

**Minutes of Meeting
February 10, 2014**

I. Announcements

Robert Clare, UCORP Chair

Update: Chair Clare updated the committee on several items of interest from the Academic Council meeting of January 22, 2014:

1. There have been several staffing changes in the systemwide Senate office. UCORP will be receiving a new analyst in the spring.
2. The Regents also met in January, and highlights include
 - i. The federal sequestration seems to have cut 12% of the system's research funding;
 - ii. The state will increase UC's base appropriation by 5% this year, partly in exchange for a tuition freeze;
 - iii. The pedagogy for online education and the business model continue to evolve.
3. Senate leadership has bi-weekly meetings with President Napolitano and weekly meetings with her chief of staff, Seth Grossman.
4. The Senate and the administration continue to be at odds regarding Composite Benefit Rates. At issue currently is access to manipulable data for modeling verification.
5. The Academic Planning Council is embarking upon developing an Open Access policy for all University employees: Senate faculty (who are already under the current policy), University employees with copyright (such as post-doctoral scholars and Cooperative Extension Specialists), and University employees without copyright (graduate students).
6. The Compendium will again soon be sent for systemwide review, this time for approval of the changes to MRUs (authored by UCORP) and of amendments to APM 241-24c, and to update/remove out of date references.
7. The Council heard a report that the Council of Chancellors and the Council of Vice Chancellors lamented the lack of local flexibility in designing responses to the Moreno Report. A new systemwide anti-discrimination office is being considered.
8. The President's transfer initiative is being tweaked in light of classroom capacity concerns and a closer analysis of the bureaucratic roadblocks to smooth transfer. Most indicators suggest that better education regarding transfer requirements is the best first step.
9. The Innovative Learning and Teaching Initiative (ILTI) and University of California Online Education (UCOE) effort will merge by year end.
10. The Office of the President budget will be kept flat this year. A cap on total FTE will be instituted, a cap and more rigorous approval process for consultant contracts will be initiated, and a travel cut of 10% will be sought.
11. A conference to explore greater UC and Mexico partnerships will occur at UCSD soon.

12. Negotiations with the state over budget include seeking parity for pension contributions with CSU. Annual re-education of legislators is an obstacle.
13. The proposed revisions to Senate By-Law 55 (Departmental Voting Rights) will be reconsidered by the San Diego division and probably resubmitted as a broader and less formal proposal.
14. The impact of increasing the number Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) on departmental finances, workloads, and academic quality is unknown and a cause of concern to some.

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of Meeting of December 16, 2013

Discussion: Members noted that UCAAD is chaired by Emily Roxworthy, not Emily Roxbury.

Action: The minutes were approved as amended.

2. DRAFT Minutes of Meeting of January 13, 2014

Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III. Campus Updates

Berkeley: 1) The campus is assessing its ORU evaluation process; it is felt that more probative questions are needed. 2) The new travel grant allocation process is being implemented. Questions about emeriti eligibility arose, and it was decided that recently active emeriti would be eligible.

Discussion: Members asked how the new travel grant process was being funded. Representative Mazzotti answered that the funds come from a tax on recovered indirect costs plus the COR budget. He added that faculty need not immediately spend their allocation; a total of up to \$12K may be “banked” for use and will not expire. Members wondered how well the “same, lower total for all” would be received, but Rep. Mazzotti indicated that so far, no concerns about cross-field subsidization have arisen. The full analysis will be shared when available.

Davis: 1) Questions have arisen about providing adequate space for animal research subjects, especially where cleaning is concerned. 2) The RFP for local grants has been issued.

Irvine: The new Berkeley model for local grant administration has captured much interest, but some feel it could be an entitlement, not a reward for merit.

Los Angeles: 1) Local grant reviews are underway. 2) The possibility of COR writing to Sacramento legislators was discussed. 3) Concerns about the role of “lab volunteers” have arisen as some deem unpaid lab staff unacceptable. 4) Animal rights activists have recently visited researchers’ domiciles, often leading to nasty confrontations. The University does not have a coordinated response, nor has it issued a statement of support for the researchers.

Merced: (absent during this item)

Riverside: 1) The local web portal for COR grants has been improved. 2) COR heard from Russell Vernon, Director of EH&S, that there is still confusion on the new safety standards, and most feel that a more comprehensive directory would be helpful.

San Diego: ORU reviews continue.

San Francisco: 1) Spring grant reviews have just closed. 18 grants were funded, at a rate of around \$30K each. The “same for all” approach being tested at Berkeley could help morale, but it is uncertain if the amount available for all faculty to receive the same size grant would yield

grants of sufficient size to be useful. 2) A new chancellor search will begin, and the committee is still being formed. 3) Space management in new construction and retrofitting continues to be an issue.

Santa Barbara: COR is examining the Conflict of Commitment policy.

Santa Cruz: 1) The role and performance of the state and federal governmental relations teams are being evaluated. 2) The COR will soon discuss CBR. 3) Aspirational goals for graduate student support and enrollment are being set, such as the creation of a new dissertation grant from the graduate deans.

Graduate Student: The UCSA is launching an assessment of career services and job placement programs and will issue best practices when ready.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1. Multi-campus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI):

With Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants and Programs Office

With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives, RGPO

Issue: Despite widespread support for the intent of the program, the 2014-15 budget for MRPI is only \$2.8M, down from its original amount of \$15M. The 14-15 RFP is still being developed as ORGS wrestles with deciding how best to move forward with such a small dollar amount. Should there be a targeted call? Targeted to what? Should the duration of awards change to 2 years? Only 1 year? Should there be caps- by campus? By discipline? By year?

Additionally, per the contract terms, the management fee UC receives for administration of the DOE national labs will decline by about \$5M in the coming year and may drop more in the future.

Discussion: Members agreed that the competitive aspect of the program should be retained. Some fields should have the option to renew, since market support sometimes cannot be found. VP Beckwith asked if funding a humanities group for a generation would be a better use of funds than funding 20 different groups 1 time each? He encouraged members to think about how to maximize the research investment, not just how to maximize the researchers' options. The budget setting process has not been friendly to programs like MRPI that do not have explicit and predetermined expenditures and outcomes. Members noted that seed money should be preserved, but that alone, it is not enough to maintain the research infrastructure, let alone promote world class research and outcomes. Members wondered where President Napolitano will land on the issue of prioritizing malleable research investment funds. Members also wondered if there were a baseline amount, perhaps as a percentage of research income, that should be dedicated to internal, institutional research efforts. In a \$5B research enterprise, is \$100M profligate? Who makes that determination, and based on what standards? Members also wondered how the research funds that were cut have been repurposed.

2. Technology Transfer:

With Bill Tucker, Executive Director, Innovative Alliance Services

With Dotti Miller, Director, Systemwide Programs and Initiatives, IAS

Issue: The technology transfer process is often viewed as inefficient, and President Napolitano has made it a priority to improve this process. Four goals have been

identified: 1) to increase seed funding at the campuses, 2) to expand venture capital funding for UC start-ups, 3) to boost overall technology transfer support, such as by strengthening legal defense funds and expanding campus personnel and their training, and 4) to improve communications in this area. If UC funded tech transfer at the same rate as Stanford, an additional \$30M would be available.

Discussion: Members asked who determined the investment priorities in this area and added that UC should not settle for being average here. Director Tucker noted that a sense of entrepreneurialism is needed at some of the campuses, and that foundations are not good at providing seed-funds since they generally look for quick turn-arounds. No single investor should provide more than 20% of the funding for any given project, as that is the threshold for shareholder obligations. Members worried about the impact to corporate partnerships in an era of UC-centered entrepreneurialism, and whether patent control might supplant academic freedom as a “good.” VP Beckwith noted that intellectual property debates vary by field, and he emphasized that local leadership is needed. Members should discuss this topic with their CORs to ensure that as many faculty as possible are prepared to enter into this discussion.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Council

Mary Gilly, Vice Chair, Academic Council

Update: Chair Jacob updated the committee on several items of interest:

- The federal budget sequester has cut 12% of UC research funding. NIH funding is still below 2011-12 levels.
- The state will increase its base support to UC by 5%. Discussions about enrollment management could impact future allocations.
- UC’s online education portfolio added 30 courses this spring, with 22 open for cross-campus enrollment. So far, 26 students are enrolled across campuses, and 79 have withdrawn. CSU only has 200 enrollees in their program.
- Master Plan discussions focus on smoothing bureaucratic interactions between the segments, such as for transfer ease and joint procurement options.
- The Regents received an update on the TMT project in January.
- A program with IBM could help ease the transition from the academy to industry. ORGS is also a partner, and one side effect may be to make critical thinking a compensable commodity again. Early ideas include 3-month fellowships for graduate students in industry settings and other options to increase job training and workforce preparation, not just academic training. It is also hoped that such programs could serve as impetus to close the technology gap that industry has widened over the academy. More needs to be done to demonstrate the value of humanities degrees to the workplace, and more needs to be done to empower faculty to better prepare graduate students.
- The response to the Moreno Report is available online [here](#).
- The Climate Survey findings will be presented to the Regents in March, and the data will be released afterwards.
- Members are encouraged to continue investigating the impacts of the proposed Composite Benefit Rates to graduate student support.

VI. Portfolio Review Group Report

Issue: 3 years ago, UCORP, as a committee of the whole, and the campus VCRs worked with ORGS to form the Task Force on University-wide Research Principles, Processes, and Assessment (PPA). One outcome of that effort was the Portfolio Review Group, who was charged to provide an unbiased analysis of the value-added by each centrally-funded research program. PRG divided its work into two phases: Cycle 1 evaluated those programs funded by discretionary spending, and Cycle 2 evaluated those programs funded by dedicated monies. Both reports are now final and available online [here](#). Members should discuss the reports and their findings with campus colleagues and be prepared to discuss the recommendations in detail at a future meeting.

Discussion: Members asked how the Natural Reserve System was to be evaluated. It was noted that the NRS consists of unique and finite natural resources which will disappear forever if damaged. It was also noted that NRS was not well advertised, internally or externally. Some wondered if the profile and allure of observational field biology may suffer from its lack of “cutting edge” research tools and the conflation of those tools with productivity and advancement of knowledge.

VII. Further Discussion

None.

VIII. New Business

Action: Graduate Student Representative Muir will circulate a CDL announcement soliciting participation in a survey about data set maintenance and archiving.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst
Attest: Robert Clare, UCORP Chair