

**Minutes of Meeting
March 10, 2014**

I. Announcements

Bob Clare, UCORP Chair

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

1. Academic Planning Council meeting of February 18:
 - The intersections and differences between Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition need clarification. Long-term enrollment planning requires better understanding of the two, as do public discussions about the Master Plan.
 - Best practices and governing principles for non-resident tuition and enrollment are needed: impacts to diversity, California resident enrollment, and cross-campus parity require explication.
 - Open Access is still under discussion. Other end-user groups, such as graduate student researchers and post-doctoral scholars are asking for a larger voice. It became clear that graduate students do not own copyright under most circumstances, but the lines are blurry: classroom work versus research lab work, single author versus co-authors, and varying publisher policies need further explanations.

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of Meeting of February 10, 2014
Action: The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Campus Updates

Berkeley: No new business to report.

Davis: The Davis provost outlined an incentivized budget model, which includes rebates on non-resident tuition, and is designed to make it easier to admit international students. However, the model also includes rebates tied to graduate student enrollment, but not all departments want to increase their graduate student numbers. Another aspect of the model is an assumed increase in the number of masters programs, which is viewed as a simple revenue generation tool, unrelated to academic quality or projected workforce needs. This model is troubling because it is expected to overtax already stretched support funds.

Discussion: Members observed that the change seems motivated by financial concerns, not academic ones. Members asked if there were specific reasons given for seeking an increase in MAs, and Representative McKee answered that increasing the teacher population was mentioned, but that the School of Education disagrees with the plan. At least one other campus reported that they had also been told to increase Masters throughput.

Irvine: The campus's total research budget is under discussion. Many are eager to learn the results of the Berkeley experiment, especially as a similar per faculty allotment has been proposed locally. A proposal to restore campus research funding to 2008-09 levels is still pending.

Los Angeles: 1) The internal grant review process continues. 2) Animal rights protesters have again increased the frequency of actions, and have begun protesting at researchers' residences, not just labs. COR is considering issuing a statement of support for animal researchers, being mindful of 1st Amendment guarantees.

Discussion: Chair Clare encouraged a cautious approach since this issue can easily escalate and bring personal safety concerns to the fore.

Merced: (Absent)

Riverside: A preliminary discussion of the Portfolio Review Group's Cycle 1 findings was held.

San Diego: Discussion continues regarding the role and strategic value of ORUs on campus. For certain disciplines, campus support is critical. However, the number of ORUs on campus precludes simultaneous evaluation, and the time lags in findings has so far precluded reaching a consensus. Criteria under consideration for strategic evaluation of ORUs include: undergraduate educational impact; graduate student recruitment impact; professional conferences, publications, and citations; diversity; time opportunity costs; and financial leveraging success.

San Francisco: 1) The PRG report was circulated; discussion is expected at the next meeting. 2) The spring deadline for research grants passed last week, and submissions will be announced in May. 3) Research assistants and study coordinators have been reclassified as clinical research coordinators; this was done at Human Resources' request and without faculty input or notification. The change may be beneficial for drug and device trials, but it ignores certification requirements for some social and behavioral sciences, so the real impact is not yet known. Human Resources says this change is occurring everywhere, but so far no confirmation has been received, not even by anecdote.

Santa Barbara: 1) COR consulted with the campus biology and chemical lab safety officer. 2) A preliminary discussion of the PRG Cycle 1 findings was held.

Santa Cruz: (Absent during this item.)

Graduate Student: Graduate Representative Muir reported that UCSA adopted a resolution for the creation of a new Master Plan to reflect changing external realities, such as demographic changes in the California population, changing intersegmental relationships, and newly emergent articulation obstacles. The resolution calls for a comprehensive survey administered to many stakeholder groups. The state political environment seems ripe for this discussion.

Discussion: Chair Clare noted that student support in calls for aligning enrollment, physical capacity and teaching capacity would be welcome.

IV. President's Initiatives

Nina Robinson, Associate President and Chief Policy Advisor

1. Food Security

Issue: This is a new project that emerged in conversation between the chancellors and the president. The project's scope and goals are still being defined, but will focus on food safety and delivery, will involve faculty from public health, law, medicine, and Agriculture and Natural Resources, as well as student groups and governmental relations. So far, each chancellor has nominated at least one person to a steering committee that will convene for the first time this Wednesday. A first step is to catalogue, coordinate, and leverage current UC efforts, both internally and externally. Internally, the focus is expected to be on procurement, housing and dining, etc. Externally, the focus will be to bring to bear UC's intellectual resources on a large, public crisis.

Discussion: Members asked who was on the steering committee, and AP Robinson said she would send the membership when finalized. Members asked if on-campus fast food establishments would be in this bailiwick, and AP Robinson said it can be added to the topic list. Members asked if FTE would be assigned to the project, and AP Robinson indicated that it might occur at some point in the future; a lead coordinator will probably be needed. Members noted that cataloguing and coordinating current efforts could be a significant chore as many departments continue to operate in disciplinary silos; because of cultural pulls and sociological trends, an interdisciplinary approach will be needed to bring about actual change. Similarly, the steering committee should have representation from many fields.

Members noted that food producers and food production labor standards would need included in the project, and AP Robinson agreed, adding that food related topics such as fitness, allergies, and healthy weight could all be included under this umbrella at this point. She also noted that student energy and leadership is actively being sought; any local contacts should be sent to AP Robinson.

Members asked how local resources could best be shared, and AP Robinson said that for now, she would collect names and projects. It was observed that all of the President's Initiatives would benefit from a central web repository and should have a similar level detail available. Many of the new initiatives are time-sensitive, so quick and thorough communications are needed.

2. Challenge Grants

Issue: This initiative is still in the "proof of concept" stage. It is expected to have two foci: interdisciplinary socially relevant work by younger faculty. One operational goal is to secure external funding from donors to support faculty who confront "mankind's greatest problems". It is expected that an external advisory panel will be formed to identify for the president the best topics and projects. A faculty committee would be formed to review applications. The awards could be seed money or large grants, depending on subsequent discussions. A preliminary list of donors has been drafted, and preliminary talks are underway. Possible topics include education and educational capacity; basic research; global health. The value-added will be a key criterion in project selection.

Discussion: Members noted that emphasizing younger faculty and interdisciplinary work could be difficult since younger faculty may not have as many intra- or inter-campus contacts. It was also noted that previously cut research programs frequently addressed these issues, so reinvigorating the research budget could achieve many of the programmatic goals. Chair Clare observed that careful due diligence would need to occur to prevent duplication of effort. Some wondered if external advisory panels and external funders could be another step in the privatization of the University. Nonetheless, it was agreed that President Napolitano is relying on UC's research prowess to advance these and other goals.

V. **Portfolio Review Group (PRG) Recommendations**

Discussion: Some members had questions about how the PRG members were selected, and Chair Clare related the history, noting that the Senate is underrepresented because it could not make the deadlines. Nonetheless, each campus has representation, and the process and product were supported by all participants. Some members noted that the report did not challenge

current funding levels and that not enough background information was in the report to allow a detailed evaluation of it.

Chair Clare encouraged members to discuss further both the Cycle 1 report and the Cycle 2 reports so that UCORP can submit targeted feedback, especially about the review process. Graduate Student Representative Muir suggested including students in the review process, both to bring the student perspective and to give student participants experience in this aspect of policy making.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

1. Proposal to Amend SBL 55, Round 2

Discussion: Members observed that the revised proposal still does not fully address the core issue, noting that the informal status quo measures could still achieve the same de facto results. Members also observed that all votes are only advisory to CAPs, and that CAPs are only advisory to administration. Others stated that one goal of the proposal was to improve the process by increasing participation, and therefore, legitimacy, which requires formal action.

Action: Chair Clare and Analyst Feer will draft a response for further discussion.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1. Challenge Grants

Issue: VP Beckwith continued discussion from Item IV above. He noted that the Vice Chancellors for Research like the idea of a “strike fund” to support emerging initiatives. Some consensus is emerging around the top challenges where UC can leverage its size and unique resources. Topics include environmental research with ANR and NRS; California public health research with the five medical centers; “big data” research with the DOE national labs; transportation studies with ITS; and global health research is a new area.

Discussion: Members noted that education and workforce preparation were not listed, and VP Beckwith indicated that the VCRs did not include it on their list. The task is how best to leverage \$10M, and usually the answer is by securing additional external funds. Members observed that some problems are sociological and require nuance and qualitative measures, rather than bottom line growth and favorable press.

2. MRPIs

With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Issue: Director Erwin reported that ORGS plans to issue a Call every 2 years, with 2 award options: 2-year awards for planning grants for new multicampus collaborations, and multi-year (2, 3 or 4) year awards for either new or existing multicampus collaborations. A portion of funding would be set aside for each type. This would allow a more frequent refreshing of the opportunity and portfolio, while still allowing established programs that succeed 4 years of ongoing support. The 2 year awards are non-renewable (for 2 years) but winners could apply in future rounds for the multi-year awards.

Discussion: The committee discussed how to achieve a balance of new and continuing support for programs, and how to be responsive to the PRG findings. Members also

asked how requests for continuing funds had been handled. Director Erwin replied that about half the population asked for continuation funds, and that all but one received some funds. An informal notification has been sent, and formal note is forthcoming.

Action: Members should send feedback on the draft Call directly to Director Erwin over the next 10 days.

VIII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair

Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Vice Chair

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

1. Composite Benefit Rates

Issue: New data has been received from the CFO, and it is being analyzed. Further details on the expected impact of the change are expected soon, as are reports from Berkeley and Davis, who have already experimented with CBR. Each current scenario cuts money from the research budget, with the bulk of the cuts falling on graduate student support. Additional feedback on the impact to HSCP-governed faculty is needed. The decision-making time frame is unknown, but could be as soon as early April in order to secure federal agreement and program the payroll system for a January 1, 2014 launch.

2. Shared Governance

Issue: Recent and anticipated personnel changes highlight the need for continual education regarding Shared Governance. Distinctions between the faculty and the Senate are unclear to new administrators, and the UC culture of deliberation is different from the corporate culture of “drop everything”.

3. Graduate Student Support

Issue: Later in the spring, an all UC conference on doctoral student support will occur. Graduate deans, CCGA, and ASGS will all be invited to discuss how to increase support and recruitment/retention of doctoral students. More information will be shared as it becomes available.

IX. Indirect Cost Recovery

Note: Item resolved offline.

X. Faculty Performance Metrics

Issue: This is an emerging topic, similar to student educational outcomes, but for faculty.

Discussion: Members noted that Great Britain tried a similar project that ended badly. There is a lot of literature from Europe on this topic that should be considered before UC moves too far or too quickly. Texas has also started investigating this topic. The discussion at UC is early, and the Senate can help set the terms and the frame. Possible metrics to consider are peer citations and impact factors. The NRC also has a metric that could serve as a model. UC should continue to advocate for peer review for critical assessments, not algorithms.

XI. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst
Attest: Robert Clare, UCORP Chair