

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

## Minutes of Meeting

April 13, 2015

**I. Announcements and Agenda Review, Liane Brouillette, Chair**Academic Council:

Rachael Nava, new Executive Vice President and CEO of UCOP attended the meeting

- Has only been here 2 months, and comes from the health plan field
- Plans to bring her experience to UC Care
- Oversees benefits to UC employees, while Dr. Stobo oversees the health centers and medical centers
- UC Care may bring a profit

2015 Admissions – increase of 60% of waitlisted students; campuses have been asked not to admit more students than last year.

Regent Elroy Ortiz also attended the Academic Council meeting. He is the President of Long Beach City College. He pressed upon the urgency of regularizing UC transfer requirements. Students tend to default to CSU transfer requirements, and he stressed the importance of UC requirements that would okay for CSU also.

President Napolitano is meeting with groups of Deans. The goal is to better understand specific disciplinary groups.

Sexual Violence and Assault Task Force stated the population covered is broad. The population includes visitors, students, faculty, and staff members. Regarding visitors, it is not clear if visitors do something, what would happen to them.

The election for the new Vice Chair of Academic Senate resulted in James Chalfant from UC Davis.

Merit raises. On January 26, 2015, a joint Senate and administration task force was set-up to provide recommendations on two decisions.

- Assuming the 3% of the current payroll will be devoted to salary increments in 2015-16, what action should President Napolitano take (vis-a-vi ladder rank faculty), and how should the University react regarding the salary lag from the remuneration study?
- Option 1: Increase both on-scale and off-scale of ladder-rank faculty salaries. Under this option, salaries of each faculty member would increase by 3% and the faculty scales would also increase by 3% on July 1, 2015. Raise salaries by each faculty member by the same percentage. Would address the inequalities associated with compression, inversion, and the loyalty penalty. For above-scale faculty, Option 1 would provide a 3% increase.
- Option 2: Increase the on-scale component of ladder-rank faculty salaries effective July 1, 2015. The on-scale component of faculty salaries would approximately increase by 3.5%, and the faculty scales would increase by the same percentage. The off-scale dollars would remain the same. Option 2 would raise the salaries of faculty members by slightly different percentage depending on their mix of on-scale and off-scale components. Option 2 would slightly decrease the inequality associated with compression, inversion, and the loyalty penalty. For above-scale faculty, Option 2

would require an additional implementation component. This could be to a single systemwide plan or to a plan to be determined on the campus level.

- The working group recommended Option 2; they did not recommend a systemwide plan nor a plan to be determined by the campus level. They sent the advice to President Napolitano.
- The start date would be July 1, 2015.

## II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of February 9, 2015
2. DRAFT Minutes of March 9, 2015

**Action: The minutes were approved as amended.**

## III. Systemwide Review items

1. Final Review - APM 080, Medical Separation (Comments due by April 17, 2015)  
Declined to comment further.
2. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Presidential Policy - Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence (Comments due by April 20, 2015)  
The Task Force strongly advised faculty to comment. Discussion: This may not be in the purview of UCORP. UCORP decided that it will not take it up since there is no research policy.
3. Final Review - UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use (Comments due by April 24, 2015)
  - Discussion followed that the section on Procedures is empty. Who oversees procedures? Would like clarification on website of procedures.
  - Agreed – to comment.
4. Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 128.D.2 (Comments due by April 26, 2015)  
This bylaw is about Vice Chairs. The University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction would like to make all Vice Chairs at-large members. No comment from UCORP.
5. Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Access Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services (Comments due by May 15, 2015)
  - This is relevant. 1-2 points that can be clarified. Section 4.C.2. – specified “program and educational objectives” – *who makes that? Objectives? Training? Need specificity of responsibility.*
  - Decisions made at the campus level, right?
6. Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 182 - University Committee on International Education (Comments due by May 15, 2015)

### Background

- Currently, UCIE only covers student exchange programs, which is the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP).
- However, more activities have broaden in the international sense. UCEAP is not the only/priority area in this area.
- Examples of broader activities include MOUs between UC campuses and international institutions, and the Presidential initiatives of the UC Mexico and Global Food.
- There is also the increase of international students, independent research activities abroad, co-authoring with international authors, UCSF Global Health., and UCR MEXUS.
- Other institutions, such as Stanford, University of Illinois, and Harvard have this type of bylaws.

### Discussion

- Under Point 5, what is “experiential learning programs”? At Irvine, these would include the Health programs.

- Section B.2.i. is amazingly vast, but weak.
  - Research is the purview of UCORP. When should UCORP be included?
    - Under Section B.2.i., something could be added. “International research,...along with applicable Senate committees.”
    - Or put “policy recommendations” section – Section 3?
    - Or put something overarching instead of trying to put in.
    - Should be in Section B. “in any of the following that relates to research, UCORP should be consulted” – put prose at more general level.
    - Insert in section B.3. Problem is that section doesn’t specify research. “(in consultation with UCORP)” between research and into.
7. Proposed Revisions to APM-360, Librarian Series and APM-210-4, Instructions to Review Committees (Comments due by May 15, 2015)  
 Discussion: UCORP should support. Clarify 360-80-a2c. Designated University Official – who is that? It was decided to discuss further at the May meeting.
8. Final Review - Proposed Revisions to APM 210-1-d (Comments due by May 21, 2015)  
Discussion
- What is “due credit”?
  - The spirit of the proposed revisions was discussed.
    - Trying to encourage underrepresented ethnic minorities (UREMS) to be more involved in other aspects of the University.
    - And to give credit to those who do that.
  - Is it too late in the process to provide more feedback.
  - The section is better than the previous draft.
    - It’s still unclear.
  - During Council, there were differing opinions between the Social Sciences/Humanities and the hard sciences. There are not much UREMS in the labs, and this would penalize the hard sciences field.
  - Is this a requirement? No, have to find to do it. Sciences – limited time to do it. Then, it’s “extra”/gold star. In the end, CAP – campus Committee on Academic Personnel.
  - This is not equitable with teaching, research and public service.
  - This wording is better than the last version shown to UCORP since it’s less vague.
  - It was decided from the UCORP members who were present would like feedback from the other members.

**IV. UC Innovation & Entrepreneurship, Reg Kelly, Ph.D., Senior Advisor on Innovation & Entrepreneurship; Director, California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3)**  
Background on Reg Kelly. Professor at UCSF, chair of his department, Executive Vice Chancellor at UCSF, retired and came back for QB3. Dr. Kelly would like to make sure that universities are sustained and are giving back to society at a cost we can afford. He stated that if we really loved our research, we need to do better of marketing ourselves and tell the taxpayers.

Background on his UCOP work. At QB3, they are questioning if UC is doing a good job of getting science into the community? Only two start-ups per year are created, and perhaps something is wrong.

Dr. Kelly stated that we are almost only focused on our faculty. Faculty members have a huge job, and lots of demands. How can faculty members be interested and take their ideas to the world? At start-ups, individuals work for peanuts and work all the time. Graduate students and post docs are

like that, and this is where the work was being done. How can we help them start their companies? At QB3, the focus is on how post docs do this since they usually have little business skills and no money.

There are classes on entrepreneurship and innovation, which allow the participants to learn on their own. The participants can go to QB3 for advice and service. It's like "start-up in a box" service. Within a year, there have been 70 companies that have been established. Then, the participants can apply for small business grants, and there are workshop on completing a business grant application. Students are three times more likely to get a grant.

There is a problem with space. There are innovation incubators, and there have been 6 companies within a year.

There was about \$150 million brought into the San Francisco area through small business ventures, and going to Sacramento with great numbers. The founders of Genentech and Chiron came from UCSF.

Set up a small venture fund. Can we actually invest in these small companies. Have 20 companies. \$725 million – one acquired for that – by Bristol Myers. Venture funds 1.3 (3%/year) return. They have been ahead at 1.8. Not in it to make it, but to help students to start companies.

With President Napolitano discussing if QB3 can apply to other campuses. QB3 is available as consultants.

\$250 million venture fund from our pension funds. Weakness – just goes back to pension, doesn't go to the University.

University Associated Venture Fund – Get free help. Get pro-bono. Incubators – can see which are performing well. Advantage to be on campus venture funds.

Puts UC ahead – how to generate seed funding. Vulnerable place – post doc students. We help them. If we succeed in that, other institutions will ask us to help them.

### Discussion

- With you own ideas, such as those in education, can this apply? For example, devised programs for K-2 to learn English faster. The copyright is held by UC Regents, and will like to make it available. It can be published and UC owns it.
  - Almost all companies and universities do this. You can make it open source and make it public. Your judgment – better served if creating a company? Then, put money in it, and have to negotiate with UC regarding intellectual rights, and license back. Dr. Kelly suggested to take the "start-up in a box" workshop.
- Nice that the University offer options – academia and creating companies, which helps attract graduate students.
- Does UC offer buy-outs? Professors may get 20%.
- Faculty model where faculty lead? UCSF – faculty members start company every 2 years.
- Applications that help with health and well-being. No interest in starting a company, but what should the individual do?
  - Maybe the student wants to start the company. \$800 to start. Low legal fees since there are many companies willing to help.
- This seems really exciting, and there is potential to accelerate start-ups.
  - Cal IT in San Diego. 6-8 companies. Based on the QB3 model. All agree that IP belongs to UC. If we leave and take non-UC job, then new idea doesn't belong to UC. Tech Transfer office on campuses are set-up for funding.
  - What is our UC role to maximize funding to UC and/or state of California?

Where Reg Kelly is thinking of going. Next week, he will talk to the Governor and President. The Committee of Two (CO2) will be talking about research. How can we be seen as agents of local economic growth? He's spent most of life in Academic Health Centers which merged with hospitals, which makes money. Six in the UC system – they improve the local health – create jobs, ideal training places.

One idea is to take away the hospitals and replace with innovation centers to generate training experiences. Take the ideas of the Academic Health Centers and Academic Innovation Centers.

#### Discussion

- Pitfalls? All the time.
- Little discussion of the value of the research and public service functions.
- How did the amount (\$250 million) come up? Dr. Kelly worked with the UC Chief Investment Officer, and he's also working with several campuses to set-up their own funds.
- Wealthy dollars will give back. More indirect? More long-term?
- Stanford and MIT understands that. UC is behind in time with that. Technology Transfer – arguing for every penny; give trouble. Short-term gain vs. long-term gain.
- Equity based? Tax for the university?

#### **V. Campus updates**

Davis: Committee didn't meet.

Merced: The committee is in the middle of Faculty grants program, and they are trying something new which involves more schools. With the indirect cost recovery program, the return go to the deans or the PIs. It is slow to implement to PIs there. The plan is to implement in the middle of Summer.

The challenge for faculty voice is the next phase of development phase. With the building of new buildings, the administration won't take faculty input for draft and final proposals. The plan is to go to faculty to evaluate plans by 3 development teams. Faculty find this unacceptable, and they are fighting hard to have their voice heard.

San Diego: No update.

Santa Barbara: The Sexual Harassment document was discussed at their meeting, and they looked at the Copyright document.

Berkeley: The committee had a few documents to review. There are ORU reviews, and the ORU report has been divided. They are determining which ORUs need to be properly reviewed. Some ORUs have issues that emerged from yearly report.

UCLA: The committee is in the middle of their grant process. There are sub-committees by field of expertise, and they hope to get evaluations in before the next meeting so that decisions can be made at the next meeting.

The campus is caught up with the diversity requirement for undergraduates, which was a result of campus incidents. COR opted not to opine. UCLA is the last UC campus (or one of the last) to pass it, and it was passed over the weekend.

UCSC: The campus completed grant allocations for the year, and this took up most of the business for the past 2-3 meetings.

UCI: The Vice Chancellor for Research just retired. He had a definite philosophy for ORUs, and that some university ORUs morph into the private economy.

Undergraduates: Next week, the students will lobby in Sacramento lobby. There will be the annual student lobby conference.

Graduate students: For him, not much, but working. He is a micro-biology PhD student working on honey bees.

## VI. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership – Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair

- She was at ICAS Legislative Day.
- With the legislature, the Senate did pass out of the Educational Policy committee that would buy out UC's tuition increase. This would give \$75 million to UC (hopefully, in addition to 4% Governor's increase and no increase to out-of-state students).
- UC raises NRT by 17-18%. From UCOP, from her understanding, this would result in negative revenue with fewer students.
- The next CO2 meeting will focus on Graduate Education and Research, which the President placed on the agenda.
- Prop 98 money going to K-14 and community colleges.
- Last Thursday and Friday, she was at the Los Alamos laboratory. They would like closer ties with the scientists and all the national labs. The bonds need to be tightened so that those relationships don't go away.
  - The APM regarding Adjunct Faculty series is being looked at to possibly revise.
- The Lab Fee restored next year? Only if the lab management fee is restored, and the Department of Energy makes those decisions.
- How to increase women and minorities in the labs? Will push on pregnancy leaves for scientists.
- Regarding the proposed revised APM 210-1-d, what is "due credit"? The reason to change current policy is because it's too vague. How diversity efforts with teaching and research can be evaluated? With this policy revision, appropriate credit needs to be given and be communicated, such as a creating a patent and being evaluated based on the patent's impact.

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

- MRU Review, Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives and Chris Spitzer, Coordinator – UC Research Initiatives
  - Director Erwin's task is to review the MRU review process since MRUs receive systemwide funding. UCORP is the lead committee with these reviews. UCPB and CCGA are part of it.
  - Director Erwin's unit, UC Research Initiatives, has been tasked to staff the reviews.
    1. Develop templates.
    2. Apply and implement to the MEXUS review.
  - Templates reviewed and approved this academic year.
  - She met with CCGA last week, and UCPB would defer until next month.
  - Would like input and suggestions from UCORP. ORGS' role is to facilitate the process. Ultimately, UCORP's recommendations would go to the Vice President.
  - Schedule and proposed process
    1. Two types of templates: (a) 5-year and (b) 15-year/sunset review.
    2. Will pass draft to UCORP within 2 weeks.
    3. Might be efficient that each committee assign 1-2 individuals.
    4. After draft is passed onto UCORP, then, would give committee to review and give comments.
    5. May meetings – revise templates. Then, give to small groups.
    6. June meetings – approve by each of the committees. Or can have additional reviews, and vote in July.
  - Director Erwin and Coordinator Spitzer suggest to have a sub-committee; 1-2 from each committee (UCORP, CCGA, UCPB) with Valerie Leppert (CCGA) and a 2<sup>nd</sup> CCGA member since Leppert will be CCGA chair next year.

- Chair Brouillette will encourage UCORP Vice Chair Judith Habicht-Mauche since she will be chair next year and Chair Brouillette will not be here next year.
- The ORGS unit will do the work, but would like UCORP to opine.
- Discussion
  - What's the motivation? New templates? Or newer templates? Would like to take a fresh look versus having hundreds of pages, and have newer templates. The review should be meaningful and be read. A few years ago, the Senate requested the reviews and everyone came out with a B+. It is burdensome to complete the review process. Lot of work with similar outcomes.
  - Cal ISIS went under a review a few years ago. What is the most important thing? What is meaningful to evaluate?
  - How would this apply to the Humanities Research Center? Earmarked funding, systemwide resources are well-used.
  - Why should MRUs continue to exist?
  - Why 5 and 15 years? Because it is stated in the [Compendium](#).
  - What is the difference between MEXUS and the President's UC Mexico Initiative?
    - MEXUS MRU started in 1980 with an agreement with the Mexican government to provide training for Mexican students. This was an opportunity for UC faculty and students in Mexico, and would cover all disciplines.
    - The President's UC Mexico Initiative is a separate initiative with different staff and particular goals, some are similar and extend to MEXUS. Other goals are distinctive to MEXUS goals. This initiative works parallel to MEXUS, but has different directors. Both are headquartered at UCR. Parallel and in cooperation, but separate.
  - Agree to have a subcommittee? Chair Liane Brouillette will ask Vice Chair Habicht-Mauche, and will talk about populating the subcommittee at 3pm. Director Erwin would like the names.
  - Director Erwin will send the PRG template.
- Catalyst RFP, Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives
  - UC\_Research can impact on the world. "Research for the world."
  - Look at faculty collaboration across the career stages.
  - President funded \$3 million in last call.
  - Discussion.
    - Letter of Intent (LOI) – how to get the significance in 350 words? LOI needs to be short. Do you want to propose another length? Other abstract requirements are 300-400 words.
    - Suggestion – useful to have previous successful examples (such as abstracts, LOIs). Have the 5 catalyst awards from last year on their website.
    - Director Erwin will extend the deadline for another day, and would like UCORP to have the opportunity to review.
    - Feedback has been submitted and modifications will be made based on that feedback.
    - Maybe other documentation – something to give a sense of the viability? From one's experience, is from relationships.
    - Who will be evaluating it?
      - LOIs – by a panel from Director Erwin's office, which will consist of UCOP representatives, some Provosts and Vice Chancellors for Research.

- Full proposals – independent peer review, outside UC and perhaps 1-2 UC (no conflict of interest).
- Non-profit, Wendy Streitz Executive Director – Research Policy & Coordination
  - Background. Executive Director Streitz described that if UC and other academic institutions are willing to share in any financial success, that it should be fair. The inventors should be paid first, according to policy. They should share in the losses too. There is a big area of possibly helping potential patents, and that inventions don't sit on the shelf.
    - Licensed invention takes about 5 years.
    - Foundations have 2 concerns: (1) UC won't be diligent, and (2) companies won't be diligent.
    - Companies want to exert control with the licenses, which are often confidential.
    - It's largely successful, but it takes a long time.
  - Discussion
    - ED Streitz and others are trying to deal with this ahead of time, and the time varies.
    - If the foundation supports, do they own the research? The government don't own research either, but they have marching rights.
    - Process of Technology Transfer (TT)? Training students, publishing papers...usually people are focused on inventions
    - Interim Vice President Tucker will share his 2-page document.
    - Regarding UC graduate students finding a job, Senior Advisor Reg Kelly, talked about encouraging them who are inclined. He envisioned something broader. Bill Tucker explained the "Start-up in a box" model.
- ORGS update, Bill Tucker, Interim Vice President – Research & Graduate Studies
  - Portfolio Review Group (PRG) – sent letters out to MRUs asking for their strategic plans, such as the San Diego SuperComputer Center, NRS, and 2 others
  - Engaged with Institute with Transportation Studies, which asked for augmentation in funding. Hopefully, the increased funding can be directed to UCLA, the newest. Then, UC Davis.
- Natural Reserve System (NRS)
  - A part-time consultant that is focused on fundraising since the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary is coming up. The consultant challenged them to raise \$50 million.
  - The production team from "Bay Area Backroads" was hired to produce a 20-minute documentary.
- Graduate Studies
  - Grad Slam – systemwide grand final on May 4, 2015, at Oakland Marriott where ten winners will compete. The President will emcee, and the confirmed judges are the Provost, Regent Island, Jessica Aguierre (NBC Bay Area news), someone close to the governor like the first lady, and a politician or someone on the Governor's staff. It will be from late morning through lunch. The prizes are \$1000, \$3000 and \$6000. It will be streamed live and recorded, and there will be viewing rooms on the campuses.
  - Graduate Advocacy Day – April 28, 2015, in Sacramento. The focus will be on the role of graduate students. Topics will include start-ups, companies, and innovation.
- Innovation agenda – Working collaboratively with Reg Kelly and with the CIO. The President's Innovation Council met for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time in February 2015. They discussed where they want to go, and there is a new work group on innovation centers. UC Ventures and the CIO are investing in early/mid-stage companies.



- Question: What does the Committee of Two (CO2) have to say about Research and Graduate Students? UC has diverse approaches to research. It doesn't work to have one center to work on the same thing.