

**Minutes of Meeting
October 8, 2012**

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Kleeman welcomed new and returning members, who in turn introduced themselves.

II. UCORP Overview and Announcements

OVERVIEW: Chair Kleeman provided an overview of the UCORP's charge and responsibilities. UCORP members should bring new issues before the committee on a pro active basis, and not wait to be asked for comment. Chair Kleeman also outlined the correspondence process and the lines of the communication through the Academic Council to the President, separate from UCORP's ability to communicate directly with its named consultants. Members were encouraged to bring not just their campus perspective to the committee, but also their own critical thinking skills and analyses. Confidential materials will be clearly marked, or accompanied by a clear statement restricting circulation; information contained in publicly accessible websites is not confidential. When confidential materials are presented to the committee, members may discuss the concept with their counterpart committees and local constituents, but are asked not to share or disseminate restricted materials.

DISCUSSION: Members asked how the Regents are selected and what their role in governance is. Chair Kleeman indicated that the Regents are appointed by the governor and ratified by the state legislature for 12 year terms. The Board of Regents has ultimate legal responsibility for the welfare of the university, and sets key policies governing compensation, physical plant maintenance, and tuition.

Announcements:

Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:

1. Academic Council meeting of October 3: If Proposition 30 does not pass in November, UC will face an additional \$225M in "trigger cuts"; it is expected that the Regents will raise tuition to compensate for the further loss in state funds. The proposed Negotiated Salary Trial Plan pilot, "rebenching", online education, open access publishing, and copyright are all issues before the Senate (see Item V below). New lab safety standards are being developed and promulgated, partly due to legal obligations arising from the settlement of a criminal case; UCORP members should think carefully whether the new standards have broader, policy-based implications.
2. Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR): ANR is funded by a tax levied against each of the campuses, and its work is research intensive. Previously, however, research faculty have had little systemic role to play in determining goals and evaluating outcomes. The Senate has been given seats on the ANR Program Council, and additional Senate nominees are being sought.

3. Department of Energy National Labs: The DOE national laboratories are run by LLCs, to which UC is one partner. UC uses the fees it earns from being a co-manager to fund joint UC-lab research projects.
4. Program Review Group (PRG): The PRG grew from the report generated last year by UCORP, the Vice Chancellors for Research (VCRs), and the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS). That project was the Task Force on Principles, Policy and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research (PPA), and its report was endorsed by the Academic Council and sent to President Yudof for evaluation and eventual adoption. Currently, the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is vetting Senate nominees to the PRG, the group identified to weigh the pros and cons of the systemwide research portfolio balance and allocations, and to recommend strategic investment opportunities. Additional nominees may be submitted following the meeting.
5. Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC): UCORP has an ex officio position on TTAC; interested members should contact Chair Kleeman after the meeting.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Bob Powell, Academic Council Chair

Bill Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair

Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

UPDATE: Council Chair Powell also noted that additional Senate faculty representation on the ANR program council was being sought. Members should be mindful of communication restrictions regarding University property and time vis-à-vis the upcoming election. Specifically, discussion of Proposition 30 should follow posted guidelines. The new funding streams and rebenching models (see Item V below) would fund the Office of the President by after-the-fact taxation, rather than off-the-top culling; one rate for each student classification across the campuses will be phased-in over six years; the first funds to be allocated by the new formula would be a portion of the Proposition 30 funds, should it pass. The current iteration of Negotiated Salary Trial Program (see Item V below) was drafted by a joint Senate-administration task force at the request of former Provost Pitts. In the spring, UCORP has been invited to meet in Sacramento with state legislators; this would be the third in a series of Senate-focused meetings, after admissions and graduate affairs are discussed. At the November Regents meeting, a presentation on academic graduate student support will be made; maintaining academic and research quality will be the frame.

Council Vice Chair Jacob amplified Chair Powell's statements regarding the importance of direct lobbying in Sacramento; he encouraged members to be mindful of the impacts of term limits and the need to address legislator priorities, not just Senate priorities. The Compendium is silent on the transition from state-supported to self-supported graduate programs; this omission should be addressed. The University continues to dialogue with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), UC's accreditation grantor, regarding the applicability of outcomes-based assessments in research universities generally, and UC campuses specifically. UC's online education program has been slow to gain traction; many internal procedures need further fleshing out.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Environmental Health and Safety

Erike Young, Director, Systemwide Environment Health & Safety, Office of Risk Services
Ken Smith, Systemwide Lab Safety Manager, Office of Risk Services

ISSUE: Director Young noted that even though recent events at UC may have served as the proximate impetus for enhanced lab safety procedures, there is a national trend of improving lab safety protocols. The new lab safety culture includes the expectation that UC will have systemwide, standardized best practices. One remaining policy gap leaves unpaid student workers outside of OSHA authority. Nonetheless, in order to protect external funding, among other considerations, UC should not risk being convicted. To that end, the new standards emphasize 1) documented training, 2) personal protective equipment (PPE), and 3) standard operating procedures (SOPs). Although only chemistry and biochemistry have to meet the new standards in short order, the recently promulgated lab safety standards match California OSHA standards, and should not represent any disruption to labs that already meet them.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired after UC's overall lab safety record, as distinct from the total accident record of the University. Director Young indicated that UC's lab safety record was better than the overall University safety record; both have improved in recent years. Members noted that, in some instances, meeting the new standards would require additional resources, whether for software/recordkeeping or for PPE, such as gloves and lab coats in various sizes, materials, and cuts, and their laundering.

V. Systemwide Review Items

1. Negotiated Salary Trial Program:

DISCUSSION: Chair Kleeman noted that UCORP had opined on the NSTP precursor, draft APM 668; the previous UOCRPs' questions have not been answered. Members added that a successful outcome had not been defined: Could results be generalized from the potential sample population? How does this interact with diminishing external funding? Is the goal to expand industry collaboration and contracts?

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft the committee's response.

2. APM 430 (Visiting Scholars):

ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

3. APM 700 (Leaves of Absence):

DISCUSSION: Members were unclear as to the disposition of the research funding associated with any faculty person found to have abandoned his job.

ACTION: The committee will discuss this item further at its next meeting.

4. Rebenching:

ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on this item at this time; should divisional discussions warrant reconsideration, the committee will discuss the item again at its next meeting.

5. Open Access:

ISSUE: Chair Kleeman summarized UCORP's prior discussions of open access, and suggested that open access was inevitable; it falls to the faculty to ensure it is done wisely.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that some professional associations relied upon subscription fees for solvency, so the impacts of this publication locus shift could extend to professional credentials, not just for-profit publishing houses. Members also noted that general re-acclimation would take time and could be difficult in some areas. Nonetheless, clear precedents exist and have been successful, such as the NIH dictate that requires research it sponsors to be reported in open access repositories. Academic precedents include Harvard, Stanford, and UCSF.

ACTION: Chris Kelty, chair of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) will be invited to an upcoming meeting to discuss the matter further.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

UPDATE: Vice President Beckwith provided new members with an overview of the Task Force on Processes, Principles and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments (PPA), highlighting the Program Review Group (PRG), which will be responsible for issuing recommendations on relative funding priorities. He has nominated Paul Gray (UCB, professor and provost emeritus) to be chair, and it is hoped that the first meeting can be convened this fall.

DISCUSSION: Chair Kleeman inquired as to the review status of the PPA report, and VP Beckwith indicated that since both UCORP and the Vice Chancellors for Research participated as committees-of-the-whole and since the Academic Council had already endorsed the report, further review was not being sought. Further, feedback solicited from the executive vice chancellors had already been sought and incorporated to the drafts both groups reviewed and approved. From this point, further revisions will come from operational experience. Chair Kleeman asked what type of information the PRG will review, and VP Beckwith said the PRG will receive some budgetary information as well as some quality reviews; the goal is for the PRG to provide contextualized, systemwide recommendations for future investment, not to provide specific feedback on individual programs. The first year is expected to focus largely on assessment, with recommendations being issued in subsequent years. Chair Kleeman then asked if PIs had bought into the process, and Deputy Gautier responded that there had been a mix of responses.

UPDATE (CONTINUED): VP Beckwith updated the committee on several other topics of interest: UCORP members are encouraged to watch the lab safety video and to otherwise educate themselves regarding the new lab safety standards. Insufficient Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) continues to cost the University money; UC is working with other national parties, such as the American Association of Universities (AAU) and the Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), to increase and revise facilities and administration (F&A) standards; the Berkeley and San Francisco campuses will see their

federal ICR rates increase next year. Local CORs are encouraged to invite VP Beckwith to consult directly. The budget continues to strain research investments.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired if increased ICR would impact funds available directly for research or graduate student support. VP Beckwith noted that if overall research funds did not increase, trade-offs were inevitable, but could extend to administrative support and the physical plant, as well. Members also inquired if changes to non-resident tuition (NRT) for academic graduate students were likely. VP Beckwith responded that the report recommending changes to academic graduate student NRT contained a menu of options for increasing the University's revenue. Nonetheless, business practices are changing in nearly every corner of the University.

VII. Campus Updates

Berkeley: The local COR has significant turn over this year, and COR grant allocation guidelines are the subject of renewed discussion.

Davis: Last year's COR funded all internal applicants for small grants. Interdepartmental collaborations are being encouraged campus-wide.

Irvine: Last year saw a drop in the number of small grant applications, and this year's COR budget has yet to be determined.

Los Angeles: The campus-wide review of all organized research units has unclear next steps at this point. COR funding is still to be determined, and transdisciplinary seed grants from the VCR continue.

Merced: (absent)

Riverside: The local COR is considering granting ex officio membership to the VCR; other campus' best practices are solicited. The limits of allowable expenses for direct and indirect costs as defined in OMB A-21 are under further discussion.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will contact ORGS regarding OMB A-21 interpretation.

San Diego: Last year's internal grants were enough to cover meritorious applications. Open Access is on next week's agenda.

San Francisco: (absent)

Santa Barbara: (absent)

Santa Cruz: An external review of the VCR is coming, but the VCR has already stated his intention to retire. The COR budget has been cut, and applications for internal grants have slowed.

VIII. Further Discussion and New Business

Note: This item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will invite Provost Dorr and UCO Director Faber to upcoming UCORP meetings.

Adjournment: 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair