

Minutes of Meeting**May 9, 2011****I. Chair's Announcements***Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair*1) Academic Council meeting of March 30, 2011:

- The revised MRU guidelines were approved by the Academic Council with an overwhelming majority. Two concerns were raised. One had to do with limiting the MRU directorship to Academic Senate members at the rank of associate professor or higher. The other had to do with the elimination of research entities that have the UCOP "stamp of approval" for the purposes of seeking external funding and without being an MRU or an MRP. Following their approval by the Academic Council, the revised MRU guidelines were also approved by the Academic Planning Council at their meeting of April 20, 2011. The next step involves drafting language for the Compendium, which Senate Associate Director Todd Giedt is leading.
- The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA's) draft guidelines for self-supporting programs and curricular oversight established a satisfactory compromise and were approved.
- The 2011-12 Vice Chair of the Academic Council will be Robert Powell, currently divisional chair at the Davis campus.
- The budget outlook remains gloomy. Ongoing annual fee increases are projected, unless the State restores its support.

2) Academic Council meeting of April 27, 2011:

- The CCGA guidelines on transitioning to self-supporting programs from state supported programs require the programs to disestablish themselves and then reapply as a new program, but they can use previous academic reviews in their applications.
- The online education pilot program was discussed. See Item III below.
- The Implementation Task Force continues to discuss its final recommendations for distributing central funds by transparent formulae.

II. Consent Calendar1) March minutes:

ACTION: The approval of the minutes was deferred pending correction. Revised minutes will be circulated by email for approval.

2) Memo to Academic Council endorsing progress of Seminar Network:

ACTION: Approved as noticed.

III. Online Education

ISSUE: The pilot project previously approved by the Regents, and endorsed by the Academic Council, seems to be departing from the approved trajectory and not meeting the predetermined conditions for continuation. For example, program advocates have

fallen significantly short in external fundraising efforts, but the program has been approved for internal financing from the Short Term Investment Pool (STIP). Previously anticipated funds from the Gates Foundation may have to be rejected due to “funding strings” limiting open access. Further, the academic integrity of the courses and their approval processes have yet to be demonstrated sufficiently in the eyes of many. And since many of the courses in the pipeline are gateway courses, unanswered questions about overlap with the California Community Colleges (CCCs), transfer credit, and baccalaureate credit remain.

DISCUSSION: Members voiced concerns about a perceived lack of central guidance for various and independently functioning smaller efforts at online education. Similarly, members queried the absence of established best practices from universities further along in developing online courses and curricula. Members echoed the concern about financing the pilot program with internal sources during this difficult budget environment, and wondered where precisely the “break even” point was on this investment. Similarly, committee members agreed with concerns about ownership of proprietary course material and restrictions on open sourcing other materials.

Members noted that the proposal also inverts the ideal UC course conception: even if successful, online courses are not what applicants want from a UC education. Many sought additional data on the projected enrollment and course demand figures, citing again the unclear transfer guidelines with the CCCs and the California State University. Finally, the ability to teach and mentor good research practices, even at the undergraduate level, is diminished significantly via online course delivery.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a response from the committee and circulate it via email for endorsement.

IV. Research Priority

ISSUE: UCORP continues its discussion of the lack of priority on research at UC. Vice Chair Crawford reported that the recent Committee on the Future (COTF) recommendations seem to minimize the import of research in attracting both faculty and graduate students, and even undergraduates, to the University.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that costing figures included in the COTF are open to interpretation, and even philosophical debate: The true cost of research seems to fluctuate throughout the report, depending on funding source and type of research, among other factors. Other members wondered whether research should even be presented in cost-benefit terms, suggesting both the difficulties in projecting long-term investment returns on effort and teaching economically (to the state) and professionally (to the University).

Members also noted that many of the current research-related recommendations would be difficult to implement: indirect costs cannot be increased by declaring it a priority to do so, and the state’s zero-sum funding environment is not factored into the recommendations. Indeed, the frame of many recommendations seems to assume that “research costs money” – and is therefore unwelcome. Finally, members noted that graduate students should be included more explicitly in future statements.

ACTION: Vice Chair Crawford will draft a Research Mission Statement for discussion.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1) Centrally Funded Research Programs

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith reported that all programs would be impacted negatively by the current budget climate. In response, his office has prepared a white paper outlining ORGS' current fiscal allocations (see Distribution 1). VP Beckwith outlined some of the cuts facing his office: The Discovery Grant program would not be funded in 2011-12 for a savings of \$16M, and another \$4M will be reclaimed from other Multi-campus Research Unit allocations. It is unclear whether the lab fee research program will survive.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether the Discovery Grant program might be restructured to become self-supporting, rather than discontinued. VP Beckwith replied that such restructuring was an option, but his goal is to free up money; since the Discovery Grant program is largely engineering based, and since there is no shortage of external engineering research funds, the program closure is expected to have a smaller impact on UC researchers and their ability to secure grants than the other programs. Members also asked how intellectual property questions were being handled given the changing grant and funding landscape. VP Beckwith indicated that significant time is spent on contract negotiations, but reminded the committee that his office is working to develop a standard contract with the state to facilitate the flow of research funds. Members noted that cuts to the lab fee-funded research programs would have cascading impacts: campuses get indirect costs from the research, and the HABSS fields fared well in the competition. VP Beckwith concurred, noting that it seemed like research was disproportionately cut again, and any diminution in lab fee funds would be most harmful.

2) University of California Observatories (UCO) Update

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith reminded the committee that the Observatories were one of three MRUs not competed in the recent RFP, along with the White Mountain facility and UC MEXXUS. So far, UCO's budget has been protected pending its upcoming review. The review is intended to address UCO's long-term trajectory, not just assess its work to-date: The next generation of "big science" is unaffordable to UC as a solo actor, and long-term partnership contracts restrict significant funds. Nonetheless, opting-in to a partnership to develop a 30-meter telescope (TMT) is proffered by many as a system goal. At the same time, UC has always been a leader in astronomy, and faculty throughout the system continue to benefit from the facilities. The external review team charge (see Distribution 2) directs them to include in their deliberations the reports and recommendations of the UC Astronomy Task Force, which is comprised of internal stakeholders.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether it was assumed that astronomy at UC would continue, since the charge and presentation suggest fait accompli. Other members wondered if astronomy was the best use of UC's limited "big science" dollars, and wondered what other options were being considered and how they were being compared. VP Beckwith indicated that other "big science" ideas

could be considered if the TMT partnership fails. Then members asked for more information on the TMT partnership. VP Beckwith noted that he is UC's principal investigator in the project, as is his opposite number at Cal Tech. To date, the partnership has accepted hundreds of millions of dollars from private foundations in exploratory funds, and it may not now be possible to exit the contract due to prohibitive reimbursement and restoration costs. Members rejoined that cost over-runs could be just as harmful to UC, as could UC's stewardship of a project that is deemed "too big to fail."

3) California Institutes of Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs)

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith reported that his office was working to revise the Cal ISI review charges to incorporate Senate feedback regarding improved quantitative data and greater alignment with the director's report. One obstacle is that the Cal ISIs were not created to advance scientific research at UC, but to help bridge the University-industry gap. As such, their relevant review metrics will not be traditional MRU metrics, for example. More details will be shared as they become available.

DISCUSSION: Members asked for a review of the Cal ISI funding stream, and VP Beckwith answered that the Cal ISIs are funded by an Office of the President-Campus split of \$20M-\$5M. From the Office of the President, \$10M is a fixed portion of the budget, and the other \$10M is borrowed on a "one-time" basis each year from the Discovery Grants. Future funding streams are still under discussion. Members asked how much of the fixed \$10M is earmarked from Sacramento, and VP Beckwith replied that none was; they are UC internal allocations only. VP Beckwith reminded the committee that UC sought to host the Cal ISIs with the upfront knowledge that state funding was not guaranteed.

4) Indirect Cost Recovery Update

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith reported that currently UC has approximately a \$250M recovery gap between the actual cost of research and the indirect costs recovered. UC loses another \$120M from the federal government due to ICR waivers, not to mention waivers on private donations. This practice is not sustainable, but the federal and state governments are in no position to increase their ICR rates. Nonetheless, national organizations such as the AAU, AAUP, and COGR are working to improve ICR writ large. They are working with the new head of the Office of Management and Budget, and they are highlighting the rate discrepancies between various federal cognizant agencies.

DISCUSSION: Members asked for more details on UC's under-recovery of ICR funds. VP Beckwith noted that during recent rate negotiations, UCSD proposed a rate of 70% to cover all actual expenses, but was given on 54%. Of the 54%, not all is recovered. Waivers account for approximately 16% of potential ICR funds. VP Beckwith further noted that competitive peer institutions have not been harmed by barring waivers as a matter of policy, or by requiring departmental off-sets to any waivers.

VI. Campus Updates

Members

UCB: The local COR budget continues to fluctuate as a one-time funding redirection was overcorrected.

UCD: A new VCR has just begun work, and the local COR has formed both policy and grants advisory groups to improve operations moving forward. An ORU competition model is being developed.

UCI: The local COR is emphasizing cultural diversity grants, and all campus-based ORUs are up for sunset reviews.

UCLA: A new VCR has just begun. The COR grants budget is down, as are applications; a causal relationship has not been established.

UCM: (no representative appointed)

UCR: (absent)

UCSD: The local COR is reviewing campus ORUs as well as the processes surrounding limited submission proposals.

DISCUSSION: Members wondered whether processes should be standardized across the system for submission proposals, or whether that would infringe upon local autonomy. The committee agreed that this is a local issue, but that sharing best practices would help.

ACTION: The COR profile summary will be updated to include a field for limited submission procedures for the 2011-12 survey.

UCSF: The local COR continues to administer local grants, similar to the NIH council.

UCSB: There has been difficulty in librarian recruitment and retention, which has hampered some aspects of research.

UCSC: Local COR grants are being administered as usual, but with 20% less funding as part of a cut to the local Senate budget. The local Office of Research will undergo an external review next year, following a review of the VCR this year.

VII. New Business

- UCORP will meet in person in June.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair