

**UCORP Minutes**  
**November 10, 2014**

**I. Announcements**

*Liane Brouillette, UCORP Chair*

**Update:** (See also Item IV below.) Chair Brouillette noted that UCORP has been asked by the Academic Planning Council and Provost Dorr to reconsider the Compendium section that includes MRPIs. The logic is that the Compendium is for programs that are formally established, but MRPIs are not such formal entities. When MRPIs were added to the Compendium, they were a new program and represented a significant shift.

**Action:** Analyst Feer will compile greater history of the issue for consideration by the committee.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. DRAFT Minutes of Meeting of October 13, 2014

**Action:** The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

**III. Campus Updates**

Berkeley: 1) The local COR now only oversees an emeriti grant program. 2) ORU reviews are ahead. Advice on how to standardize submissions is appreciated. 3) Last year was the first year the campus gave a standard grant to all faculty. Annual awards of ~\$4000 may be pooled for up to 3 years. The program has been well received.

Davis: 1) Changes to the billing practices for animal facilities are being explored. 2) Core research services may be moved to a shared services model under the administration of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research.

**Discussion:** Members asked if there organizational reasons for the proposed shift, or if it was proposed as a cost-saving measure only. Representative Guo said the financial data are forthcoming. Expenses will be recharged to grants, etc. Members noted that questions of scale would need to be considered in implementation; one size does not always fit all. Some projects, such as animal facilities and compliance monitoring might be usefully centralized.

Irvine: (absent)

Los Angeles: 1) Changes to the faculty grants program will provide more feedback to applicants. 2) The chancellor sent an open letter to the campus in support of animal researchers. No new resources have been made available, but the show of support has value. Students who participate on research projects that involve animal subjects have also recently been targeted for harassment.

Merced: 1) A new research review protocol is being used now. 2) Limited submission practices are being clarified. 3) An online grant management system is being tested this year. 4) Establishment of a committee on library and scholarly communications has been postponed due to lack of resources. 5) No new funds are available for COR grants, even though the number of faculty has increased recently. The application and review process for COR grants are also under discussion. 6) It was asked whether recovered ICR funds could be sent to junior faculty who are hoarding start-up funds to meet basic operations.

Riverside: 1) COR meets for the first time today. 2) COR grant reviews are underway.

San Diego: ORU reviews are scheduled. A open call for new ORUs will be issued.

San Francisco: (absent)

Santa Barbara: (absent)

Santa Cruz: 1) A study of opportunity funds usage continues. 2) COR grant deadline is today.

#### **IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Mary Gilly, Chair, Academic Council*

##### **1. Announcements**

- The November Regents meeting will include discussions of budget and tuition. The timing of the release of the information precludes incorporation of Senate feedback. This topic will be politically volatile and strong responses are expected.
- The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met recently and discussed sexual assault policies, the impact of Common Core-induced retirements on the teacher pipeline, and the role of AA degrees as transfer mechanisms from the Community Colleges to CSU, but not UC. An analysis of the largest transfer majors and their preparatory curricula is underway.
- Some Prop 98 funds will be spent by the Department of Education on a career pathway transition project.
- UC Path implementation has been delayed yet again. It is also over budget.
- The Innovation Council's communications workgroup met and discussed topics such as whether an entrepreneurial environment at a research university would be attractive to internal stakeholders. Discussions of how and whether to include entrepreneurial activities in CAP reviews are getting started.

**Discussion:** Members noted that there was a difference between helping those who want to commercialize their research on the one hand, and changing the tone and direction of research on the other. Chair Gilly noted that a special advisor to the president, not a vice president, will be submitted for approval to the Regents next week for a one year term. Chair Brouillette suggested that UCORP could help identify hiccups in the tech transfer process, and other members noted that many campuses are ahead of the Office of the President in this area.

- The sexual assault task force is being chaired by SVP Sheryl Vacca. The training onus is a concern, but programs on working with victims may be needed. Federal guidelines require more frequent training than California guidelines, so merged training programs may not be possible.

##### **2. Doctoral Student Support**

**Issue:** Chair Gilly and Provost Dorr will present recommendations to improve doctoral student support to the Regents at their January meeting. The recommendations before the committee are the result of a systemwide workshop convened last April in Irvine. The recommendations address four areas: 1) non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST), 2) net stipends and multi-year support guarantees, 3) professional development, and 4) diversity.

At the conference in April, there was widespread support to end NRST after the first year of study. Assessing the costs took time, and changing the policy to that degree would require Regental action. The second recommendation is to not charge NRST to grants, and the third is to let the campuses continue to devise their own practices.

For net stipends, an average gap has been identified. To match the average stipend would require an increase of \$31M systemwide. Aspiration funding levels are at \$38M, and to be at the top of the list would require \$42M. It is unclear how much philanthropy can help close the gap. Concerns about underwriting multi-year funding guarantees have also arisen.

UCSD has a good portal for undergraduate internships and such, and it is thought to be a good model for a graduate student professional development and employment portal.

Diversity recommendations focus on expanding the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) initiative and establishing a similar program for Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). Funding for summer bridge programs is also recommended.

**Discussion:** Members noted that it would be politically difficult to propose eliminating NRST while simultaneously pursuing 5% tuition increases. Chair Gilly noted that consistency across campuses will also be scrutinized. Some felt that uniformity across the system and predictable funding would service the institution best. Others noted that the national best practice is to eliminate NRST, but again cautioned regarding external politics. The optimal level of uniformity across campuses was discussed, and it was noted that many non-residents eventually do become California residents. Some felt that NRST represented discriminatory policy.

**Action:** Chair Brouillette and Analyst Feer will draft a response to the proposals for electronic approval by the committee.

### 3. Future of Office of Research and Graduate Studies

**Issue:** Chair Gilly reported that the Academic Council will send a memo to President Napolitano noting that entrepreneurship should be considered part of research, not separate from it, that graduate studies must remain linked to the vice presidency for research, and that all faculty research is innovative.

## V. **Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies**

*Bill Tucker, Interim Vice President, ORGS*

- Advertising UC Research

*With Dottie Miller, Deputy to the Vice President*

**Update:** Many research outcomes are reported in the Accountability Report. A research time line is being developed with External Relations. Most research reporting is handled by the campuses, not systemwide, though. Different audiences may require distinct communications strategies.

- Portfolio Review Group Next Steps

*With Dottie Miller, Deputy to the Vice President*

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

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives*

**Update:** Deputy Miller reminded the committee that both the long-term strategy and the decision-makers for that strategy are still to be determined: state politics and Office of the President organizational changes complicate the process. More financial data will be provided to UCORP to help show the impacts of the PRG recommendations. Interim VP Tucker added that most of the programs involved are budget line-items, and Director

Erwin noted that the 15-16 budget will be the first time the PRG recommendations can be reflected due to oddities in the University calendar.

**Discussion:** Chair Brouillette asked what changes to the PRG process were being contemplated for the next iteration, noting specifically that faculty representation was lacking in the first Group. Deputy Miller noted that the Group recommended that the process only occur every 3-5 years, but acknowledged that faculty representation was low due to the speed with which the Group was launched. All agreed that the portfolio should be reviewed as a whole and that curating institutional memory would serve everyone well.

**Action:** Deputy Miller will share additional materials.

- MRPI RFP Update

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives*

**Issue:** Director Erwin reported that the RFP was open and that reviewers were empanelled last week. The current funding total is \$12.5M, and a success rate between 8-10% is expected. There are five subject area committees that will submit ranked recommendations to a steering committee to determine final awardees. So far, response has been enthusiastic, but there has been frustration regarding the low funding total. ORGS hopes to use the oversubscription rate as leverage for additional funding. Interim VP Tucker wondered if external funding sources could be tapped to augment the program.

**Discussion:** Members wondered if “indirect costs” could be covered as further incentive for participation, or if campuses could be asked to match funds to increase the total pot.

- Challenge Grants Update

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives*

**Update:** There is no new information to report at this time. The President's announcement has been delayed.

- Lab Fee Research Program Update

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives*

*With Kimberly Budil, Vice President, Lab Management*

*With David McCallen, Associate Vice President, Lab Management*

**Issue:** Director Erwin reminded members that this is the third cycle of this program, following 2009 and 2012. The current projected funding for 15-16 is between \$13-14M. The funding total decreases over time partly due to built-in contract de-escalators. A two-year cycle is being used now to better match other funding programs. The funded research will bring mutual benefit to the campuses and labs and serve the public interest. The areas have been identified: 1) new or short-term programs that need help getting out of the gate; 2) graduate fellows (see below); and 3) larger research and training programs, which may receive up to 4 years of funding.

- Graduate Fellowship Program Update

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives*

*With Kimberly Budil, Vice President, Lab Management*

**Issue:** This program is a new pilot under the lab fee program. The Regents have set aside an initial \$400K investment to support 3 students for 2 years or 2 students for 3 years. A 2-year award cycle would better match similar industry programs. It would provide a \$57K stipend plus expenses and would be available to UC students who have advanced to candidacy. An 8% ICR rate is included. VP Budil noted that the program is a good

strategic investment and partnership opportunity. Her office is committed to fostering more connections between the labs and campuses, to giving more students experience in the labs, and to protecting the lab free program, though fee restructuring is likely over the next few years.

**Discussion:** Members appreciated three aspects of the program: the unique educational and research opportunity that is being presented, that UC is the pipeline to lab employment, and that graduate students are the best link between the labs and the campuses. Hopefully the program can grow over time. VP Budil agreed that hands-on experience is essential to appreciating the work and culture of the labs.

- Openness in Research

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

*With Ellen Auriti, Office of General Counsel*

**Issue:** At the request of the Vice Chancellors for Research, UC is considering whether to accept federally sponsored research that includes citizenship and publication restrictions. Traditionally, UC has not accepted funds with “strings”, but this could open new avenues of research and income for the University. Some researchers reach “dead ends” and must change the direction of their inquiry or find a new means of pursuing it. In some departments, federal funding comes largely from the Department of Defense, and the number of projects they sponsor without this type of restriction is diminishing.

On the other hand, this step could restrict the availability of top graduate students to participate on research in their area and could represent a first step of compromise troubling to some. UC has long-standing commitments to principles of non-discrimination, but this change could ease that position. Another concern is that additional compliance costs would be incurred, and some infrastructure would need updated.

The new policy will include a clear statement of principles, limiting the expansion to projects funded by the federal government and for reasons of national security only. No classified research would be allowed under this possible change. Campuses would have the option to participate, having weighed carefully the benefits and impacts to students and faculty. Fundamental research would still occur in non-secure zones of the campuses.

**Discussion:** Members suggested that any new policy also include reporting requirements to detail the impact of the policy change. Members pressed for more examples of what new research would be made available, and wondered if UC was really losing out. Members noted that current consulting and OPA agreements allow this research to occur, but Director Streitz noted that such arrangements are off-campus only; the proposed change would directly involve the institution.

**Action:** Members will discuss this with campus colleagues and report back next month.

- Data Access and Management

*Note: Item deferred.*

- Uniform Guidance for Federal Grants

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

**Issue:** ORGS is developing a primer for federal grant recipients. UCORP is asked to help determine what researchers need to know.

**Discussion:** Members suggested process maps and case studies to help illustrate the process.

**Action:** Discussion will continue at the December meeting.

- Natural Reserve System Overview

*With Peggy Fiedler, Director, NRS*

**Issue:** Director Fiedler presented an overview of the NRS, its educational and research roles, and its new strategic vision. Like many UC enterprises, NRS has suffered funding cuts recently. NRS would like to see base funding restored that was lost in the funding streams realignment. Many sites have deferred maintenance needs that include leaking roofs and basic plumbing. Despite such obstacles, NRS hosts a wide range of educational programs including day trips for K-12 students, year-long ESL programs, quarter-long research programs, and spring break projects. An internal issue to resolve is that of NRS internal auditing processes; the administrative practices are sometimes as old as the physical facilities, but stricter cost control could deter some participants, such as K-12 public schools. Another concern is that the campuses with which individual reserves are affiliated set the usage fees and control the funds that flow to the facilities; the systemwide office has no role in these processes. Receiving funds from the already over-stretched EVC budgets, even local maintenance budgets, seems unlikely. Private fund raising seems like the next step, but campus-based partners will be needed. The ANR mission is distinct from the NRS mission, and those funds are not available to NRS.

**Discussion:** Members asked to whom NRS was directing its outreach efforts. Director Fiedler indicated that their target has been Sacramento and the legislature, as well as President Napolitano. She added that grants fund researchers who use NRS facilities, but that NRS does not receive indirect costs from those grants. Members suggested that NRS emphasize both its service and research mission impacts. Members also wondered what changes could be made to the NRS business model, and what role extra curricular partners like the Nature Conservancy could play. Members suggested strategically framing campaigns within the new sustainability projects and goals.

## **VI. Systemwide Review Items**

1. Proposed Amendments to APM 080 (Medical Separation) and 330 (Specialists)

**Action:** The draft response was approved as noticed.

2. Proposed Amendments to SR 682 (Residency)

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

3. Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access

**Action:** San Diego Representative Jernigan will serve as lead reviewer for this item.

4. Proposed Amendments to SBL 128.D.2 (Vice Chairs)

**Discussion:** Members had no objection to the proposed changes, so long as staffing and travel budgets were not significantly impacted.

**Action:** Analyst Feer will draft a response for approval by the committee.

## **VII. Further Discussion**

**Action:** UCORP will consider ORU evaluation practices in the spring.

**Action:** UCORP will discuss tech transfer obstacles and best practices at the December meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst  
Attest: Liane Brouillette, UCORP Chair