

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Minutes of Meeting
October 13, 2014****I. Announcements**

Liane Brouillette, Chair

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

- Support for research will be a recurring theme this year. The Portfolio Review Group (PRG) has completed its review, but actions still need to be taken. Whether and how to reconstitute the PRG will also be a future discussion item. The future of research support is complicated by the retirement of Vice President Beckwith; his successor's responsibilities have not yet been determined as the Office of the President is undergoing another strategic review and President Napolitano may have specific goals in mind. The role of the Senate in the selection of the next vice president and how that office is positioned going forward remain to be determined. One reason the role of the next vice president is in flux is the University's new emphasis on technology transfer and increasing the income-generating potential of the UC portfolio of active inventions. President Napolitano's UC Ventures program is one example of this change in philosophy. The Academic Planning Council is also discussing these issues.

President Napolitano has written that she will restore \$2.61million in MRPI funding, but a plan for future years is still needed. The Senate has called for a minimum level of central support for research, but that proposal has not received much discussion. Finally, how to govern systemwide research in these challenging times may also be revisited.

- A long-term policy for graduate student support and non-resident tuition are being developed by the Office of the President and are of clear interest to UCORP. Some are calling for a cap on non-resident enrollment. Non-residents are a political "hot potato" in Sacramento but, as state support wanes, the University's revenue generation options may be limited.

II. Consent Calendar

None.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Council

Dan Hare, Vice Chair, Academic Council

Mike Kleeman, 2012-13 Chair, UCORP

Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

1. Portfolio Review Group

Issue: Past Chair Kleeman provided an overview of the history, charge, membership and operations of the Portfolio Review Group (PRG). Many feel that the group worked well together and issued thoughtful and comprehensive recommendations. However,

because the group was not empowered to take action, the fate of its recommendations rests in the hands of the current administration. The activities of the PRG, although useful, were also found to be exhausting and time consuming, taking nearly a year to organize and another year to complete its tasks. Consequently, a three-year cycle was proposed. President Napolitano has expressed support for the continuation of the PRG but issues concerning continuity, organization, and visibility remain to be addressed.

Discussion: Members noted that the PRG process requires a willing administration as partner, making discussions between the Senate and the Office of the President more pressing. It was noted that the Senate was instrumental in keeping funds for the lab fee program in that program and used for research.

Action: Discussion on whether and how UCORP should opine on this matter will continue.

2. Commercialization of Research

Issue: Current administration efforts such as UC Ventures and the President's Innovation Council have changed the tenor of discussion about university-industry relations. The goals and roles of these new bodies are partly still to be determined. Some are looking for the magic invention to rescue UC's finances, while others view the effort as another possible, and possibly pragmatic, response to the state's ongoing disinvestment in UC. The Innovation Council will advise the president on topics such as creating an entrepreneurial environment at UC, communicating opportunities, assessing best practices, investing in innovation, and providing rewards and recognition for faculty participants.

Discussion: Members noted that UC, despite its generations of research prowess, only has a handful of highly profitable patents. Members also noted that conflict of interest and conflict of commitment guidelines would need to be drafted and communicated carefully. Members also agreed that the UC patent process could usefully be streamlined.

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

Aimée Dorr, Provost

Bill Tucker, Interim Vice President

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Jeff Hall, Director, Research Grants Policy Office

Dottie Miller, Deputy to the Vice President

1. Multi-campus Research Support

Issue: Following letters from the EVCs and the Academic Council, President Napolitano has restored \$2.6M to the MRPI program on a one-time basis. Additional funding has been requested going forward. This chapter highlights the fact that most research dollars remain fungible in the University budget. How to protect and increase systemwide research funding is a continuing topic of discussion.

Discussion: Members observed that because the funds are fungible, research has suffered disproportionate cuts recently. Interim VP Tucker noted that the budget at the Office of the President is considered zero-sum at this point and that President

Napolitano is unlikely to increase campus assessments. Indeed, as other mandatory expenses continue to increase, the question is likely to become what additional cuts can UC endure? President Napolitano understands the value of basic research and recent public statements support that contention, but funding stability for research does not yet seem to be a priority

Members asked what actions were being taken in light of the PRG recommendations. Ms. Miller stated that the recommendations were submitted to then-Vice President Beckwith, who shared them with Provost Dorr and President Napolitano. So far, no decisions have been made regarding which recommendations to implement. No decisions are expected until the conclusion of the OP strategic review.

Members again noted two broad categories of research conducted at UC- that stipulated by the legislature and that initiated by faculty. Interim VP Tucker agreed that there are political calculations in determining research funding allocations, and added that many programs funded at the System level are, whether pass-through or other, small dollar projects, which limits that amount of money that can be recaptured and repurposed. Members expressed frustration with the inflexibility of central funds, especially for a mission-critical endeavor such as research. Interim VP Tucker agreed, and noted that the timing of the PRG report did not align well with the budget calendar this year. Additionally, the campuses' desire for more financial autonomy works against centralized research support, despite the success of centrally funded programs like MRPIs and the Proof of Concept program.

2. Innovation Council

Issue: Interim VP Tucker said that part of UC's mission is to market ideas and see that they get used. While teaching and publishing will remain the main ways of disseminating information, President Napolitano has asked how UC can better create value in the community, state, and nation. These efforts are to supplement, not supplant, existing research programs. Many students, too, have called for greater entrepreneurial training during their education; greater commercialization efforts could help meet that need.

ORGS has been asked to help in four areas: 1) communicate the role UC can play in developing technologies for the marketplace; 2) streamline processes and incorporate best practices; 3) invest in individuals through facilitation and moral support, and invest in new companies through UC Ventures; 4) determine a threshold of financial support for people and patents appropriate for a research enterprise the size of UC.

Discussion: Members noted that the Innovation Council represents a top-down method of identifying promising research, which is the opposite of UC's tradition of faculty-driven, bottom-up research. Further, this type of program could mistakenly send the message that marketable research is more valuable, or at least of a higher profile, than basic research. Members further noted that the destination partly determines the path: A research portfolio will be designed differently if its goal is to help the California economy rather than to advance knowledge. Blending the two will be tricky.

The President's goal is to enable interested faculty to file patents, with a minimum of red tape and other obstacles. Faculty success will still be defined by the

creation and transmission of knowledge. Members noted that the creation of knowledge is by definition innovative, regardless of discipline or financial impact

It was noted that all universities are struggling with these and similar issues. A UCORP opinion should stress the value added by central support and multi-campus moorings, but warn against defining and discussing the research mission in financial terms. Many feel that the true benefit of research is in public service.

UC Ventures

Issue: Interim VP Tucker reminded the committee that this idea came from a Regents working group on technology transfer, and will be led by Chief Investment Officer Bachher's office. The goal is to help nascent projects reach their next step by providing access to UC researchers and brain power. Incubators, accelerators, and the like will be supported. Because UC is not beholden to market time frames, greater flexibility is anticipated; because UC will not charge itself management fees, greater profitability is possible. UC currently spends \$2B in venture capital investments, and this represents a small shift to internal targets.

Discussion: Interim VP Tucker noted that the CIO has already received lots of interest, even though the program is still in development. A good next step would be a comprehensive survey concerning current obstacles to technology transfer that need to be fixed. Many campuses have smaller versions of this program, and their leaders may convene over the winter. UC Ventures may be established as an LLC to ensure objectivity.

3. Portfolio Review Group

Note: See above.

4. Lab Fee Program

Update: A new RFP will be released in the spring of 2015, with a 3-year award term. The time frame may be adjusted to 2/4 years to align with the MRPI schedule, though. The 2015 total is about \$13.5M, which is down from initial levels of \$18-20M due to contractual de-escalators.

A new program focusing on graduate fellowships is under development; it would be a one-time award, available after advancing to candidacy, for up to 3 years of research at the labs. The motive of the labs is to increase the amount of new talent in the pipeline. The new Vice President of Lab Management is keen to increase engagement between the campuses and the labs. Demonstrating to external audiences the value added of UC management of the labs is also a goal. More information will be available next month.

5. MRPI

Issue: With the president's recent augmentation, the program now has \$12.4M to fund operations for the next 2 years. So far, 186 proposals have been received, and the reviews will occur in early November. The review will again consist of two stages: In the first stage, applications will be divided into 5 content areas with a total of 60 reviewers who will score the applications on merit, innovation, excellence, collaboration, and benefit to the system/state. In the second stage, the chairs of the five content panels

will determine which of the top applications from each panel will be funded. An 8% success rate is expected.

6. The Compendium

Issue: Provost Dorr noted that the Compendium section on MRPIs needed to be reexamined. Not all stakeholders are convinced that MRPIs should be included in the Compendium at all since that program is not composed of permanent programs, or programs that would need to be formally established or disestablished. However, the guidance and background might be useful.

7. Challenge Grants

Issue: This new program is intended to flesh out the research dimensions of the President's new initiatives by funding high profile, high priority research to stimulate increased public support of UC. More details will be available in November, but early plans suggest \$10M will be made available over 3 years and will hopefully be matched by philanthropic funds. Projects should be multi-campus, interdisciplinary and faculty-led. Projects should address sustainable environmental practices, food security, California poverty and social equity/justice, and health and health care delivery, for example.

Discussion: Members asked if this project was related to the Coro Fellows, but that information is not known. Nor is it known if the RFP will limit the type of applicant to, for example, junior faculty. Another goal is to illustrate the value of research in the public arena, with the aim, again, of increasing public pressure and advocacy supporting UC research.

8. Biosafety Level 3 Inventory

Issue: President Napolitano appointed a task force to examine UC's hazardous chemical storage and usage protocols. Partly, this action was in response to public records requests and media pressure, as well as an NIH request to redouble efforts in this area. EH&S staff are leading this project, and the Senate has 2 representatives, along with 3 at-large faculty members, all of whom run BSL3 labs. The charge to the group is to inventory labs, supplies, storage practices, and the like. A first draft inventory was completed, and will be sent to EH&S officials for verification. The most worrisome findings so far are "leftovers" from faculty who have departed the University. The report is due January 1.

Discussion: Members asked if communicable disease labs were subject to this, but the current effort does not include those labs, though the lessons learned may overlap. Findings will be reviewed and redacted by the Office of General Counsel, and next steps may include promulgation of best practices, enhanced training, improved decommissioning procedures, and revised exit interview strategies.

9. Future of ORGS

Issue: Provost Dorr again noted that final decisions on the future of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies will not be made until the strategic review of the Office of the President has concluded. One of the large questions to be addressed is whether and how to redistribute the responsibilities overseen by ORGS. A significant question is where best to house graduate studies since several academic affairs departments touch on this issue. Most stakeholders are not keen to divorce graduate studies and research,

but the connection between graduate studies and technology transfer is not readily apparent. Another outstanding question is whether Innovation will become anew department at the Office of the President. If so, will it be an academic unit or a business unit?

V. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Revisions to APMs 133, 210, 220, and 760 (“Stop the Clock” Provisions)
Action: UCORP elected not to opine on this item.
2. Proposed Revisions to APMs 080 (Medical Separation) and 330 (Specialists)
Action: UCORP elected not to opine on APM 080.
Action: Merced Representative Noelle will serve as lead reviewer for APM 330.

VI. Campus Updates

Note: Item not addressed.

VII. Animal Researcher Safety

Issue: This problem has recently resurfaced at UCLA, and to a lesser extent at UCSC. Faculty members’ private property has been vandalized and some have reported harassment on sidewalks and other public locations. The University’s institutional response is thought to have been taken as far as it can go within reasonable limits, but impacted faculty require more support. Should institutional leaders make a public statement about the value of animal research? Should federal funders be asked to join the defense? Variable practices nationally complicate the issue.

Discussion: Members debated whether having a public face would be calming or incendiary. Members also debated the value of education campaigns in the face of moral outrage – for example, fruit fly researchers have been harassed; what argument can persuade those protesters? Many noted that the public discourse is dominated by animal rights activists, and that the story of how research relates to education and quality of life improvements has not received equal coverage in the media. A new dimension that the institution must be prepared to address and act on is online harassment.

VIII. Executive Session

Note: During executive session, other than action items, no notes are taken.

IX. New Business

None.

Adjournment 4:00 p.m.

Minutes drafted by Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Liane Brouillette, UCORP Chair