

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Minutes of Meeting
Monday, December 14, 2015****1. Announcements and Agenda Review***Chair Habicht Mauche*

The next UCORP meeting is a teleconference on January 11th, 9:00-12, and will focus exclusively on the UC-Mexus Review.

- PRG Review Approval Document

The committee reviewed the draft PRG review comments for VP Bill Tucker. Discussion was primarily on the Natural Reserves System (NRS) and whether to provide specific input on their strategic plan, or to keep the comments more broadly focused on the system going forward. In debating this, the committee considered the goals for the review, which have to do with the need for program oversight, especially in light of funding streams model. The letter should make clear to the UCOP administration that UCORP supports the program and feels that ORGS/UCOP and divisional administrations bear responsibility in funding this valuable resource.

Action: The NRS director will be invited to a future UCORP meeting to talk about the implementation of the strategic plan. UCORP can provide feedback to the director at that time.

After meeting with the director, UCORP members would also like the opportunity to talk further with VP Tucker about UCOP's ongoing commitment to NRS.

Action: Chair Habicht Mauche will finalize the committee's comments on the PRG by the end of the day.

Systemwide meeting highlights:

- The Regents passed a revision of the UC Health bylaw that changes how it is governed. Nominations for a Senate representative on the oversight committee may be submitted to Divisional chairs.
- The Retirement Task Force is completing its work. President Napolitano will review it, and then it will go to the Senate for an expedited review in late January/early February. President Napolitano will then present the plan to the Regents in March, and it is expected to go into effect July 1, 2016.
- The Regents continue to work on crafting a universal "Statement on Intolerance" It has been a challenge to come up with a meaningful statement that also protects free speech.
- The Regents are putting new pressure on UC to expand the diversity of its graduates, undergraduates and faculty, including requiring new reporting of results (with data).
- The Sexual Harassment/Sexual Violence Task Force is meeting now, and will also have a draft statement ready for Senate review in February.
- The Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) may change its name to the Office of Research Strategies and Graduate Studies. The job description for the Vice President position is still being approved.
- From the ACSCOLI meeting: Lab fee reduction from LANL is still uncertain.

2. Consent Calendar

- DRAFT Minutes of Meeting, November 9, 2015

Action: November 9, 2015 meeting minutes approved.

3. Campus Updates

UCSF: Committee on Research is meeting next week and will discuss a potential policy change regarding the specialist series. The specialist title provides a means for international scholars to get into the system and get J1 Visas.

A faculty survey on whether the UC Retirement Plan impacted their decision to come to or remain at UC clearly showed that it influenced of the majority of respondents

An effort at UCSF to centralize certain HR services has not been successful.

Irvine: Search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research going on now. UCORP member Ed Dimendberg is on the search committee.

San Diego: The campus committee is interested in any upcoming Openness in Research Policy discussions.

Santa Cruz: There have been new faculty grant awards partly funded by the VCR. A small number of awardees will receive additional resources.

Merced: Concern about growth in faculty without commensurate growth in research funding. Merced has recently received some funding for internal grants and has been discussing how to allocate. Ajay Gopinathan, the Chair of Merced's COR will be representing Merced on UCORP starting in January. Deborah Wiebe had been sitting in for Gopinathan this semester, so this is her last meeting. Chair Habicht Mauche thanked Wiebe for her service.

UCLA: UCLA has a new experimental faculty research grants program for inter-disciplinary research that includes traditional arts and humanities as well as sciences.

UCLA's VCR is stepping down with short notice. There will be an interim VCR starting in January, selected by a committee. UCORP member Mark Cohen is on the search committee as chair of COR). Cohen reported that the UCLA COR has a responsibility to review ORUs, but is concerned that reports are not read. The [Compendium](#) lays out the rules for "Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units," but might not include the relevant information on divisional committee responsibility.

4. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair

- The Academic Senate representative on the new UC Health Oversight Committee will also be ex-officio on the Senate's Health Care Task Force.
- *Cyber-security news:* UC has an Electronic Communications Policy that was revised in 2005. A systemwide group is now drafting an Electronic Data Security policy. A draft of that policy will be coming to the Academic Senate in January or February for limited "management review."

An outside vendor was hired in response to the UCLA data breach to evaluate risk and attempt to identify bad actors by looking at web traffic. Some faculty were concerned about this, and discussion might occur in a couple of Academic Senate committees (Faculty Welfare and Academic Computing & Communication) and in Academic Council in January.

A couple of years ago there was an effort to set up committees on campuses and systemwide to look at balancing privacy vs. security. Berkeley actually has a group, but it is unclear whether they exist on other campuses.

Action: UCORP members are encouraged to review the Electronic Communications Policy (<http://www.ucop.edu/information-technology-services/policies/electronic-communications.html>).

- *Retirement Task Force:* When the draft becomes available, senate leadership may develop specific suggestions to guide the review by the Academic Senate. The UCSF Survey came up, and Chalfant agreed to circulate it to the committee. Most surveys on the topic seem to confirm that benefits are important to UC employees.
- *Regents:* The Regents approved the budget and new enrollment plan for adding up to 10,000 new undergraduates. They are now starting to ask whether UC has a plan for accommodating the additional load. This could dovetail with the “campus space” issue that has been brought up before. UCOP generally says about space, “we leave that to the campuses.” The additional student population could very well have an impact on research, as it affects how faculty are spending their time.
- *ACSCANR update:* No big issues right now, but note that the Agriculture and Natural Resources programs – extensions, 4H, etc., around the state – receive around \$70 million. UCORP talked with the Vice President at the end of last year. Would UCORP like to be involved in the ANR review?

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

Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives

Chris Spitzer, Coordinator – UC Research Initiatives

Dorothy Miller, Interim Deputy Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

- *Proposal Review*

Briefly touching on the PRG discussions, Chair Habicht Mauche informed Interim Deputy Miller that the Natural Reserves System (NRS) will likely become a focus of this committee in the near future. Regarding the other plans in the PRG, the main concern was that they were not really strategic.

- *President’s Research Catalyst Awards*

Director Erwin distributed information about the President’s Research Catalyst Awards, which were recently announced. The President committed \$10 million overall. There is currently \$2.1 million left after 2 years. The remaining funds will be folded into MRPI (Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives). For the next round RFP, scheduled for February, UCORP will have a chance to review the RFP before it goes out.

- *Lab Fee Research Program*

UCORP will also have a chance to review the RFP for the Lab Fee Research Program Fund in the spring. The LFRP began in 2008 with new contractual relationships between UC and the national labs (LANL & LLNL). Some of the “fee” is used for administration, management, and oversight. The rest is used for funding collaborative research between LANL/LLNL and at least one campus.

Erwin outlined three mechanisms for the LFRP that are under consideration:

1. Approximately \$400,000 will be set aside for two graduate students in-resident at the labs. The funding would be for one student at each lab for 2-3 years, and the funding would be set aside and paid out on a year-to-year basis (approximately \$60K/student/year).
2. Strategic partnerships around key collaborative areas that have been identified as strategically important (clean energy and water, predictive medicine, mesoscale materials science, and high energy density science). The idea is that because the areas are already a focus of the labs, they would contribute funding as well. These partnerships would be further restricted by requiring a minimum of 3-4 campuses and 2-3 labs.
3. Open call, as before, with a 1-to-1 partnership requirement. Projects must align with the missions of both UC and the Labs.

6. UC MEXUS Review

After an introduction to the review materials from Coordinator Chris Spitzer, the committee engaged in a preliminary discussion of the review. During the January phone meeting, the committee will continue discussion and refine its issues and questions for the Executive Director, Program Directors, and advisory committee members who will attend the February meeting. UCORP is also expected to consolidate the questions generated by CCGA and UCPB.

Erwin suggested that the committee focus on the work of the MRU for the past 5 years, as well as what they say they will do going forward. Are they meeting their own goals? Can they support their own plan for going forward?

Chair Habicht Mauche noted that she has had some involvement with UC Mexus via her graduate students and as a peer reviewer. Other committee members either had tangential knowledge of UC Mexus or none at all.

In order to focus UCORP's discussion of the review, Habicht Mauche distributed notes on potential areas for investigation. One concern was a perceived inequality in grants given out to the arts and humanities fields. From the data provided in the supplemental materials, it appears that faculty in the arts, humanities, and social sciences have received a significant share of the small faculty grants. The larger, collaborative Conacyt grants have primarily, but not exclusively, funded research in various science disciplines.

Committee members began compiling questions for the February meeting, including:

- Q. How much (amount and percentage) of the budget is spent on administration?
- Q. What is the real operating cost? (Operational costs are about \$1 million, according to the review documents.)
- Q. What is the big carry-forward shown in the review document? (This might be best formulated/asked by UCPB.)
- Q. Why were non-collaborative faculty grants discontinued?
- Q. Top-level Mexican scientists? Scholars?
- Q. Is budget aligned with mission? Is UC Mexus meeting its goals? Ask the Executive Director to provide data or evidence. (Give him time to prepare.) Does the "impact" (citations) align with the goals?
- Q. What is the percentage of awards that have resulted in publication or some sort of peer-reviewed output?
- Q. Are the small grants worthwhile? Can we find out impact?
- Q. What are your strategies for increasing the visibility of conferences? One survey response noted that communication with former grant recipients would be helpful in getting the word out about events as

well as the grants to widest audience possible. The visibility of the program may have diminished with loss of faculty grants.

Q. How does the Conacyt agreement affect UC Mexus' actions and decisions?

Q. Why are collaborative grants almost exclusively in Mexico City?

Q. What program outreach is done in Mexico?

Q. What is your decision-making process? Does the advisory council meet frequently enough? Are they effective and engaged?

Q. You mentioned the UC-Mexico Initiative in the review packet. What is your opinion/perspective?

[Note: Questions have been sent separately to UCORP chair and members for further refinement.]

Actions:

In advance of the January 11 conference call, Sri Nagarajan and Dieter Gruenert will do more analysis on the data, and Mark Cohen will look into impact of workshops and conferences.

All committee members will read the review packet document carefully.

Meeting adjourned: 3:40pm

Minutes prepared by: Joanne Miller

Approved: 1/11/16