

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

## Minutes of Meeting

June 8, 2015

**I. Announcements and Agenda Review, Liane Brouillette, Chair**Equity for Access

Academic Council drafted a letter to Interim Vice President Bill Tucker, which Chair Brouillette sent before the meeting. Does UCORP agree with the letter? *Chair Brouillette read the highlights of the draft letter.* Below are main points of the letter and the discussion that followed.

- a. Unclear alignment with UC Mission. Vice Chair Habicht Mauche disagreed with the last sentence. (“UCSF recommends adding a provision forbidding the use of University space for non-academic purposes and adding a new section prohibiting routine commercial tasks in University facilities.”) UC should let companies use and pay for facilities, as long as it doesn’t get into the way of letting people do what they do. Student representative Dodge stated that part of the UC mission is to let companies do their research. Discussion also included on-campus and off-campus recharge rates, and if this has to do with UCSF QB3.
- b. Pressure on Resources and Space. There was agreement on this section.
- c. Overly Restrictive Conflict of Interest Guidelines. There is a bit of conflict with the first statement. (“Several reviewers noted that the provision banning UC employees from serving on the Board of Directors or exercising voting rights in a company in which UC has an equity interest is too restrictive.”) There are Conflict of Interest policies already in place.
- d. Lack of Faculty Oversight and Role of DCMs. This was the most contentious area discussed that the Academic Council meeting, faculty oversight. UCORP members thought this portion seemed fine. With the suggested systemwide advisory committee, which was recommended in this portion, the composition of that committee needs to be well-assembled.
- e. Risk, Value Assessment, and Other Financial Details.

Discussion

- UCD is one of the sites.
- Perhaps get legal and business expertise from UC, such as from the Business and Law Schools.
- Most of UCORP points are made in the student access and faculty oversight areas.
- UCORP Davis member stated that the benefits are not clearly stated, and that financial gain may not be there. Vice Chair Habicht Mauche explained that the sense is not to make money, but to encourage partnerships.
- The draft guidelines should be clear.
- There were questions regarding the sense of support from the Senate.
- Seems like most people are in agreement. Chair Brouillette will circulate UCORP’s response.
- Comments by Wednesday, June 10<sup>th</sup>. A response will be drafted regarding Council’s letter to Interim Vice President Tucker.

**II. Consent Calendar**DRAFT Minutes of Meeting, April 13, 2015 – **APPROVED****III. NSF Funding, Judith Habicht Mauche, Vice Chair**

[http://www.nsf.gov/about/congress/114/hr1806\\_impact.jsp](http://www.nsf.gov/about/congress/114/hr1806_impact.jsp)

[http://www.geosociety.org/geopolicy/news/2015/1504\\_COMPETES.htm](http://www.geosociety.org/geopolicy/news/2015/1504_COMPETES.htm)

Background. (from [http://www.geosociety.org/geopolicy/news/2015/1504\\_COMPETES.htm](http://www.geosociety.org/geopolicy/news/2015/1504_COMPETES.htm))

On 20 May 2015, the House passed the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015, H.R. 1806, which authorizes the National Science Foundation (NSF), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and research at the Department of Energy (DOE) for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. Although the bill includes overall increases for all three agencies from FY 2015 funding levels, it contains several sections that are of great concern to the scientific community, including cuts to the NSF geoscience directorate.

The bill sets NSF funding at the directorate level and unevenly distributes it between programs, with engineering, computer science, biology, math and physical science programs receiving authorization increases and geoscience and social science programs receiving authorization cuts. The bill sets FY 2017 authorization values equal to FY 2016 levels, indicating flat funding authorization from FY 2016 to FY 2017 across all three agencies. The bill also includes deep authorization cuts to the DOE Office of Science Biological and Environmental Research (BER) program and Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) and directs BER to focus more on biological and genomic research and less on climate research.

Vice Chair Habicht Mauche also explained that the bill will give money, and for the first time, how to use the money. The targeted disciplines of Social Sciences and Geosciences include the areas of climate research and renewable energy, which means that new climate research can't be started with this funding. This is an example that politicians can fund research, which already has been done with Political Scientists. They were told that they can only submit proposals on specific areas. There is a concern that Congress and Senate can dictate what NSF can fund. The UC NSF total is 8% of NSF total. Vice Chair Habicht Mauche suggested to write a letter to Council, then to the UC President about the President saying something about the "letting the science people decide" on the funding.

Discussion. Some of the points made were the following;

- The Union of Concerned Scientists officially opposed the Bill ([http://www.ucsusa.org/news/press\\_release/house-passes-bills-attacking-science-0480#.VZQW6PIVhBc](http://www.ucsusa.org/news/press_release/house-passes-bills-attacking-science-0480#.VZQW6PIVhBc)).
- Should UCORP write a letter or statement?
  - Suggest to Senate Chair Mary Gilly that UC could have an influence if the President or someone wrote something regarding this issue.
- A large number of Republicans are opposed to climate research, social scientist research (political and liberal), and renewable energy research.
- The broader principle of "if Social Sciences today, then something else tomorrow." This is actually legislating funds.
- Allocation decisions should be made based on scientific expertise.
- Social Sciences is not seen as a science; there is a narrow notion of the definition of science.
- **Chair Brouillette will draft letter that will go to Council.**

#### **IV. UCOP Electronic Newsletter, Carolyn McMillan, Manager of Content Strategy – University Affairs/Communications**

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/>

Information. Manager McMillan explained that an electronic newsletter was launched about 1 ½ months ago, which aggregates some of the UC research. Her department tries to determine what will grab a general audience, and to present it in a visual and engaging format. About 6500 have signed up so far, and these individuals primarily have a UC affiliation.

Discussion. A few UCORP members have signed up for it. Chair Brouillette will send a list of teachers to McMillan; there are 58 school districts in the state. Each district has a resource specialist for science, and should have a list of teachers in that field. Other discussion points followed:

About the newsletter

- Viewers are tracked. The target audience is the California public. The mission is to represent the University, to touch lives in a positive way, and to show how UC make lives better.
- It is difficult to imagine that a general audience would sign-up for this. McMillan responded that people are looking for specific stories. This is also a media source for journalist bloggers, podcasts, etc.
- Stories aggregated and filtered.
- There are specific landing pages, such as the President’s Initiatives (e.g., Global Food Initiative).
- In only one month, there are 7000 subscribers.
- McMillan stated that this site does not focus on institutional news. There are no articles on tuition, *Committee of Two*, etc. It pushes information research on this newsletter. There are other avenues that are used to advocate.

What Communications does

- Does UCOP Communications go out and ask Californians on what they want to read? Communications look at what people react and respond to.
- Is there a partnership with *The Conversation*? UCOP Communications is in conversation with the publishers regarding the representation of UC and the work of the faculty. Last week, they pitched them a story about water and electricity since UCI had a water conference.
- McMillan would like to have story ideas, and welcomes any comments.
- McMillan will work with Chair Brouillette regarding teachers.
- There are 50,000 Facebook and 150,000 Tumblr followers, who are very engaged science audiences. Student representative Alexander Dodge stated he uses Reddit, which brings the “most-ups” (i.e., most votes) on the top of the page.
- Demand on biographies? Young people may not know what scientists do. There is traction on the UCD Veterinarian, who is an avid surfer.
- There are five FlipBoards – UC Health, UC Green, Ventures, Food, UC (Fiat Lux). McMillan will send Chair Brouillette the links.
- Undergraduate and graduate research? There was *Grad Slam* (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/grad-slam> ) and also, UCOP Communications do write about student research.

Campus concerns

- UCSF outreach office is limited, and the faculty members get push back from their Division. Can UCSF contact UCOP Communications? UCOP Communications has a freelance budget and can assign stories, and they would love to hear stories, but they have small staff and juggle demands.
- Alumni news? Each campus has their own alumni association. There is a systemwide alumni office. Campuses may send those alumni offices some stories.

**V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership, Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair and Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair**

NSF Funding topic and letter. Chair Gilly can email UC Senior Vice President of Government Relations, Nelson Peacock, for advice on what is the best way to communicate it. Vice Chair Habicht Mauche will email Chair Gilly more information.

#### Academic Council

Campus Review of Transfer Pathways: Nearly all campuses have signed off on the transfer pathway agreements for ten majors reached at three April meetings. Chair Gilly thanked BOARS members for their efforts to move the review and approval process forward. The President is excited about the progress the Senate has made on the project. There will be 11 additional majors discussed in October 2015 and welcomes suggestions for improving the process.

Budget. The long-term funding agreement between the Governor and the University includes a commitment to 4% base budget increases in each of the next four years and \$436 million in one-time pension funding over three years. UC will freeze resident tuition through 2016-17, increase NRST by 8% in each of the next two years, increase PDST for all PDST programs except law, and implement a new pension tier for employees hired after July 1, 2016. There is no money in the May revise for enrollment growth. If the Legislature adds it, the Governor will not veto it. The hope is to get \$35-50 million for enrollment growth for about 10,000 students.

- New employees will have the choice between a Defined Contribution Plan, and a Defined Benefit Plan that limits pensionable salary to the Social Security Wage Base established by the California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA). Some faculty members have expressed concern that the new tier will hurt UC's competitiveness. There will be a task force, which will include the Academic Senate to look at the new tier and the new PEPRA cap. The Senate is concerned on how these changes can affect potential faculty behavior in the future. (The Regents and Chancellors do not share the same concerns.)
- The budget agreement also asks UC to implement or expand several programmatic innovations—including developing three-year degree pathways to increase the proportion of students who graduate in three years; reducing the number of upper division courses required for a major; expanding the use of "predictive analytics" to identify at-risk students; and revisiting current policies related to AP course credit and credit by examination.
- Governor's staff went to 4 Senate committees meetings, and they are interested in "processing undergraduate students faster."

Transfer pathways. 20 majors in 2 years, 10 majors were finished in Spring 2015. The next steps include to work with community colleges and for websites to be updated. Eleven majors are scheduled for October 2015. The major challenge was that some campuses didn't have delegates for some of the majors.

May 2015 Regents Meeting. Some of the highlights stated by Chair Gilly stated were the following:

- During the public comments portion, there were many comments about the sexual harassment training and graduate students. Other public comments included:
  - Giltrack farm at Berkeley.
  - State definition of anti-semitism.
  - AFSME representatives. Unions arguing that sub-contractors are hired at a wage lower than union members.
  - A father of a UCSB student briefly talked about about divestment from the gun industry.
  - Food security – Students that need food banks on the campuses.
  - Warrior stadium at Mission Bay.

- Sexual assault/sexual harassment policy. The task force of 100+ members had only 2 faculty members. The policy was mainly on student-on-student. The policy has to be in place by July 1, 2015, which is federally mandated. The Task Force is trying to do a line-by-line revision; some feel that they should just start over. Director of Academic Policy and Compensation Janet Lockwood has been looking for the faculty's interest. There will be an interim policy to meet the July 1 deadline.
- UC PATH. The President states that it is now on target. UCOP will be in Fall 2015. Then, UCM, UCSC, and UCLA.
- Pilot Program to access equity for access. A number of issues were brought up during Council from UCD and UCSF, and someone suggested that perhaps that expertise from the Law and Business schools should consult in this area. Other areas of concern include UCSF sensitivity about space (i.e., will commercial interests push out research spaces?) and a clearer purpose (i.e., making money vs. encouraging start-ups). Chair Brouillette suggested that UCORP write a letter to Interim Vice President Bill Tucker.

#### **V. Consultation with the Office of the President**

*Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)*

*Chris Spitzer, Coordinator – UC Research Initiatives*

*Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives*

MRU Template Review. Coordinator Spitzer distributed two handouts. There was another phone conference with Vice Chair Habicht Mauche, UCORP member Noelle David, CCGA member, and UCPB member. UCPB was interested in the financial details. There are more of refinements than substantive changes.

Another table was added to indicate the extra funding (Appendix 2). There were more changes to the narrative section, in response to the May UCORP meeting comments, about how the leadership team interacts and governance of the MRU, and interactions of external and advisory boards. Both UCPB and CCGA are satisfied with the documents, and have approved them in their respective meetings. Regarding MRUs and graduate students, more information will be asked about the graduate students' home campus advisor and project manager.

Discussion also followed on the opportunity to pose questions to the MEXUS Director from UCORP, CCGA, and UCPB in the late Fall 2015 or Winter 2016 during a UCORP meeting. Perhaps it can occur via phone or video conference and be recorded. The planned timeline includes preparing the template for the MEXUS review during the summer, and the review would start in Fall 2015. The group also discussed on the possibility of obtaining MRU members and/or associate members' comments.

Catalyst update, *Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives*

177 letters of intent were received, with a total funding request of \$190 million. The initiative can only fund \$7 million. The first cut would reduce to 30 letters of intent (LOIs). There are about 60% STEM and 40% Arts and Humanities, and Social Sciences, and other fields.

Principles Guidelines, *Wendy Streitz, Executive Director – Research Policy & Coordination*

Executive Director Streitz is working with the Provost so that the Guidelines can be issued in June 2015. Project is moving slower than anticipated since there has been a shortage of 1-3 staff members over 2 years.

Openness in Research Policy. ORGS spoke to Faculty Welfare and CCGA. This topic will be reintroduced Fall 2015.

Policy/Guidance Data Use. Issues in this area include: concerning who owns the data and who gets to take it with them when they are leaving. This topic will be brought up in Fall 2015.

Indirect Cost Exceptions. All sponsored programs are approved in Executive Director Streitz' office. They want to delegate this authority to the campuses, and would like to do this fiscal year, but it will not go to happen. This summer, they plan to push the authority to Chancellors to help decide.

*Dotti Miller, Deputy to the Interim VP*

The UC Observatory Director Search is completed. The status of the search for the Vice President/Provost in Research and Graduate Studies is that the job description is going to the President with a target start date of July 1, 2016. The Berkeley Lab Director will be presented to the Regents in November with a possible start date of January 1, 2016. Regarding the PRG, a letter was issued to several program directors for strategic plans with a deadline of end of August 2015.

There was discussion on the Access and Equity guidelines. The comments were reviewed, but will defer to Interim VP Tucker to respond (*he did not attend this meeting*) to UCORP questions.

#### **VII. Systemwide Review Items**

Final Review: APM-133-17-g-j, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

Previously, UCORP did not comment before because the consensus was that it was an academic personnel area. An area that may affect UCORP is when a faculty member is taken off the clock and there are challenges in access to research resources which can delay progress to tenure. Chair Brouillette asked if there are any objections, and there were none. UCORP did not provide an opinion since this area is not in the area of research.

#### **VIII. Campus Updates/Further Discussion**

Innovation Council and UC Ventures Update. There is no FAQ document, but another document was circulated before the meeting, "Local Fund Investment Requirements v.2." Questions were asked about the 70% of the capital in UC Startups – why not 100%? Local fund is not just funded by UC Ventures; local fund can be generated by other sources. There was also discussion on, as the handout stated, "UC Ventures may allocate 10% of its capital to Local Funds." There was a question on what is "Local Fund's carry"?

Other campus groups that UCORP identified that Director Michele Cucullu should meet include the campuses Committees on Research (COR) or the chairs of the CORs, campus technology transfer and industrial relations/partnerships offices, and the campuses Offices of Research.

Davis

UCD COR reviewed and selected grants to be funded. There was \$1 million available, and a total of \$300,000 – \$2,000 small grants, and 33 \$700,000 large grants (i.e., 33 – \$20,000-25,000).

Santa Cruz

In Spring 2015, UCSC are coming to a conclusion of a two-year review of how the university opportunity funds are utilized from indirect costs. The concerns included replacement computers for faculty, labs and equipment, and that website information is current.

### Merced

The campus received an indirect cost recovery plan, which includes any new extramural grant will result in 5% be distributed among the principal investigators. Merced finished their grants program that is less than \$130,000. This amount hasn't changed since the campus opened, and the faculty have lobbied with the campus Provost to increase this amount.

### Irvine

With their grants program, there was an increase to \$600,000 this year from \$500,000). The \$100,000 increase came from the Office of Research. The amount was divided evenly between three areas and faculty in COR in those 3 areas reviewed the relevant proposals.

The campus centers, which are like the ORUs, have a smaller budget for grants. There are 14 of these grants of a budget of \$15,000-20000 per year. VCR asked COR about these campus centers. The pool is frozen, and there are no new campus centers. The VCR is examining how can these centers be structured for turnover. The total funding is for a maximum of 10 years (i.e., 5 years, then 5 year renewal). After 10 years, those centers would have to compete with new proposals. Discussion followed:

- if other campuses struggle with the same issue;
- MRUs had to re-compete;
- at Irvine, out of 5 ORUs, only one was renewed one;
- at Merced, they re-wrote the policies on ORUs and centralized research units;
- at Santa Cruz, it is controlled by the Dean;
- at Davis, the COR facilities is managed by the Office of Research.

### Riverside

There was discussion regarding the recharge issue happening outside of COR. Vice Chair Habicht Mauche mentioned this may be a topic of the Academic Planning Council. Analyst Banaria should find out and if it's a pilot project. COR finished the annual review of the internal research grants. The amount of labor and faculty time doesn't seem an efficient use of anyone's time because it's not much money, which is \$1200-\$1800 for conference travel. Berkeley has a model where all faculty get a certain amount. Individuals expressed that COR should work more on a policy and advocacy level. At Santa Cruz, adjudication occurs in February for research grants. Then, follow-up and consultation occurs in the spring so that faculty know funding amounts in March and can plan summer research. Also, in Santa Cruz, conference travel is rolling (around \$700), and faculty have to meet a criteria. Other campuses adjudicate conference travel grants. Davis used to, and now has 100% approval, but faculty can't send in consecutive years request (every other year is recommended). Davis' process is online during March/April window. Santa Cruz does the same, and the request can be submitted two weeks before the conference; it is a rolling model. At Santa Barbara, it's 3 weeks in advance.

### Santa Barbara

The Council on Research handles grants. The Committee has discussed the librarian series and the access to equity documents. The activity of the Committee has been winding down, and meetings have been cancelled. The latest activities include reviewing systemwide materials.

July meeting. There was consensus that the July in-person meeting will be canceled. If something comes up, the committee will conduct the business over email or have a phone conference.