

**Minutes of Meeting
October 11, 2010**

I. Chair's Announcements

Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair

Dan Simmons, Academic Council Chair

Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

Todd Giedt, Associate Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

WELCOME: Chair Kolaitis welcomed new and returning members, all of whom then introduced themselves to committee. Chair Kolaitis also summarized the committee's bylaw and charge, and stated his commitment to reflecting the depth and diversity of opinion within the committee in its official communications.

Academic Council Chair Simmons reported that the Senate has a busy year ahead. The UC Commission of the Future meets later today, and Chair Simmons will attend that meeting; a Senate analog, the Academic Council's Special Committee on a Plan for the University of California, is being led by immediate past Council chair, Harry Powell. Post-Employment Benefits remain a hot topic, as the three options currently under debate are still fluid. Chair Simmons reminded members that the Senate has been closely and heavily involved in shaping the recommendations and that negotiations continue. A third major topic this fall will be investigation of the transfer questions raised by the state legislature and some Regents.

Executive Director Winnacker provided an overview of various Senate processes and protocols, highlighting confidentiality: oral reports of committee deliberations absent documentation are acceptable in most cases; exceptions will be clearly noticed. Associate Director Giedt summarized the new travel procedures, which are also available online.

II. Consent Calendar

None.

III. Systemwide Review Items

1. Systemwide Review of the Report of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force (Formal comments **due October 21**)

DISCUSSION: Some members argued that this topic was beyond the scope of UCORP's charge, and, therefore, UCORP should not opine on the recommendations. The majority, however, felt that UCORP should indeed take a position because post-employment benefits are an integral part of the total compensation of UC employees, and that faculty remuneration and long-term compensation were integral to attracting and retaining world-class researchers, thus maintain the quality of the institution. Additionally, members contended that UC's reputation could be irreparably harmed if it were to become perceived as an unreliable long-term partner or if it began sacrificing excellence on the altar of cost savings. After this consensus was achieved on opposing Option A,

supporting Option C, and echoing UCFW in calling for the development of a credible faculty and staff salary plan to be developed as soon as possible (and no later than the end of the academic year 2010-11),

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a letter of support for the UCFW statement, specifying the need for a new salary plan and framed within the context of recruitment and retention of excellent faculty and staff; the draft will be circulated for an e-vote.

2. [Systemwide Review of Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University](#) (Formal comments due by Wednesday, November 10)

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that Council recommendations 1, 2, and 4 were not controversial and focused its discussion on recommendation 3. The possible impacts to local autonomy of centrally imposed restrictions on construction, faculty size, and the number of academic programs must be weighed carefully. Some members voiced concern over departments becoming too independent: if a department severed itself from state funding, would it be able to set its own fees and salaries? Also, the impact of fewer faculty on the research and teaching enterprises needs to be considered: would the fewer faculty be called on to teach more? Would fewer faculty be accompanied by fewer students? Many members felt that fewer students or fewer faculty would be detrimental to UC's research profile. Others posited that the trade-offs were less clear: fewer faculty might be overworked, yet more faculty might be underpaid. Similar arguments were presented for and against construction and program freezes: flexibility is increasingly valuable as an institutional asset, but buildings take time to design, construct, and realize returns, and new buildings are the loci of new research. The committee did agree that building and program freezes should precede faculty layoffs.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a statement reflecting the committee's deliberations and circulate it for an e-vote.

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

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President

ISSUE: Deputy Gautier provided an overview of the reorganized Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) and its operational arms: Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC) under Ellen Auriti, Research Grants Programs Office (RGPO) under Mary Croughan, Industry Alliances and Services (IAS) under Bill Tucker, Graduate Studies (GS) under Pamela Jennings, and Research Accountability and Coordination (RAC) under Deputy Gautier.

Director Auriti gave a detailed explanation of the work her team undertakes, which includes intellectual property policies, research administration, institutional review board (IRB) coordination, and contract and grant management, including closely monitoring "strings" and troublesome clauses (and intervening when the need arises).

DISCUSSION: Members inquired about single-IRB approval or multicampus projects, and Director Auriti indicated that several multicampus IRB memoranda of understanding

were in place and being streamlined for wider use. The KOALI system could subsume disparate campus software packages, but issues of campus autonomy remain. Members also asked about outcomes from the *Stanford v Roche* decision, and Director Auriti said that General Counsel-directed amendments to the patent acknowledgement forms were on hold pending the outcome of the case's appeal before the US Supreme Court. **DISCUSSION** then turned to MRUs; see Item VI below.

V. Consultation with the Office of The Regents – Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit

Sheryl Vacca, Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer

Luanna Putney, Director of Research Compliance

Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research, UCMerced

ISSUE: Director Putney provided a brief history of this effort-reporting initiative. Interviews with principal investigators indicated that few understood the guidelines and their purpose. UCORP is asked for advice on how to package communications on this important topic.

DISCUSSION: Members reiterated their concern that the seemingly ever-increasing compliance onus was driving out research and teaching. VCR Traina responded that effort-reporting compliance was simply too important to slight and that limited resources did not justify non-compliance. He continued by noting that the VCRs' recommendation is for once-per-career (at UC) training, followed by yearly reminders, like taxes. Further, UCR is piloting a program to replace effort reporting with payroll certification, but the program must be approved by federal regulators before it can be rolled out more widely, if successful. Members asked what other higher education institutions have tried payroll certification in lieu of traditional effort reporting, and VCR Traina said that none use it officially, although ONR and HHS are running additional pilots at other institutions. SVP Vacca noted that the time-frame for this possible change is years; in the meantime, improving the current methods of effort reporting are useful undertakings.

ACTION: Members will send feedback on the distributed slides to Analyst Feer for approval and transmission to VCR Traina and SVP Vacca next month.

VI. MRUs and MRPIs

Steve Beckwith, Vice President, ORGS

DISCUSSION: Chair Kolaitis provided a summary of the committee history with this issue, described the charge to UCORP from the Academic Council to formulate MRU recommendations for the Compendium, and stressed that UCORP has to approach this matter with a fresh perspective and a clean slate. Particular problems on which the committee should focus include 1) that the Compendium is not designed for multiple dis/establishment reviews; 2) the degree to which centralized planning should determine the system-wide research portfolio, and whose views should shape that plan; and 3) the delineation of the differences between MRPIs and MRUs. Members felt that more information was needed before specific recommendations could be made. For example, the roles of local CORs and VCRs need elucidated, as does the exact nature of UC's research portfolio since it is unreasonable to address "big-c Centers" but not "small-c centers."

VP Beckwith provided additional background on the efforts undertaken by his office: In order to refresh the MRU funding pot, a long-standing research policy goal, as much of the MRU funding pot as possible was re-competed. As it turned out, 57% of the competed funds went to incumbent initiatives. The goal is to maintain a broad research portfolio without limiting funding to a specific area or body in perpetuity, and the MRPI funding mechanism allows that. The challenge is to align a streamlined funding process with Senate oversight and processes.

Members stressed their interest in having faculty determine the scope and content of the University's research portfolio, not grant application reviewers. Members also noted that the MRPI funding mechanism could not necessarily anticipate local implementation problems, such as space and FTE, suggesting that divisional CORs should also be involved in the scope-setting and award processes.

ACTION: ORGS will prepare a comprehensive portfolio review for the next UCORP meeting, where this topic will be revisited.

VII. New Business

None.

Adjournment: 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair