

**Minutes of Teleconference****January 13, 2014****I. 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:

- “Moreno” Report Response: A joint Senate-administration task force has completed its evaluation and will issue a report later this week.
- Graduate Student Support: A joint Senate-administration meeting is being scheduled for April to address the question: how much, in specific dollar amounts, is needed to make UC graduate student support competitive?
- Technology Transfer: A new program proposes challenge grants for junior faculty and solicitation of new donors for new funding.
- CPEC Successor: The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) closed its doors in November, but a successor organization is needed to help coordinate California’s three higher education segments. How best to organize a new group and measure their impact is the next discussion.
- Composite Benefit Rate: Senate members should expect to receive the same information as administration officials, including the different models being considered. There is no guarantee that the Senate position will be adopted, but this is an important step in improving communications and transparency on this issue. Some suggest that the administration’s preferred model would decrease funds available for graduate student support by ~15%; members are encouraged to verify these findings and report back.
- State Government Relations (SGR): This year, only BOARS will convene in Sacramento; they will focus on transfer issues. Hopefully next year, research and graduate student support issues can be discussed in Sacramento.

**II. Chair’s Announcements***Robert Clare, UCORP Chair***Update:** Chair Clare updated the committee on several items of interest:

- ACSCOLI: The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) advises regarding UC’s management partnerships for the Department of Energy (DOE) national laboratories Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Labs. Recently, concerns about federal overreach into day-to-day operations have arisen. Changes in direction and scope for the National Ignition Facility have exacerbated already low morale. Morale is further harmed by a perceived lack of competitiveness in the job market. The management fee UC receives and has been using for academic research programs is expected to decline, per contractual terms, and how best to use the lower total is under discussion.
- Portfolio Review Group: The PRG process to date has been collegial and productive. Reviews of the larger programs have been completed, and the Group is now examining smaller programs, many with restricted funding. With the new focus, territorial impulses

are emerging; campuses want to “own” their research, and local grand challenges may cannibalize smaller programs. However, local grand challenges is an odd direction for a group charged to advise on the system research portfolio. More Senate representatives to the PRG are needed.

### **III. Campus Updates**

Berkeley: (Absent.)

Davis: No news.

Irvine: COR meets later this week.

Los Angeles: COR continues to discuss the elimination of the ORU designation on campus, and it continues its investigation into internal grant review processes.

Merced: COR meets next week.

Riverside: No news.

San Diego: COR continues to focus on ORU reviews.

San Francisco: 1) Centralizing grant administration for the campus in a new Research Allocation Program is underway. COR joins other stakeholders in an NIH-type council. An assessment poll is being developed. 2) Space usage continues to be of concern; a hold has been placed on future construction with an open office concept. Current renovations will try a hybrid model.

Santa Barbara: COR is curious how other campuses are paying Open Access publication costs.

**Discussion**: The three pilot campuses should have the same procedure, in which PIs may apply for a library grant to receive up to \$3000 for article preparation.

Santa Cruz: COR meets tomorrow and will discuss internal grant review processes.

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

*Steve Beckwith, Vice President*

**Issue**: ORGS and UCORP discuss how the two can best work together going forward.

**Discussion**: VP Beckwith noted that the PRG report is online, but how it will be received remains unknown. The report is largely revenue neutral, and changes to state-funded programs are unlikely. As a result, the flexibility needed to implement many of the recommendations may be hard to find. Members asked about the omission on the PRG roster of Senate representation from certain campuses, and VP Beckwith indicated that the Senate itself was slow to send nominations. Changing the composition of the group at this time is not thought to be wise. Members then asked how the PRG would change, following completion of its initial charge. VP Beckwith replied the future of the group was yet to be determined, but it is hoped that a firm commitment to the value of multi-campus research will emerge.

A call for MRPI funding for 14-15 will be released in early April, and a draft RFP will be available for review in February.

Members asked how ORGS was working with the California Digital Library to achieve data curation goals. VP Beckwith noted that since so much research is supported by federal funds, taxpayer access is important. Nonetheless, large data sets are expensive to maintain, and discussions continue.

Members noted that research support services, such as safety officers, have been curtailed, while regulations have increased. VP Beckwith observed that some services are funded by indirect costs, which are consistently under recovered. Still, federal negotiations have yielded 3-4% increases for those campuses that were due for new rates. Last fall, UC made

waves with its administrative burden report, which included a section on indirect costs; a federal inquiry is expected.

Members asked about new programs targeting industry partnerships. VP Beckwith noted that previous programs were cut during the budget crisis of recent years. The Cal ISIs are intended to help spark local economies and local start-ups. The MRPI program could also help, but it, too, was cut deeply. Shoring up current efforts might be a better short-term plan than finding new ones. Members noted that campuses have more extensive local contacts, but wondered whether funds sent to the campuses would actually be used for research vis-à-vis other local priorities. Members asked what kind of evidence existed showing the value of UC research to local economies. VP Beckwith noted that there are many statewide statistics, but not much local data. Communications illustrating the financial and quality of life gains from UC research exist, but they are not viewed.

## **V. Systemwide Review Items**

### **1. Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition**

**Action:** The committee elected not to opine on this item.

### **2. Proposed Amendments to Senate By-Law 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)**

**Discussion:** Members suggested adding more detail to the draft response, explicitly pointing to a best practice model.

**Action:** The draft response was approved as amended.

### **3. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Self-supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs**

**Action:** The committee elected not to opine on this item.

## **VI. New Business**

**Issue:** It was suggested that state legislators may not be aware of the UC research efforts in their districts. Federal legislators receive notices when their constituents receive federal grants; a similar letter to state legislators would be useful.

**Action:** Members should ask their media offices and offices of research how such letters might be generated and delivered.

Call ended at 3:15.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Robert Clare, UCORP Chair