

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Minutes of Meeting
May 12, 2014****I. Announcements**

Bob Clare, UCORP Chair

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

1. Academic Council of April 29: a) The LAO did not recommend any cuts to UC's budget, but nor did it recommend any increases. The LAO still distinguishes between UC and CSU regarding pension plan payments, but thinks that the cost of instruction should be the same for each segment. UC still needs to communicate better the role of research at UC. b) The proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights) were not adopted; the Council will advise that informal methods for separately reporting non-Senate votes are available. c) The Provost and Council Vice Chair Gilly co-chaired a doctoral student support conference at Irvine on April 15. Much discussion focused on non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) and the use of discretionary funds on campus. See also Item VI below. d) Administrative oversight of UCO has moved to the Provost's office, and budget continues to be an obstacle. In time, the plan is to move UCO funding to the Santa Cruz campus from OP; \$2.5M has been transferred so far. One goal is to eliminate faculty lines from OP.
2. UCPB of May 2: The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) also discussed central research support. At the system level, there are three sources: restricted funds of \$24.5M (the bulk of which goes to state research programs in tobacco and breast cancer), unrestricted off-the-top funds of \$28M (that fund long-standing programs and facilities like Scripps Institute of Oceanography), and funds from the funding streams assessment, which includes funds for ORGS-run programs (MRPIs, e.g.) and the lab fees program. The 14-15 projection is a total of only \$56M; restricted and off-the-top funds have been constant lately, but research has still suffered disproportionate cuts recently. The University's commitment to research and the research champion in budget discussions need to be illustrated clearly. UCORP and UCPB are asked to propose a minimum monetary threshold and justification for central research funding.
Discussion: Members speculated that humanities deans might make useful allies in this process, and that academic deans generally might be more helpful than Vice Chancellors for Research. Members also noted that the profit motive must be addressed directly when defending academic research. UC has historically leveraged research funds successfully; this fact should also be included in communications. See also Item VI below.
3. Composite Benefit Rates: The President adopted the Senate proposal, but work remains to identify optimal combinations for members of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP). The process illustrated well the value of Shared Governance and the utility of Senate consultation in generating successful policies.

II. Consent Calendar

Note: Item not addressed.

III. Campus Updates

Berkeley: 1) The Berkeley Excellence in Academic Research (BEAR) report is ready for distribution. 2) The Compendium revisions were discussed; some asked why the minimum number of campuses for MRUs changed from two to three. (Analyst Feer clarified that the change was to make MRUs more rigorous and distinct from MRPIs which were new when the revisions were proposed.) 3) More stringent evaluative metrics for ORUs are needed as the process lacks intellectual rigor.

Davis: 1) COR continues to review grant applications. 2) Internal campus accounting and billing practices are negatively impacting cost of research calculations: animal housing standards are under both research and facilities, for example. 3) Effective January 1, 2015, no NRT will be charged to grants for students in their second year or later, per the Office of Graduate Studies. Usually, only the first two quarters are paid by fellowship before grant support becomes active. Support for international students remains challenging, though, especially as departmental demographics vary widely making the problem seem localized, not shared.

Irvine: 1) COR grant reviews continue. 2) Irvine developed its own online education platform, but with the advance of commercial applications and systemwide program advances, the future of the in-house program and platform is in doubt. It is widely known that the campuses have divergent practices in this area, and a coordinated path forward is anticipated.

Los Angeles: 1) Grant review decisions are being finalized. 2) A letter of support that outlines campus resources for animal researchers is forthcoming.

Merced: absent.

Riverside: absent.

San Diego: 1) COR did a close read of the Composite Benefit Materials to help develop the models used in outlining the Senate counterproposal. 2) ORU reviews are in progress, and reviewers are looking to identify best practices regarding market success and diversity outcomes.

San Francisco: absent.

Santa Barbara: 1) COR reviewed the proposed Compendium revisions. 2) COR reviewed the Whistleblower Protection revisions (see also Item IV below).

Santa Cruz: 1) COR reviewed the proposed Compendium revisions. 2) An opportunity fund distribution report is forthcoming: that over half of opportunity funds in the social sciences are used for retention is a troubling statistic to many.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

1. [Proposed Revised Whistleblower Protection Policy and Academic Personnel Manual Section 190, Appendix A-2](#) (Comments due May 23, 2014)

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

2. [Proposed Revised Policy on Supplement to Military Pay - Four Year Renewal](#) (Comments due May 23, 2014)

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

3. [Compendium Revisions](#) (Comments due June 2, 2014)

Discussion: Chair Clare reminded members of off-line discussions on this topic. Members noted that the vetting process for funding new MRPIs might benefit from greater explication, even if it is covered in the RFPs issued at the time.

Action: Analyst Feer and Chair Clare will draft a response for electronic approval.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Mary Gilly, Academic Council Vice Chair

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

1. Composite Benefit Rates:

Discussion of how best to integrate HSCP into the final guidelines continued.

2. Doctoral Student Support:

Four proposals received the most attention: 1) one year of NRST only; 2) a guaranty of four years of support; 3) greater professional development programs; and 4) best practices for family friendly practices and diversity outcomes.

3. AB 1834 (Williams) re Graduate Student Research Unionization:

The governor vetoed this bill last year, and this year it is being held in an appropriations committee. UC still officially opposes the bill.

4. Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI):

State funds given to OP must be dispersed by May 15. Continuing plan operations are under discussion.

5. a-g Admission Requirements:

A bill may be introduced to ease the c (mathematics) requirement to accept computer science classes. The Senate will oppose such an effort.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Affairs

Aimée Dorr, Provost

Steve Beckwith, Vice President, Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

1. Doctoral Student Support

Update: Provost Dorr indicated that future discussions will include more students, and the Senate partnership will be critical to success.

2. Central Research Support

Issue: Provost Dorr reported that all unrestricted funds are being cut, not just for research. Nonetheless, she thinks that good progress has been made in terms of educating President Napolitano on the importance of doctoral education and the role research plays in the undergraduate experience. VP Beckwith provided an overview of the research funds OP oversees: Restricted funds go to the Institute for Transportation Studies, the Keck contract, and some to the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). Unrestricted but politically sensitive funds go to the HIV/AIDS program and the labor institute. Unrestricted funds under UC control go to facilities like UCO, Scripps, the San Diego Super Computer; and to concept programs like MRPI. Not all of these groups have organized constituencies, though, and Academic Affairs does not set its own budget or participate in the budget process. Some funds, such as those

for the Cal ISIs, have split control, which is another obstacle. Many observers do not realize that ORGS oversees only some of OP's research projects and funds, and the logic behind the separate oversight of funds has been lost. Still, non-ORGS budgets have been conspicuously flat in comparison, which suggests that funding decisions are decoupled from program administration and oversight. The programs most vulnerable to cuts are also those that have been identified as the most valuable by bodies such as the Portfolio Review Group.

Discussion: Increases in central support for research must overcome local leaders who feel they know how to spend dollars more judiciously than OP does. Local leaders seek programs that feed back to the local educational environment. Members wondered if cuts to the research budget had been redirected to other programs, such as UC Path. Provost Dorr noted that monies that come to OP via funding streams cannot be "isotope tracked". Members noted that OP budget decisions seem to be made reactively, and that across-the-board cuts have unequal impacts. It was noted that campus executive vice chancellors have also called for a reinstatement of MRPI funding, but they did not specify where restored funds would be found. It is important to remind local leaders that the campuses are the loci for research, not just fundraising. Persuading Sacramento of the value of UC research is a separate challenge.

VII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership (continued)

Note: Item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

VIII. Portfolio Review Group Report

Discussion: Members noted that receiving copies or summaries of the directors' reports would make evaluating the findings easier.

Action: Chair Clare will draft the committee's response for electronic approval.

IX. New Business

Discussion: Members continued to discuss how to persuade OP budget makers of the importance of funding research centrally, and how to identify a target minimum threshold.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Bob Clare, UCORP Chair