discussion:** Members wondered if the discussion of duplicate local structures vis-à-vis diminishing central funding struck the right tone. Consensus was reached that system benefits should be evident from each expenditure.

### **2. California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI):**

**Discussion:** Members noted that the Institute should evaluate how it leverages funds from the system and the state. Several other Cal ISIs are now estimating what fraction of external funding is attributable to the Institute vs. what fraction might have been raised without the Institute. Members also noted that the Institute is acting independently with an opportunity for greater system integration.

## **VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies**

*Steve Beckwith, Vice President*

### **1. Portfolio Review Group:**

**Update:** VP Beckwith said that although he does not sit on the PRG, he has heard positive reports from attendees. He will soon meet with PRG Chair Paul Grey to discuss findings and possible next steps.

**Discussion:** Chair Kleeman, an at-large member of the PRG, noted that participation has been robust and discussions have been fluid and reflective of many perspectives. VP Beckwith added that the Senate has not yet named all of its participants, but it may be advisable to complete the first round of evaluations with the current membership in order to preserve the the chemistry the Group has developed to date.

2. Sacramento Meeting:

**Update:** Chair Kleeman summarized the discussion and the participants in the Sacramento meeting, highlighting that all students are impacted by UC research, even if they are not in a research lab. The committee has been invited back next year, and it was beneficial that faculty could speak directly to legislative staff and deliver their message unfiltered. Nonetheless, the continuing zero-sum budget situation presents significant obstacles.

**Discussion:** VP Beckwith suggested emphasizing the optimization of resources for which UC is known. Vice Chair Clare added that non-podium instruction and the lack of direct trade-offs between research and teaching load were also the subject of much discussion.

3. MRPI Funding:

**Update:** VP Beckwith reported that much of the MRPI funding base has been repurposed: A new policy of no carry forwards, even for multi-year programs, in conjunction with an overall decrease in the MRPI budget to only \$5.5M, have reduced the funds available for the program. The PRG is to advise on this situation, but many decisions still seem to be made on a one-off basis, rather than with a systemwide strategy in mind.

4. NSF RFI:

**Update:** Executive Director for Research Policy Analysis and Coordination Wendy Streitz reported that the NSF has issued an RFI that seeks to analyze the regulatory burden on researchers. The RFI is open to individual researchers, and members are encouraged to circulate the information widely. At the same time, UC would like to capture similar results to improve its in-house policies. To that end, UC may develop a parallel survey for internal use, if it cannot get access to the NSF responses.

**Discussion:** Members noted that the survey calls for essay answers, which many faculty may not have time to complete fully. Instead, members wondered if a multiple choice survey could be developed for in-house use. ORGS personnel noted that this was a topic in the recent Commission on the Future, and that the FASEP survey could also serve as a model. Interested faculty can learn more at a symposium this weekend at Stanford.

5. UCO Board:

**Update:** VP Beckwith noted that he does not sit on this body, but reports indicate healthy debate to date.

**Discussion:** Chair Kleeman asked when recommendations would be available, and VP Beckwith indicated that the next meeting is in May, but that no firm deadlines had been set.

### **VIII. New Business**

#### 1. Planning for the May UCORP Meeting:

**Issue:** In preparation for a consultation with the interim director of UC Observatories in May, Chair Kleeman reviewed the recent history of UCO, and encouraged members to consult with their campus constituents and think critically about what questions UCORP should ask, and what potential role UCORP and the Senate might play moving forward.

**Action:** Draft questions/topics will be developed and circulated by email.

Adjournment: 12:15.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair