

Minutes of Meeting November 14, 2011

I. Announcements

John Crawford, UCORP Chair

UPDATE: Chair Crawford updated the committee on recent items of interest:

- Merced has recently named their representative to UCORP, and he should be in attendance next month.
- Academic Council meeting of October 26: The Research Mission Statement was well-received and unanimously endorsed. The only problem involves determining the proper protocol for submission with the highest profile.
- Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI): The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) has issued an RFP for the development of a second campus, to be funded by bonds. The level of Senate participation in determining the best use of the lab management fees is thought to be inadequate by many at the divisional level.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if the bonds for the proposed second LBNL campus were to be UC bonds, and Chair Crawford indicated that they would not be University bonds.

II. Participation on Other Work Groups

- TTAC
- Working Smarter Initiatives

ISSUE: Chair Crawford reminded members that many irons are in many fires, and that the Senate needs to be an active, early participant wherever and whenever possible. A participation matrix has been developed and is posted on UCORP's SharePoint site; members who do not volunteer will be assigned.

III. Graduate Student Support Update

John Crawford, UCORP Chair

- CAGSS
- Joint Administration/Senate Workgroup on Graduate Student Issues
- Recommendations to March 2012 Regents Meeting

UPDATE: Chair Crawford reported that while the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) is the formal home of graduate student support-related issues, such activities remain relatively new to that office's portfolio. Both the Senate-only committee and the joint Senate-administration work group will address questions of relative priority with other funding needs. In order to best inform those discussions, members are asked to submit examples of unintended/negative consequences from status quo policies, such as problems that might stem from financial aid processes or enforcement of residency requirements.

ACTION: Members shall submit anecdotes directly to Chair Crawford by Friday.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

- Review Metrics Work Group

ISSUE: Academic reviews, as currently conducted, cannot capture longitudinal growth or adaptation, nor are subsequent reviews tied to benchmarks from previous reviews. These and other concerns are exacerbated by the necessity of having external reviewers (to avoid researcher conflict of interest). Another cause for concern with the status quo is that the structures in place do little to encourage and reward conceptually risk-taking and exploratory research. Given continuing dire economic forecasts, finding new methods to maximize UC's research dollars is imperative.

DISCUSSION: Members asked what the work group membership would be, and VP Beckwith indicated that the membership had not yet been determined. Chair Crawford posited that UCORP, acting as a committee of the whole, would be appropriate given that UCORP's charge and the work group purpose dovetail so well. Members then asked what type of recommendations the work group would be encouraged to generate. VP Beckwith noted that a strategy for determining systemwide research investments was needed. For example, one recommendation might be to tailor UC research more closely with societal needs.

- University of California Observatories (UCO) Academic Review:

ISSUE: VP Beckwith noted that the external review committee has impeccable credentials and produced a nuanced critique of the UC Observatories.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired how still more information could be learned, and VP Beckwith indicated that his office should be the lead contact point for subsequent questions. Members also asked whether and, if so, how the external review interacted with UC internal astronomy community. VP Beckwith noted that while there were differences in opinion between the two groups, the differences were not significant. Most of the focus was on reallocation and oversight, rather than possible cuts. Members asked if UCO was, de facto, a shared facility, and VP Beckwith answered that use is widely spread throughout the system, but not equally so.

- Cal ISI Reviews:

ISSUE: VP Beckwith reported that the CITRIS review should be circulated in the spring, that the CalIT2 review team met in October, and that the CNSI review team met just last week. Preliminary indications suggest that each has a significant return on investment in addition to being academically impressive.

DISCUSSION: Members asked which was weighted more by reviewers: academic research or business facility? VP Beckwith noted that issues relating to public interest were viewed favorably and that the review metrics could be specified more clearly.

- Patent Policy Amendment:

ISSUE: This discussion of the impacts of the Supreme Court's *Stanford v Roche* decision regarding patent assignment continues, e.g., "shall" versus "hereby do". The revised agreement will go into effect on November 1 for new hires.

Incumbent employees will be required to sign a new agreement as the amendment is not retroactive. The question to UCORP is how best to encourage current employees to sign the revised agreement.

DISCUSSION: One suggestion was that until a new agreement is on file, PIs cannot submit new grant applications. Another suggestion was to have current employees sign the revised form at the time of their next review. It was noted that only a handful of employees could be considered “high risk” regarding patent assignment and that such a group could easily be approached without a central mandate.

Note: Discussion continued in Executive Session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

V. Review Item: UC Observatories

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

VI. Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) Update

Mike Kleeman, UCORP Vice Chair

UPDATE: Vice Chair Kleeman provided a short summary of the genesis of ACSCANR and its goals. The immediate focus will be on ANR’s governance structure and the role of shared governance, especially regarding search and review committees. External budget considerations may impact some faculty and their research, which will bring the question of how best to determine the value added by ANR to the faculty and vice versa.

DISCUSSION: It was hoped that ACSCANR could investigate an agribusiness loophole that exists in California which allows for targeted funding.

VII. Systemwide Review Items

1. Salary Equity Study

DISCUSSION: Vice Chair Kleeman noted that the Davis campus recently conducted a similar study using the same two variables. Other members noted that the causality of the reported inequity remains unclear and suggested further analysis be undertaken. It was also noted that gender and research productivity might make for an interesting study, too.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a response and circulate it electronically for review.

2. Proposed APM 668 (Negotiated Salary Plan)

DISCUSSION: Members were unclear how much discretion granting authorities have in determining how their funds could be allocated within grants. Members observed that the proposal would empower some deans while disempowering local committees on academic personnel. Members also noted that NIH regulations differ from many private funders, which could cause confusion and further exacerbate the anticipated disparate disciplinary impact of the proposal. Members also wondered about the impacts of a “race to the top” on research excellence.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a response and circulate it electronically for review.

VIII. Campus Updates

Members

Berkeley: The local COR is investigating alternative internal grant parameters to ensure that the funds are allocated most beneficially.

Davis: The new VCR at UCD has prioritized improving internal accounting procedures. A new associate vice chancellor for technology transfer is being recruited.

Irvine: Following the blanket ORU disestablishment, 17 new ORU proposals have been submitted for review.

Los Angeles: UCLA is also reviewing its internal grant processes, and among the preliminary ideas that have been floated are local block grants, off-the-top taxing for the local COR, and increased competitions for continued funding. A new emphasis has been placed on funding transdisciplinary efforts.

Merced: (NA)

Riverside: Local COR funding has yet to be determined.

San Diego: Some internal organizational shifts are occurring, and the impacts of those changes will be monitored.

San Francisco: (Absent)

Santa Barbara: The local COR has suspended its internal grant program due to lack of funding.

Santa Cruz: Local COR funding has dwindled to just recovered indirect costs, but a new faculty grant has been allotted.

IX. New Business and Planning

None.

Meeting adjourned at 4 o'clock.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: John Crawford, UCORP Chair