Minutes of Teleconference
June 10, 2013

I.   Chair's Announcements
Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair
Update: Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:
1. Email between Senate members and officers and offices subject to FOIA requests. Final versions and drafts can both be requested.
2. Open Access recommendation is receiving expedited review. The provost has issued a memo addressing many Senate concerns, and comments are due July 15. The discussion is becoming circular, so a final vote is being sought. Federal and state legislation are both moving forward, which should afford faculty additional protections.
3. Academic Council heard UCORP's concerns regarding the Cal ISI review process, but took no action. See Item IV below.
4. The updated state budget included no new cuts, but no new funds, either. The budget is expected to be approved soon. The level of direction regarding online education funds usage is still to be determined.
5. The National Ignition Facility has missed a performance deadline, and science-based projects must now pay their own operating costs. This will effectively shut out NIF science research. ACSCOLI opposes the move, as it does not solve any fiscal problems and only harms research. The Academic Council contacted the chair of the Regents' Committee on Oversight of the Department of Energy Laboratories, Norman Pattiz, who was to discuss the matter further with California's federal senators. Further information will be made available as it arrives.
6. ACSCOLI also discussed the lab fee program. The program is highly competitive and oversubscribed; funding is available on a 3-year cycle. The lab directors have asked for a greater say in the fund usage, hoping to align the research more closely with their strategic goals. External calls for access to the funds to off-set other budget pressures persist. One suggestion is for greater funding for internship programs, but some question whether that investment would suffice to yield measurable outcomes.
7. Composite Benefit Rates continue to be contentious. The Berkeley campus has directly petitioned the federal government to receive a separate rate for faculty summer salaries. The federal response has not yet been issued. If their petition is granted, it should apply to the entire system.

II.   Consent Calendar
1. DRAFT Minutes of May 13, 2013, Meeting
   Action: The minutes were approved as amended.
2. Memo to UCO

Discussion: It was suggested that the local CORs designate a lead contact for UCO interactions; the draft memo will be edited and re-circulated for electronic approval.

III. Systemwide Review Items

1. APM 241

Issue: The main concern is that the lead campus is perceived to have too little input in the appointment of MRU directors under the proposed language. It is asserted that the chancellor of the lead campus be included in the deliberative process.

Discussion: Members wondered what level of input would be adequate. If an MRU is system-focused, its leadership is appropriately determined by systemwide officials. Also, since MRUs receive central funding, central decision-making is warranted. Some see a lack of checks-and-balances, though; given the intimate relationship with the lead campus, local officials should be involved. Chair Kleeman noted that the search committee routinely includes Senate members approved through the standard procedure involving the University Committee on Committees. Nonetheless, the designated official can disregard the search committee recommendation. Chair Kleeman indicated that the revision was intended to align administrative policy with Regental policy. Further, in many research entities that span multiple campuses, it is difficult to determine which is the lead campus.

Action: UCORP will suggest adding "except as specified in section 241-24" to section 241-10 to clarify the consultative process.

2. Open Access

Issue: The revised proposal includes a cover memo from Provost Dorr that speaks to some of the implementation questions UCORP and others have raised. It also includes assurances regarding commercialization of intellectual property. The libraries will continue their negotiations with publishers, and this policy could provide useful leverage or a new direction.

Discussion: Members felt that the revised draft should go further in terms of specificity of deadlines, requirements, and incentives. One example was the lack of guaranty for financial support for faculty, as opposed to a statement of intent. It was noted that UC could withdraw from the policy, should implementation not go well.

Much discussion focused on licensing. The current wording offers more flexibility, but it is not clear who has authority to exercise that flexibility. It is also unclear what would constitute "other systematic use." Some members noted that the parameters of the proposal are no more restrictive than current publisher contracts. Furthermore, there is state legislation that could push UC in this direction; it is better to set our own terms.

Action: UCR Representative Nunney will draft the committee's response for electronic approval.

IV. Cal ISI Review Process

Issue: Recent reviews have taken increasingly long to complete: The CITRUS review lasted 3 years. In one case, the Office of Research proceeded without the response from one of the host campuses. While UCORP has done relatively well in responding to reviews we have received, the Academic Council has been less timely. Involvement of the local Senates has been inconsistent, at best.

Discussion: Members discussed the impacts of conducting internal and external reviews concurrently. It was argued that this could lessen the administrative burden on directors. However, others voiced concern that participants might become confused about which review was asking questions and which processes needed to be followed for each interaction; this occurred during the second Cal IT2 review. Another theory for slow responses could be incomplete guidance from the review coordinators. The guidelines often do not include firm deadlines, so there is little incentive to complete onerous or contentious work. The threat of having their voice excluded from the review could be enough to motivate participants to be timely; more punitive incentives might be required in some instances, though.

A review checklist should be developed, and a review coordinator should be indentified and empowered to advance the review according to the established time line. A central repository should be developed for holding review materials, previous reviews, and best practices. Director reports should be limited to 50 pages, and supplemental data can be made available via the central repository. The Portfolio Review Group is developing a template for reviews, which should serve as a model. A suggestion to review the CalISIs less frequently was rejected.

Action: Chair Kleeman will draft a letter summarizing the committee's suggestions for electronic approval.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1. General Updates

    With Kathleen Erwin, Director, Research Grants Programs Office

    - A lab fee symposium will be held on July 11 in San Francisco. More information will be sent directly to members.
    - The MRPI call for applications will be circulated in late summer. A draft for comment will be posted online, with the final version being released in October. The submission deadline will be in the winter, the review will occur in the spring. The total budget is expected to increase from last year, but specific numbers are not yet known.

2. NSF Survey on Administrative Burden

    With Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

    With Dragana Nikolajevic, Analyst, RPAC

    Issue: In response to reports that PIs spend as much as 40% of their research time on administrative duties, the National Science Foundation has conducted a survey of PIs to learn their views. The National Science Board heard the results of the survey recently. The NSF will initiate a pilot that asks for less information at the time of initial proposal. Another concern was a lack of uniformity among funding

agencies. Separately, the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) and the American Association of Universities (AAU) issued a report which emphasized limiting proposal requirements to match funding levels. Suggestions included harmonizing performance regulations, evaluative practices, and doing more on a "just in time" basis.

UC's response came from 14% of ladder-rank faculty from across the system. Highlights of our response are 1) to improve internal UC administration and guidelines, 2) to simplify the proposal process, perhaps by requesting more information after each level of review, and 3) to make the indirect cost recovery practice and disbursement more transparent. Adding to these obstacles are differing levels of strictness in campus interpretations of the varying federal guidelines. The ORGS workgroup investigating ICR is expected to issue its report this winter (see item 3 below). Campus specific information will be available when the final report is completed.

Discussion: Chair Kleeman noted that many faculty feel a local solution to ICR and other administrative burdens would be preferable. Director Streitz agreed, and the workgroup is examining where the most impactful changes can be made. It was noted that Commission on the Future also issued recommendations on administrative burdens; they will be circulated to the committee.

3. Indirect Cost Policy Recommendation Implementation
With Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
Issue: The Indirect Cost Waiver Policies and Practices Workgroup report had 3 recommendations: 1) delegate greater authority to campuses, 2) issue University principles re ICR, 3) eliminate systemwide cost waivers for easier local implementation. Step one is to issue the policy, and a draft is being reviewed by the workgroup. Systemwide review will follow, and we expect it to be non-controversial. The policy would include the campus delegations, but a supporting IT system must be developed. Technical changes are already being designed, and should be ready to go live over the summer.

VI.   New Business
None.

Adjourned at 12 noon.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst
Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair