

**Minutes of Meeting  
October 10, 2011**

**I. Announcements and Welcome**

*John Crawford, UCORP Chair*

**UPDATE:** Chair Crawford introduced himself and reviewed the committee's charge. After committee members introduced themselves, Chair Crawford outlined several of the committee's ongoing business items:

- Academic Council meeting of September 28, 2011: The implications of a proposed APM 668 (Negotiated Salaries) were discussed, but UCORP may elect not to opine if the proposal is found to be beyond the committee's charge. Similarly, The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) has released a Salary Equity Study. The online education project is moving forward, even though it has encountered several new obstacles.
- Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI): This group is charged to advise on the University's co-administration of the Department of Energy national labs that UC operates in conjunction with several private partners via limited liability corporations. Chair Crawford is UCORP's representative to this group, whose first meeting will be later this month. Anticipated topics include management fee usage and employee morale.
- Committee on Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS): This group is charged to investigate and propose solutions to obstacles in graduate student research, including non-resident tuition. UCORP is represented on this body by Chair Crawford, UCSF Representative Marcucio, and UCR Representative Clare.
- Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR): This group is charged to advise on the administration and operations of the division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). UCORP is represented on this body by Vice Chair Kleeman.
- 2011-12 outlook: UCORP can expect to investigate and advise on issues relating to multi-campus research entities, the California Institutes for Science and Innovation, intellectual property assignments, centralized research funding, indirect cost recovery, and human subjects protections, in addition to any member-generated projects and topics.

**II. Consent Calendar**

*\*\*None.\*\**

**III. Research Priority at UC**

*John Crawford, UCORP Chair*

**ISSUE:** The 2010-11 UCORP worked to draft a Research Mission Statement to elevate the visibility and priority of research at the University. This effort began during the Commission on the Future, and continued through last year. The current UCORP is

asked to approve the statement for submission to the Academic Council, and from there to the administration and the Regents.

**DISCUSSION:** Members were supportive of the effort, and after some “word-smithing”, unanimously endorsed the Statement for submission.

**ACTION:** UCORP will submit the Statement to the Academic Council for endorsement and submission to the President.

#### **IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)**

*Steven Beckwith, Vice President*

##### **1. Export Controls:**

*With Brian Warshawsky, Export Control Officer, Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services (ECAS)*

*With Luanna Putney, Director of Research Compliance, ECAS*

**ISSUE:** Director Putney reported that export control had been relocated to the Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services (ECAS) as part of a larger effort to co-located previously disparate efforts.

Director Putney also noted that some faculty at other institutions had been imprisoned for violations of export controls, specifically regarding international researchers’ access to sensitive materials and technologies. Mr. Warshawsky added that the current effort is designed to serve as a clearing house for information from various sources.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that a single source for relevant regulations and restrictions would be helpful to researchers and compliance officers alike.

Members also asked whether the new compliance clearinghouse would require additional trainings, and Director Putney answered no, the goal is awareness at present.

**ACTION:** Members shall send feedback on the draft program directly to Director Putney and Mr. Warshawsky.

##### **2. Technology Transfer:**

*With Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination*

**ISSUE:** Vice President Beckwith noted that part of the impetus for the current effort stems from Regental calls to investigate the generation of new revenues by any means necessary. Large short-term revenue is unlikely, but smoother processes might help save bureaucratic expenditures. Another aspect of the discussion is the degree to which centralization of technology transfer functions would be desirable in terms of fostering industry partnerships. Director Streitz added that the Office of the President currently offers assistance to smaller campus offices, houses a central database, and handles equity and legal reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked how negotiations are handled at present, and Director Streitz indicated that they occur at the local level only. Members also asked if there was any indication which locus is most advantageous. Director Streitz noted that decentralized offices are seldom the least expensive option, especially as economies of scale are sacrificed, but since outcomes are time-delayed, clear evidence is hard to identify. VP Beckwith added that success was

dependent on the goal envisioned: revenue generation would have a different metric than advancing the state of the discipline. Director Streit observed that, anecdotally, local offices seem to encourage disclosures.

**ISSUE 2:** The Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) will reconvene soon, and UCORP should name a representative.

**ACTION:** Interested members shall contact Analyst Feer.

3. Human Subjects Protections:

*With Jeff Hall, Director, Research Policy Development*

**ISSUE:** Director Hall reported that in July, the federal government issued new draft regulations for preliminary comment. The goal of the new regulations is to reduce administrative hurdles where possible without easing the protections for invasive research. Concerns and obstacles include possible impacts to in-progress research (if a new protection protocol is required), political calculations (regarding stem cell research, for example), and crafting multi-site memoranda of understanding to allow for single IRB approval. Additional information is available online. The comment deadline is next week, so any additional feedback can be sent directly to Director Hall for inclusion.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Crawford asked what happens after the comment deadline passes. Director Hall indicated that the current review period is part of the advance notice; the next step is the formal proposal of the draft, during which UC will again have the opportunity to opine. Following that, actual implementation guidelines will be issued. Earlier feedback, however, is better in these processes. Members asked whether divisional COR responses were being included. Director Hall indicated that so far, only UCB had opined, and he encouraged the other campuses to send comments. Members then asked how the new regulations would interface with strict (and penalty-carrying) HIPAA requirements and the possible mining of medical center emails. Other questions inquired how data could be proved to be “anonymous” and how consent would be handled in extreme cases.

**ACTION:** Members should send feedback directly to Director Hall.

4. University of California Observatories Academic Review:

*With Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President*

**UPDATE:** VP Beckwith reported that the component parts of the review had all been received and were being collated. One new aspect reviewers were asked to consider was UC’s total research portfolio balance (see also Item IV.5. below), especially as any new UCO projects would be long-term and large budget.

**DISCUSSION:** Members observed that discussions of long-term and large budget projects should not occur without reference to ideas and projects that might compete for the same resources. Members also observed that the Observatories still enjoyed relative budget security, so any review recommendations/outcomes are likely to be contested. Finally, members wondered what might happen to in-place plans for UCO should funding disappear or be redirected.

5. Multi-campus Research Entity Review Metrics:

*With Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office*

**ISSUE:** The goal of this project is to develop standardized metrics by which all University-sponsored or –housed research programs will be evaluated. Because UC hosts state-mandated research, their reporting requirements can be added to the template. VP Beckwith proposed a joint working group between his office and UCORP, and the idea was warmly received.

6. Central Research Funds:

**ISSUE:** Partly in response to external budget demands and partly in response to continuing internal calls for greater flexibility in deployment of research funds, ORGS is investigating options to maximize research investments. One question is whether a greater degree of commercialization in some areas may enable greater scientific investigation in others. Previous efforts to keep the University research portfolio fresh by periodically recompeting central research funds will continue.

7. DOE Lab Management Fee Usage:

*With Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office*

**ISSUE:** VP Beckwith indicated that the final usage plan for the lab management fees needed to be finalized by October 30, and the question to UCORP is whether these funds should be “earmarked” for specific research purposes. It was noted that all fungible funds were “at risk” of being repurposed.

8. Working Smarter Initiatives:

- [Indirect Cost Recovery](#)
- [Research Administration](#)
- [UC Tracker](#)

**ACTION:** Members shall volunteer for working groups that most align with their interests.

## V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

*Robert Anderson, Chair, Academic Council*

*Robert Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Council*

*Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Universitywide Academic Senate Office*

**UPDATE:** After thanking committee members for their service, Council Chair Anderson updated the committee on several items of interest:

- **“Rebenching”:** The University’s internal funding allocation processes are under review, and the Senate, through its Implementation Task Force, is making suggestions. One recurring divergence centers on differential practices by location; another is non-resident enrollment. More broadly, on-going state disinvestment in UC leaves the University in dire straits.
- **DOE Lab Fees:** Previously, the Council has opined that these monies should not be restricted, pointing to greater need for faculty recruitments, for example.
- **ACSCOLI:** The cultural differences between the University’s academic research environment and the LLC private partners continue to pose challenges.
- **CAGSS:** Many long-standing issues remain to be resolved, and thoughtful and deliberate approach is required. Among the many topics to dissect are non-resident tuition, professional programs, and the differing assumptions between participants regarding the nature of graduate education and what a successful outcome to this process would be. A subset of questions focuses on UCSF and

the distinctions between MD and PhD students and studies as well as whether post-docs might be a better investment in terms in clinical outcomes.

## **VI. SharePoint Overview**

*Todd Giedt, Associate Director, Universitywide Academic Senate Office*

**ISSUE:** Associate Director Giedt provided an overview of the SharePoint system, noting that the entire Office of the President is migrating to this platform.

**ACTION:** UCORP will use SharePoint to the maximum extent possible.

## **VII. Systemwide Review Items**

### 1. [Systemwide Review of Salary Equity Study](#)

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed the methodology employed by the study's authors, wondering if other indicators might have yielded more robust data. Members noted that the largest single factor in salary advancement was the securing of an outside offer. Members observed that the report did not investigate any possible causes for the reported equity gaps.

**ACTION:** UCORP will continue discussion of the Salary Equity Study at its next meeting.

### 2. [Systemwide Review of APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan](#)

**DISCUSSION:** Members inquired how the current draft differed from the status quo, and it was reported that the new draft is supposed to include improved grievance procedures. Members noted that the negotiated aspect of many health sciences faculty salaries increases the likelihood of personality conflicts, underlining the need for clearer grievance procedures.

**ACTION:** UCORP elected not to opine on this item.

### 3. [Systemwide Review of New APM 668, Negotiated Salary Program](#)

**DISCUSSION:** Members wondered how much pressure faculty would feel to shift their effort to securing outside sponsorship, but were unclear what impact that shift might have on funding for other aspects of the research enterprise, such as graduate student or post-doctoral scholar support. Members also wondered what morale impacts the proposed program would have on non-participants. Some members wondered what the precise criteria would be for the "good standing" requirement.

**ACTION:** UCORP will continue discussion of this item at its next meeting.

### 4. [Systemwide Review of APM 200 and APM 205](#)

**DISCUSSION:** Members supported changing the 43% recall maximum benchmark to an annualized calculation.

**ACTION:** UCORP elected not to opine on this item.

### 5. [Systemwide Review of Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 610 \(residency\)](#)

**ISSUE:** The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) has ruled that students do not need to be physically present to receive baccalaureate credit, regardless of the requirements for in-state versus non-resident tuition, but the advent of the online education era has changed the discussion dynamics.

**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that not all research is done "on campus," either, and so greater flexibility in determining academic residency might be useful.

**ACTION:** UCORP will submit a letter endorsing the proposed amendments.

### **VIII. Campus Updates**

#### *Members*

Berkeley: The local council on research (COR) has a good working relationship with the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR). COR internal grant distribution and disbursement processes are being reviewed.

Davis: UCD has a new VCR, and technology transfer processes are on the agenda. COR priorities include grant management software and the efficacy of information technology service centers.

Irvine: Local organized research units (ORUs) were recently nearly all disestablished during an effort to improve strategic decision-making processes and outcomes. Both processes and outcomes will need to be revisited in the coming year.

Los Angeles: Local COR funds will be preferentially given to areas that receive lower market support. UCLA now has a new VCR, and COR has prioritized developing better business relations.

Merced: (Representative TBD.)

Riverside: The divisional COR met last week, and set as a goal for the year implementing more best practices. COR has also been invited to help vet limited submission RFPs. UCR is getting a new (VCR), and COR has high hopes for renewed engagement.

San Diego: ORU reviews continue, and a graduate student bill of rights has been introduced and is being vetted.

San Francisco: Local COR is changing its pre-awards processes, and the impacts of those changes are being monitored.

Santa Barbara: Local ORUs are also under evaluation, with the hope of elevating their profile.

Santa Cruz: The local COR meets tomorrow, and will discuss how to proceed with a 25% budget cut for 2011-12. ORU reviews are on hold, pending budget outcomes.

### **IX. New Business and Planning**

**\*\*None.\*\***

Adjournment at 3:55.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: John Crawford, UCORP Chair