

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Minutes of Meeting
December 8, 2014****I. Chair's Announcements**

Liane Brouillette, Chair

Update: Chair Brouillette updated the committee on several items of interest from the Academic Council meeting of November 24, 2014:

- Governor Brown named two new Regents just hours before the November meeting: Former Assembly Speaker John Perez and Long Beach Community College President Eloy Ortiz Oakley. The Regents passed the proposed tuition increase plan and voiced disappointment in the amount of Prop 30 funds being allocated to UC. The proposed tuition increase would impact all forms of tuition equally.
- UC's budget projections assume a 1% enrollment growth rate, but no increases in staffing. A systemwide enrollment plan may be developed; Los Angeles and Berkeley seem to have reached the "tipping point" in non-resident enrollments. An effort to decouple undergraduates and graduates in non-resident discussions has begun.
- A 3% raise for non-represented employees was approved by the Regents.
- President Napolitano indicated that the vice president for research and graduate studies position would be divided into two jobs- one focusing inwardly and one facing outward. Reg Kelly was appointed on a one-year basis as Senior Advisor to the President for Innovation. He will focus on developing templates for external contracts, but campuses will develop strategies.
- Transfer applications are flat so far this year. The goal is 1 transfer for each 2 admits.
- EVP Brostrom reported that each tuition dollar generates \$0.63 in financial aid.
- California revenues are exceeding expectations to date, but UC is unlikely to receive additional funds from the state pending further negotiations. The governor wants to explore new cost and education models for the university, for example, one that explores a no-growth university or one that offers three-year degrees.
- The disposition of NRST income is still being left to campus discretion.

II. Consent Calendar**1. Minutes of November 10, 2014**

Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III. Campus Updates

Members were asked to report specifically on campus innovation practices.

Berkeley: Absent.

Davis: [Innovation Access](#) at UCD has 3 audiences: faculty, industry, and investors. Staff are being hired to liaise more with industry and start-ups. A new program, Venture Catalyst, targets small grants to start-ups. A warehouse-style incubator has been leased, and student

entrepreneurship competitions for start-ups have a long tradition on campus. New communications are being developed to better relate to the public at large.

Irvine: Irvine Representative Edwards represents UCORP on the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) and the Senate on the Innovation Council's Entrepreneurial Environment working group. The latter group has been meeting every-other week, and they have heard from many stakeholder groups on commercialization obstacles. Many existing options are not well advertised, and new efforts need local champions on campus and in the community. Various functions to raise awareness of the potential benefits of commercialization are also being explored.

Los Angeles: Investigation on-going.

Merced: Campus efforts are focusing on developing business-friendly protocols that faculty who are not adept at negotiations can use. Faculty coaching is being discussed.

Riverside: Absent.

San Diego: UCSD is the only campus that has full responsibility for all aspects of technology transfer and commercialization processes. The VCR has indicated that other campuses are taking on more responsibility in this area, though. UCSD is ahead because it had a large number of IT transfers, not biomedical transfers which have become more common. IT requires a faster turnaround, and a new distribution model was developed: More funds are given to the investigator; local partnerships are viewed as critical. An "express licensing method" to turnaround engineering and physical sciences transfer applications in one month is being tested. A similar template for biological sciences is being explored. Data suggests that profit growth is marginal, but the data are not precise. Many parts of the process were siloed, and better cooperation is essential to improving experiences and outcomes.

San Francisco: Reg Kelly is formerly from UCSF and led [QB3](#), one of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). UCSF has seen slow growth in incubators, but external factors are not known.

Santa Barbara: Investigation on-going.

Santa Cruz: Toxic campus politics and a lack of support for support staff have left faculty without guidance in this area.

Discussion: Members wondered who was collating and promulgating best practices, and further wondered how much systemwide leadership would benefit commercialization efforts given the variation in California markets and geography. Members also wondered about duplication of effort at the system and divisional levels, and how each role could best be defined and limited.

Members discussed how faculty could be incentivized to commercialize their research, and whether private motives could conflict with institutional goals. Members agreed that resources need to be made available to individuals, and that resources should be easily accessible. Most complaints about the status quo involve the opacity of the process, not the value of commercialization. Many procedural concerns are local idiosyncrasies that require localized solutions. Another widely reported concern is that the procedures in place take too long – an ideal process would take only 1 month, not the 18 months commonly reported today.

IV. Consultation with ANR

Note: Item deferred.

V. Consultation with Senate Leadership

Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair

Update: Vice Chair Hare updated the committee on several items of interest:

- APM 210.1.D (Review and Appraisal Committees)
Vice Chair Hare reminded members that they are asked to opine on the UCOP-proposed compromise language advanced by UCAP and UCAAD, not to the informal counterproposal being circulated. The goal of the official proposal is to clarify how to best reflect diversity-related activities in CAP reviews. Is the proposed language an improvement?
- Regents Meeting of November 19-20, 2014
 - 1) Budget negotiations with the state are iterative and will continue throughout the spring. The proper level of state support for UC will be the focus of much discussion. That Governor Brown vetoed additional funding for UC the same day he approved a tax break for Hollywood studios suggests the issue is one of priority, not money. To help demystify UC, the Governor proposed working groups on his priority areas – 3-year degrees, increased use of online educational delivery models, etc., – but his list omitted graduate studies and research. Since many areas the Governor is interested in fall in the Senate’s purview, the relevant Senate committees may be called on to help respond to inquiries.
 - 2) Proposed Senate Constitutional Amendment 1 would strip UC of its constitutional autonomy and give the legislature more direct control of UC operations. UC opposes the proposal.
- Total Remuneration
The divisions are also working to define a path forward to close the faculty remuneration gap. Divisional representatives to UCFW, UCPB, UCAP, and UCAAD should have been invited to meetings with EVCs and other local administrators to identify local priorities and options. Systemwide workgroups will convene in January to consider the received feedback.
- Undergraduate Admissions
So far, there is a 5% increase in freshman applications, and a modest increase in transfer applications.
- Advocacy
The UCSA president was summoned to Sacramento to meet with the Governor’s Chief of Staff, where he reported that students opposed most of the governor’s priority projects, such as 3-year degrees and expanded online education.

VI. Consultation with Office of Research and Graduate Studies

Bill Tucker, Interim Vice President, ORGS

Dotti Miller, Deputy to the Interim Vice President

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Programs Office

Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

1. Technology Transfer Obstacles

Issue: VP Tucker noted that his predecessor had conducted a limited survey on tech transfer obstacles, and most respondents indicated a lack of resources was the main obstacle. VP Tucker added that industry is thought to use deadline pressure to cut or curtail faculty IP rights and guarantees. It is thought that a master template will help alleviate this pressure, but disciplinary differences complicate the issue. Further, UC is constrained by federal regulations and public access requirements that sometimes conflict with proprietary commercialization efforts. Director Streitz noted that FY 13 saw 1600 different sponsored project agreements; master templates exist for non-profits and clinical work, but not yet for engineering and technology fields.

Discussion: Members suggested that corporate cooperation and concessions should also be sought, not just unilateral changes by UC. Members asked about the length of time the tech transfer process required, and Director Streitz replied that most questions are handled by the campuses so there is no central tracking for time or other metrics. Some campuses have good tracking tools that could be adapted for use elsewhere. Members asked if a separate fund/guidance for students would be established, but VP Tucker indicated there were no central resources so any action would be done locally. He added that another obstacles inventors face is that investors do not usually invest in “proof of concept” projects.

2. Portfolio Review Group Next Steps

Issue: Additional PRG background materials have been made available to UCORP for deeper scrutiny; not all materials have been made publicly available, though. New materials include: 1) FAQs, definitions, and a process map; 2) a background of the PRG operations; 3) a charge document with roster, roles, and responsibilities; 4) a Conflict of Interest statement; 5) principles for alignment; and 6) templates sent to program directors for completion, as well as a list of the appendices the PRG asked to review. The materials listed in (6) will be pared, reflecting what PRG members found most useful. ORGS is drafting an update on the implementation of PRG recommendations; it will be shared with UCORP when it is ready. UCORP may send further suggestions for the refinement of PRG framing materials by the end of the academic year.

Discussion: VP Tucker noted that future conversations could focus on the political will to cut programs versus the academic merit of cutting them. Director Croughan added that the PRG tweaked some of the principles suggested by UCORP and the [PPA](#) process, so a careful review is merited.

3. Research Web Presence

Update: Deputy Miller referred members to the [research news link](#) in the agenda, and noted that ORGS had been meeting with OP groups to discuss their communication needs. This is the first such assessment attempted by ORGS. Issues to address include the continuity of research management when personnel changes occur.

Discussion: Members noted that research needs a greater presence on UC webpages, overall, especially campus webpages.

4. Openness In Research

Update: Director Streitz reported that she has scheduled spring meetings with CCGA and UCAF, and she will report back after those meetings.

5. Data Access and Management

Update: Director Streitz noted that this was the resumption of a process started nearly 5 years ago, before significant personnel changes derailed the project. The original work group has been reconvened, and VCR feedback has been solicited. Benchmarks from competitors are being updated. Most concerns focus on stewardship of data and materials during instances of researcher separation from the University. It is not yet known whether the final report will recommend a policy or guidelines in this area. A complete draft should be ready in the spring for review.

It is expected that the new report will include: a statement of purpose; a section on ownership citing APM 020; a section on data sharing expectations – not requirements; a section on research responsibilities regarding accessibility and transferability of data, as well as duties to co-researchers and sponsors; and a section outlining separation procedures.

Discussion: Members wondered whether a policy or guidelines would best be suited to address concerns in this area. Director Streitz shared her opinion, which is that a policy is needed since “teeth” would conceivably be required. The drafting process included representatives from the Office of General Counsel (OGC), and the [Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee](#) (SLASIAC) is currently editing the draft. The [California Digital Library](#) (CDL) is working to create a data repository similar to the Open Access repository. Members wondered if some disciplines and technologies advanced too fast for a formal policy to govern actions. Specific practices for software upkeep and the like should probably be addressed in accompanying appendices or related guidelines affiliated with the policy that can be more easily updated.

Members also asked if researcher “ownership” was to apply to data and/or to inventions. Director Streitz indicated just inventions at present. She added that some flexibility for local interpretation will be included. Members noted that a successful policy would not increase the administrative burden on faculty and researchers. Members added that the policy/guidelines should address research with authors from institutions with different stewardship policies, too.

6. Federal Grant Uniform Guidance

Update: New federal guidelines for grant operations have been issued, and a systemwide working group is identifying changes that impact UC the most. Systemwide research administrators have also opined. FAQs will be developed and circulated for feedback. Many changes impact accounting practices and allowable costs, such as for computing equipment and shared large purchases (>\$3K). This threshold is felt by many to be too low, and UC supports a coalition appealing that decision. The large purchase change was stayed until July 1, 2016, pending further evaluation, but the remainder of the changes will go into effect Dec 26, 2014. The new rules do not apply to old awards, so there will be two sets of rules for a while.

VII. **Systemwide Review Items**

1. Proposed President’s Policy on Open Access

Issue: The proposed policy would expand the open access policy passed last year to all university publishers, not just Senate faculty.

Discussion: Members sought clarification as to whether students were employees for this purpose – as opposed to others like RAs and TAs – and suggested developing a process map/decision tree. The disposition of copyright would also benefit from greater clarity. Members noted that a Presidential policy would elevate research, and agreed that it would be reasonable to have one deposition policy for all researchers.

Action: Chair Brouillette and Analyst Feer will draft a response for electronic approval.

2. Proposed Amendments to APM 210.1.D (Review and Appraisal Committees)

Discussion: Members wondered what harm this revision is designed to redress, and others noted that the presence of diversity does not lead to academic or research excellence nor should it supplant such excellence. Members questioned the drafting of the language, wondering if the target was research into diversity or diversity on research teams? All agreed that research into diversity should be held to the same standards of excellence as research into other fields, and sought proof that it was not being evaluated in such a manner so as to necessitate this amendment. Others noted that teaching, research, and service were not equally weighted by CAPs now, and suggested that these proposed edits do little to clarify the situation.

Action: Chair Brouillette and Analyst Feer will draft a response for electronic approval.

VIII. MRPIs and The Compendium

Issue: Chair Brouillette recounted the history of MRUs and the MRPI conversion in 2009. At that time, the creation of MRPIs was a significant enough change that UCORP felt the differences and operations of MRPIs should be explained in a governance document, such as The Compendium. However, the Academic Planning Council asserted that MRPIs are not programs to be established or disestablished, and as such, have no place in The Compendium. APC took no action on the suggested revisions, and now asks UCORP to reconsider including MRPIs in The Compendium.

Discussion: Members wondered if MRPI funding would be secure going forward if the program was not codified in The Compendium, and Chair Brouillette indicated that she and others had been given assurances that the program and its funds will continue.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo supporting APC's decision not to include MRPIs in The Compendium for electronic approval.

IX. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Liane Brouillette, UCORP Chair