UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting
May 11, 2015

I. Announcements and Agenda Review, *Liane Brouillette, Chair*

Academic Council

- Salary increase – not sure if in final budget. The plan right now is to split the 3% increase = 1.5% for all faculty/off-step faculty included, and the President's plan is to have the other 1.5% spent at the Chancellor's discretion. Academic Senate proposed that all faculty members get the 3%; Chancellors' proposal was to have all 3% at their discretion. The 3% will go toward faculty who are onboard July 1, 2015 (not new hires). Chancellors will report back to the President on how the 1.5% was used.

- Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence Policy – This will be discussed at the next Council meeting regarding changes. Changes are needed under Title IX because sexual harassment victims sued under Title IX and won.

- *The Conversation* – This daily online publication which is entirely written by professors is being piloted in U.S.; it was started in Australia. It is supported by 6 different large foundations, and the ideal of this publication it to present accurate information of articles that contain 600-800 words since so much misinformation is in the media. Bruce Wilson, who oversees the Development and University Relations, is trying to encourage UC to participate by visiting each of the campuses; he already went to UC Irvine. Currently, there is also East Coast Participation.
    - Reprinted for free.
    - Chance for broader audience.
    - *The Conversation* relies on faculty to pitch to them. Chair Brouillette tried to pitch to them.
    - The articles are based on previous publications that have been peer-reviewed, and will take opinion articles if the author has proper credentials.
    - *Chair Brouillette went out over the PowerPoint (in the agenda).*
    - Ideal: democratize knowledge with 60 editors, and to make academic articles newsworthy.
    - Cost? Maybe institutional sponsorship? Chair Brouillette responded that *The Conversation* is relying on foundations. Vice Chair Habicht-Mauche stated that it sounds like the long-term funding model would be that institutions would buy-in, like a subscription cost.
    - This is journalistic writing of research. If the article is too academic, *The Conversation* will make suggestions.
    - Is every article edited? Perhaps; the author has final approval.
    - Bruce Wilson maybe interested in CORs. He would like to meet both faculty and administration, such as Communications; **please send Chair Brouillette an email if UCORP members are interested.**

- UC Electronic Newsletter – *UCOP Communications representative was not able to attend the meeting.* UCORP wants more news about UC research.

II. Consent Calendar, *Liane Brouillette, Chair*

Please send Analyst Jocelyn Banaria any edits to the April 2015 minutes, so that a vote in June can occur.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

3. Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Access Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services (Comments due by May 15, 2015)

- Question on what is an Accelerator.
- UCSC COR is making sure that those doing research have priority with the space/facilities.
- At UCM, the Designated Campus Manager (DCM) provides an annual report to faculty body.
- There was a recommendation to make Section C-2 clearer.
- Another suggestion involved the guidelines and to work with the Academic Senate closer.
- This is instead of recharge, and involves industry contracts.

III. Innovation Council and UC Ventures Update, *Michele Cucullu, Director, Private Equity – Office of Chief Investment Officer*

- Finalizing strategizing UC Ventures. $250 million, with 10% to innovation on the campuses. The 10% doesn't have to get deployed. This can be local funds, where the "eyes and ears can be on the ground."
- The business plan of UC Ventures is over 100 pages. One part of the business plan includes a syndication requirement. If less than $100 million, would need to syndicate.
- Should UC Ventures continue with companies that do not look promising? UC would have to bring another co-investor.
- Current status. March 10, 2015 – present Investment Strategy Internal Committee was approved. It will continue to work across the University. With the Communication engagement plan, feedback was received. The plan is to present a business case to Regents on May 27, 2015. There are conversations with outside recruiters to select a recruiting firm, and it will probably take 6 months to get team in place. The plan is to launch the fund after team selection – perhaps in Spring 2016. They will take their time to select the team so that they can be careful in the selection.
- Discussion followed.
    - There will be 4-6 individuals on the team.
    - Senate Chair Gilly and Vice Chair Hare are involved with the business strategy, as well as the campuses. Director Cucullu is making visits to campus VCRs, Tech Transfer teams, Innovation Centers, Incubators, Accelerators.
    - There is a FAQs document, and is looking to distribute it, and is open to suggestions.
    - **Analyst Banaria will follow-up with Director Cucullu regarding FAQs document to distribute to UCORP.**
    - Regarding the draft guidelines, some are unsure about the DCM. This is not Director Cucullu's area; it is the area of Bill Tucker of ORGS.
    - Members commented about ensuring faculty lines of communication are there. Director Cucullu agrees. For her next campus visits, she will do that. She will be at UCI Irvine May 28 -29, 2015, for the water symposium.
    - **Please direct to Director Cucullu what other campus groups she could meet.**
- Other updates.
    - Director Cucullu's group is looking at technology platforms, and trying to manage alumni relationships as mentors.
    - Additional team investing. **Director Cucullu will send the information on local fund requirement**. Return a part of the profits to the campus.

- Another deal-flow: the creation of Angel funds. The local team will manage them/themselves, which will have own team, own accounting firm, and run autonomously. No connection to UC Ventures. They may invest with UC Ventures.
- Director Cucullu has been working closely with Reg Kelly, who is working on this.
- There have been no investments thus far through UC Ventures.

IV. Systemwide Review Items *(continued)*

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost – Academic Personnel

Janet Lockwood, Director of Academic Policy & Compensation – Academic Personnel

1. *Proposed Revisions to APM-360, Librarian Series and APM-210-4, Instructions to Review Committees*
   (Comments due by May 15, 2015)

- Some librarians are represented by Unions and some are not, so Academic Personnel would like to make policy in line with contract. They found that policy hasn't been reviewed in decades, and are also cleaning up policy. The UC Council of University Librarians (CoUL) and the Council of Library Associations have been involved with this policy revision. Those who are not represented, there is a significant management role, but they are in the same series as those in the represented group.
- Discussion.
  - At many other universities, the librarians have faculty status. Vice Provost Carlson stated in her research, ½ are and ½ are not.
  - Who is the "Designated University Official"? It will be the Chancellor.
  - Any impact on Research Policies? No.
  - UCORP should opine since Librarians deal with fields of Humanities, etc.
- **Chair Brouillette will write a short statement to support the proposed revisions.**

2. *Final Review – Proposed Revisions to APM 210-1-d* (Comments due by May 21, 2015)

- This version is clearer and easier to understand, and also reflects the "undue weighting".
- There is a troubling phrase about research, specifically, the phrase " get credit for." Some think that current language is problematic. This is about getting legitimate credit, not extra credit.
  - On one campus, the search committees demand this information in the application process. And the committees attend a special session on how to evaluate.
- The APM does not include criteria for advancement. Yes, it's in the APM.
- This is not a 4th criteria.
- There is a communications need; people don't understand how to fill out the form.
- UCAAD was collecting how campuses carried out 210-1-d, explicit or integrated? Information is collected both ways.
- Examples? Great idea, but got push back to do centrally. Better done locally.
- Is there a study on the burden on UREM and female faculty at UC? Vice Provost Carlson stated that that hasn't been studied, but there is lots of research in this area. The UC climate survey may have some of that information from the question "How equitable the review process is?"
- **Director Lockwood will send the Academic Personnel website that contains the document with examples to Analyst Banaria** so that it can be shared with the members of UCORP, and they can share it with their CORs.
- Discussion followed regarding UCSF online CV management, self-assessments (i.e., teaching, research, diversity), bio bib, where to place community service, a template that has "also include contribution to diversity" – should this be separate or integrated?, and double-counting.

- It was concluded that UCORP is in support of the proposed revisions.

VI. Consultation with Office of the President

Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives, Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

- Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) – 1st round competition in 2009, last year – 2nd round competition. New awards in January 2015. 20 projects received funding, and there is an updated list on their website (http://ucop.edu/research-initiatives/programs/mrpi/2015-Awards.html).
- Able to get $2million/year augmentation, and it starts next year.
- 20 MRPI + 5 Catalyst awards. 186 proposals with 25 funded.
- Announcement for next opportunity? Don't know deadline yet.
- Draft RFP to UCORP, post on website to solicit comments.

- The Lab Fee Research Program is funded by income from Los Alamos and Livermore labs to highlight research partnerships. Monies were swept from their budget, so no competition this year. It is hopeful that the monies will be restored. The plan is to request $14 million from Regents. This program will fund new graduate fellowships, which is a pilot project. It is intended for UC graduate students who are doing dissertation research. They can apply for 2 years of funding (such as in-residence fellowship at the labs). They would receive mentorship from a UC faculty advisor. This pilot project would fund 2 graduate students. There is a lab commitment component, which would provide a meaningful research opportunity, and would receive another type of mentoring. The students would spend a significant time at the labs.

- Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) program – Undergraduate Summer Research Training Internships to those who enrolled at an HBCU. There may be an extension to Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) and Tribal Colleges; they are looking into it and it's at the very early stages.

- Catalyst Awards – A request for proposals (RFP) was distributed to UCORP, which resulted in over 200 participants over 3 phone calls. The letters of intent (LOIs) are due June 4, 2015, which will hopefully result in 30 proposals. Senate Chair Mary Gilly agreed to be part of the LOI review.

Chris Spitzer, Coordinator – UC Research Initiatives, Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

- Multicampus Research Units (MRU) Review
    - *Handed out 15-year review template (is in today's agenda).*
    - Phone call meeting which included UCORP Vice Chair Judith Habicht-Mauche, UCORP member David Noelle (UCM), and Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Vice Chair Valerie Leppert. UCORP member Massimo Mazzotti (UCB) sent in feedback. Comments included the definition of an MRU. The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) agreed to have a small group too, and would provide feedback on the budget section. During this call, the following topics came up:
        - The question of why 15 years for a review.
        - Making it clearer that one of the outcomes of a Sunset review is actually a sunset of an MRU (i.e.., "if you were to be refunded, what would you do that is new, etc.?")
        - Can there be an MRU without systemwide funding?

        - UCORP member Noelle stated that the original draft was more strict, and lobbied to be more flexible. CCGA Vice Chair Leppert asked to include graduate student education.
    - Graduate student should be highlighted upfront.
    - Biosketch – may want to give more guidance.
    - Perhaps the review is of the team, not just the Director. MRU is not a research grant. The Director's appointment has to be renewed every 5 years. The MRU and Director review has gotten out of sync. Qualifications should be focused also on the team, not just the director. The Director is committed for 5 years vs. the leadership team.
    - 15-page narrative doesn't include bio sketch. Is this the correct length? Maybe a more open-ended section regarding the Director's bio sketch.
    - Perhaps allow letters of support to be attached, such as submitting names to Director Erwin and her unit can solicit for letters of support as well as look at the impact. In June 2015, ORGS will show the template to the MEXUS Director and ask for names for external letters, but they would like to show the reports to the expert letter writers.
        - What is the purpose of the external letters? Review from what they know or what is in the report? Not an external review
    - Ideas for the review
        - Maybe invite Director to do a presentation at UCORP.
        - Could identify site visit from a small sub-committee from UCORP.
        - What are the goals? Want the Directors to stay sharp; reduce the administrative burden; and trying to find balance.
        - Q&A live sessions or webinar that is recorded for the UCORP, CCGA and UCPB to participate.
    - Next teleconference – in 2-3 weeks.
    - **Send to the UCORP listserv:** wording, comments, feedback by Monday, May 18th.
    - **Coordinating the visits – Director Erwin will work with Analyst Banaria in September**

Bill Tucker, Interim Vice President – Research & Graduate Studies

- Search for VP. Interim VP Tucker hasn't seen the job description. The Provost asked Interim VP Tucker to continue as Interim onto 2015-16.
- UC Observatory (UCO) Director search is close to completion.
- Innovation Council. There is very little ORGS focus. There are two workgroups – (a) Reward and Recognition and (b) Entrepreneurship. They have begun to look at mechanics and policy issues. In addition, there is a focus group regarding the entrepreneurial area. There is another workgroup to help President's Senior Advisor Reg Kelly with Academic Innovation Centers. This workgroup would address: (a) how would structures should be set up for other fields and (b) getting knowledge out and benefitting the public
- Grad Slam occurred last Monday, May 4, 2015. You can read about the 10 finalists on this website: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/grad-slam . There will probably have a second annual Grad Slam, and ORGS will also look into if UC should participating internationally. *The Conversation* may put some articles of Grad Slam there.
- Portfolio Review Group (PRG). Strategic Plans solicited, and working with Institute of Transportation Studies.
- Restatement of Principles Guidelines. There was a discussion with Provost, and it will be going out under the Provost soon.

IV. Systemwide Review Items *(continued)*

3. *Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Access Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services* (Comments due by May 15, 2015). Discussion included the following:

- Discussed with 4 Senate committees, and discussed with Senate Leadership to get consolidated Senate feedback. Want more Academic Senate involvement.
- There was faculty input regarding the "Designated Campus Manager" (DCM). How is that person appointed? Answer: want a campus point person to provide information, and there would be consistency at the campus level. Each campus determines its DCM, and could be overseen by its COR. DCM could be the manager of the Incubator, one of the managers of the Incubators, and/or the head of the licensing office. It's up to the campuses. The DCM should interact and consult with the Academic Senate.
- What makes you eligible to be a start-up? Interim VP Tucker stated that it should be a very small company (such as having less than 5 people, less than $5,000 in the budget).
- Non-profits promote entrepreneurial activities, which could be endorsed and use similar models. Incubating non-profits. Apply more broadly**. UCORP member Terry Jernigan (UCSD) will write it up and send to Chair Brouillette.** (Due May 15)
- QB3 – other campuses up and running? Berkeley has one; Davis has an off-campus wet lab incubator that opened last week; UCLA – CSNI, Old Med school; UCSD; and Irvine is developing new space in the Research part. UCSF QB3 – started 10 years ago.
- Someone needs to monitor that start-up companies don't take precedent of access of regular facilities of faculty and graduate students.
- Annual report would be useful, which may address the financial risks and provides an opportunity for faculty committee to look at the reports.
- Conflict of commitment?
    - Not interfere with research and educational activities use of these of facilities will not conflict the interest
    - Other mechanisms to monitor faculty time, IP issues.
- What is an Accelerator?
- Vice Chair Habicht-Mauche stated that her campus' COR makes sure that those doing research have priority with the space/facilities.
- UCORP member David Noelle (UCM) explained that with his campus' COR, the DCM person provides an annual report to the faculty body.
- Section C-2 should be made clearer. Maybe it should be clearer in the guidelines, and to state to work with the Academic Senate closer.
- In regards to Senior Advisory Kelly's presentation, is that a recharge model? This is instead of recharge.

Chair Brouillette will come up with feedback by May 15th

VI.Consultation with Academic Leadership

Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair
Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair

- Governor's staff -
    - They really weren't interested in higher education, but with efficiencies.
    - April 29, 2015 Council meeting – 4 of the staff members attended. The topics they were interested in were the following: Admissions, Transfer, 3-year degrees, how to process undergraduate students as quickly as possible to save money. So, the Senate committees related to this are BOARS, UCEP, and UCPB.

- At the BOARS meetings, there were 3 of them. One of their ideas is to have students admitted to UC, and develop an algorithm to process them to a campus.
- Going through May revise now. LAO report last month. Prop 98 funding go to K-14.

- The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) Leg Day. The LAO report was released and stated that they have to get creative with funding. In November 2016, universal pre-school will be on ballot, and the governor's staff/LAO suggested to get on that ballot initiative.
- SB 15 – UC has endorsed, which would give UC an additional $75million and buys out tuition increase. The staffers would like to increase 5,000/year for the next 5 years. How can UC accommodate?
- It was calculated that 17.5% increase in non-resident tuition would result in a net loss.

- Transfer Initiative – Transfer Action Team recommended to streamline same major preparation for all 9 campuses for incoming transfer students. Senate committee Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) supported that recommendation. On the individual campuses, they see that transfer students met that campus' expectations, so campuses don't see a problem. For example, majors, such as Economics, may have five differing major requirements on five different campuses.
  - Ucop.infocenter is a new website that shows data visually, and has some transfer information. http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/california-community-college-enrollments-uc
  - The goal is to get 21 majors, which is 80% of the majors for Transfer students, on similar major preparation requirements (10 in the Spring 2015, and 11 for Fall 2015).
  - Faculty was not the problem.
  - There are 3 meetings. The results will be conferred with their academic departments, and the Senate committees of Educational Policy are informed.
  - In October 2015 , Vice Chair Dan Hare (who will be Chair by then) will head up 11 remaining majors.
  - BOARS and UCEP will help to finalize agreements.
  - Communications about common majors will be housed at UCOP.

- SB 1440 [CC and CSU can collaborate to create Associate of Arts (AA) and Associate of Science (AS) degrees, which enables completion of these degrees would make students eligible to transfer]. It has not worked. Students change their minds; they don't know what they want.

- President Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence
  - Question came up, such as "What about the Senate? What about the Faculty?" The response included, "Students now, faculty later."
  - The Federal law has to be effective July 1, 2015.
  - Getting an hour training/year vs. two-hour/two years.
  - P&T process different than this process.
  - Mandated reporting with students' activity. There was confusion with this area; it's not confidential, and students have to know that a faculty member will be reporting them.

Liane will send out letter; comments to Liane on Thursday, May 14, which should go out Friday, May 15, 2015.