

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Monday, June 13, 2016**

Members attending (or participating by phone)	Judith Habicht Mauche (Chair) Sri Nagarajan (Vice Chair), Ed Dimendberg (Irvine), Richard Desjardins (UCLA Sub), Isaac Martin (UCSD), Janet Myers (UCSF, via phone), Jeffrey Richman (UCSB), Steve Whittaker (UCSC), Rachel Hatano (Graduate Student, Merced), Alex Dodge (Undergraduate Student, UCSD, via phone)
Members absent	Ramona Naddaff (Berkeley), David Pleasure (Davis), Ajay Gopinathan (Merced), Richard Arnott (Riverside)
Consultants and guests	Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Vice Chair), Tom Andriola (UC Chief Information Officer), Aimée Dorr (Provost and Executive Vice President), Mary Croughan (Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office), Kathleen Erwin (Director, UC Research Initiatives), Christopher Spitzer (Coordinator, UC Research Initiatives), Peggy Fiedler (Director Natural Reserve System), Susan Carlson (Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs), Amy K. Lee (Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Director)

**1. Announcements, Agenda Review, and Approval of Meeting Minutes**

*Judith Habicht Mauche - UCORP Chair*

Meeting minutes from April 11, 2016 were approved.

**Chair Reports:**

UCORP Chair Judith Habicht Mauche announced that the UCORP leadership for 2016-17 had been approved, with Isaac Martin (UCSD) serving as chair and Jeffrey Richman (UCSB) as vice chair (and anticipated chair for 2017-18). The last bit of business for the committee is the annual report, which will be sent out to UCORP members for review in July.

The search committee for a new Senior Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies interviewed several candidates over two days of interviews and chose three candidates to forward to Provost Dorr for consideration.

The UC MEXUS Review Report was accepted by the Academic Council with little discussion. The Academic Council thanked UCORP and the other committees for their work on the review.

Chair Habicht Mauche reported that the most contentious item at the May Council meeting was the comments on the proposed APM changes to the health science clinical professor series.

The contract to manage the Los Alamos National Lab, which had been threatened with early termination, was extended to October, 2018, and included concessions for UC that provide a

greater stability in the fees earned. Next year UCORP will hear more about the Laboratory Fees Research Program and related issues.

**Campus reports:**

*Santa Barbara:* Focus at Santa Barbara this year was on campus research grants. The rules were recently rewritten to improve the process, so the committee spent some time assessing how the changes turned out. Over the course of the year, local committee discussions included sexual harassment, openness in research, and the departure of Mike Witherell (who was the vice chancellor for research) to head the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

*UCLA:* UCLA's committee also focused on faculty grants, which this year included transdisciplinary awards. The committee discussed how to make adjustments for next year, including changes to the appeals process. This year there were twelve appeals. Grant reviews are sent to applicants and some were upset with the tone of the comments. (It turns out that not all campuses send applicants the actual reviews. UCLA has been doing it for a few years.) UCLA's maximum grant amount is \$10,000, or \$20,000 for joint proposals. Enabling grants are \$2,000.

*San Francisco:* A few years ago UCSF centralized the process for faculty funding, and then created review panels to cover specific areas. Scores are provided to applicants, but not reviews. The "Resource Allocation Program" (RAP) has been seen as successful.

*Irvine:* All research funding went back to schools, so the local committee did not review grants this year. It was felt that members of COR from year to year lacked the expertise to make meaningful decisions about awards, and in past years funding was perceived as unfair. Irvine may be heading toward the Berkeley model where all faculty have research accounts. The COR is drafting a proposal to Irvine's Academic Senate. The per-faculty goal at this point depends on the mix of included titles, but it is anticipated to start at \$2,000 and work up to \$4,000. Generally at least some of the funds can be carried forward, but if funds are not spent after a few years then they are not renewed. Irvine has announced a new Vice Chancellor for Research, Pramod Khargonekar, an engineer who comes most recently from NSF.

A brief discussion of faculty research accounts revealed that GSEIS faculty at UCLA have research accounts of \$1,800 per year, and are allowed to carry over \$1,000. The UCSF Academic Senate has given small amounts of research grant money for the past two years. Providing equal amounts of grant funding for all disciplinary areas would not be popular at some campuses.

*Santa Cruz:* There is concern at UCSC about the lack of infrastructure support for faculty. For example, in contrast to staff members who get new computers every 4-5 years, faculty have to buy their own computers.

*San Diego:* UCSD's grant committee split off from COR. COR reviews ORUs, but not individual faculty grants.

**2. Consultation with UCOP – Information Technology Services**

*Tom Andriola - UC Chief Information Officer*

UC's Chief Information Officer Tom Andriola joined the meeting to talk about a cyberinfrastructure initiative and cyber-attack response tools.

## **1. Cyber-Infrastructure**

In March, 2015, a group of Vice Chancellors of Research, University Librarians, CIOs, and faculty from around the system convened to discuss how to best support faculty and maintain the competitiveness of UC's research enterprise. Looking ahead 5-10 years, the participants formed smaller working groups representing campuses and disciplinary areas to brainstorm about the future and what funders will expect in terms of research infrastructure.

The types of real assistance that researchers need include data management, technology, and tools. From the March conference there arose an idea for an expert "service" that could support faculty broadly – a marketplace or "exchange" for researchers to get the storage, computing expertise, or tools that they need across all campuses. The exchange would be campus driven, but not location specific.

An MRPI proposal for funding was submitted but not selected. Right now the campus champions are looking for seed funding. The Cyberinfrastructure Steering/Oversight Group, which includes two faculty members (Willeke Wendrich at UCLA and Terry Gaasterland at UCSD) will bring the proposal to the level of EVCs and try to obtain funding, although most funding is expected to come primarily from sources outside UC. The [Pacific Research Platform](#), which has NSF funding, is somewhat connected.

Committee members suggested that the Steering Group get in touch with Judy and Gary Olson at UC Irvine, who have had NSF funding in this area and could bring additional end user perspective to the project.

Committee members asked about high-performance computing, and whether that was within the purview of the CIOs. About half of UC's CIOs have high-performance computing within their responsibilities. The involvement of faculty with CIOs and CIO initiatives varies from campus to campus. Andriola encouraged relevant campus Senate committees to invite their CIOs to one of their committee meetings for an exchange of ideas and information.

The committee talked about the potential for an advanced research networking infrastructure. One participant has had experience with a research interface that has more functionality than anything so far in use at UC. UCSF uses an open source "networking software" called Profiles (<http://profiles.ucsf.edu/>). Other campuses may have software that does a portion of what Profiles provides, and some campuses have expressed interest in using Profiles. The UC University Librarians are involved in this area and have worked on issues at the backend such as persistent identifiers for people and data.

Campuses – and individuals – are struggling to determine best practices for learning management systems, file sharing services, data storage, and more. Committee members felt it would be helpful to even know what tools others are using. Most committee members did not know that UC has a contract with Box that includes privacy safeguards for UC materials. All campuses are having resource issues, which has in part been manifested in centralization of support services. Departments have felt a real loss of IT support.

The next steps for the UC Research Cyberinfrastructure Alliance include building the concierge service and establishing and promoting the marketplace.

## **2. Cyber-Risk Update**

Since February, CIO Andriola has provided updates on UC's cyber-risk response and security actions to Council, Senate committees, Berkeley, Davis, and the Regents. The idea behind UC's risk strategy is "detect and respond" – not build walls. It's a balance between risk and security.

Andriola provided some background on the nature of the UCLA attack that took place last summer, and noted that there are 17 pending lawsuits against UC because of it. The university must face the challenge of providing a safe yet open network, and protect its assets. After a somewhat rough start, faculty are now very engaged in decision-making and ongoing consultation. The Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC), which was formed in the wake of the UCLA breach, now includes three senate representatives (up from one) who are appointed via Senate channels. The CRGC's Advisory Board will also include three Senate-sanctioned members.

Fidelis was the first service with which UC contracted after the UCLA attack to examine network traffic and find out whether the attacker was able to get into other areas of UC's network. Subsequently, the Health Science campuses started a search (with a formal RFP) for a more long term technology solution for threat detection. They decided on FireEye, which offers a more robust suite of services than Fidelis. Experts from UC's Office of General Counsel have evaluated the FireEye contract – and its services – to determine whether it complies with UC's Electronic Communications Policy (ECP). The contract will be signed soon by UC as a system; CIOs are currently discussing a minimum deployment of FireEye as it replaces Fidelis. Decisions about exactly what is deployed and specifics about implementation will take place on the campuses. While a certain layer of protection is mandatory, all other decisions about network monitoring, security tools, etc., will be made locally at each location. ANR is included in the contract and the national labs are somewhat included, although they may have sensitive information that might require additional security features (and that may already be in place).

Many inquiries have been around the amount, content, and timing of the data collected. All stored data will be maintained locally on campus. All network traffic is hashed (coded) and the content is not replicable. IP address information is only available locally. Decisions about how long data is retained will be made at the campus. The typical time period is 30 days. The contract will spell out who from FireEye can look at UC's data, and how the company may combine UC intelligence with other security agencies.

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

*Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair*

*Coming up for Academic Council:*

Two campuses (San Diego and Santa Cruz) are proposing resolutions for divesting from fossil fuels (Santa Barbara had a campus vote a couple years ago that did not call for systemwide action). Council is asking that the two campuses prepare a joint proposal, and there will most

likely be an action item in the fall. UC already has an investment strategy that incorporates “ESG” (environmental, social, and governance) concerns.

*California State Budget:*

The State budget approved by the legislature includes the promised 4 percent base budget increase as well as an additional \$18.5 million to be provided in exchange for UC’s admitting 2,500 more California residents. The funding comes out to approximately \$7,400 per student, which is short of the estimated \$10,000 per student required from the state. Last fall, UC agreed to the proposal to admit 5,000 additional students for only \$5,000 per student provided from the state. Admittance of non-California residents and the “compare favorably” standard will be examined by BOARS as part of UC’s response to the state audit report.

Academic Senate leaders are soliciting suggestions for metrics to be collected that will show the consequences of such sudden and large increase in students. Ideas have included housing, advising, student satisfaction surveys, standard success measures such as graduate rate and time to degree, and mental health.

CSUs and community colleges are feeling similar pressure, but have a different relationship with the state government.

**4. Consultation with UCOP – Provost and Office of Research and Graduate Studies**

*Aimée Dorr – Provost and Executive Vice President*

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

*Kathleen Erwin – Director, UC Research Initiatives*

***The Lab Fees Research Program*** has received 35 letters of intent for the Laboratory Fees Multicampus-National Lab Collaborative Research and Training awards. 3-5 proposals will be funded. 22 letters of intent were received for the Graduate Fellowship opportunities. 4 of those will be funded.

For the 2017 MRPI awards, 108 proposals were received. Director Kathleen Erwin noted that the extent of the multicampus engagement around thematic areas had to be communicated in the letter of intent. 20-25 proposals will be funded.

***Update on VP-RGS search:*** Provost Dorr said that the search committee for the new Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies was representative of all constituencies. She has received the recommendations for the top three candidates and her next step is to make an offer. She is expecting to make an announcement sometime in July.

***UC MEXUS Review Report:*** Provost Dorr complimented the UC MEXUS Review Report and noted that not only was the review necessary, but it was particularly good that the MRU received a positive review along with important recommendations. Some topics that were touched upon in discussion included:

- Managing expectations about UC’s resources and what UC will contribute to the MRU.
- The appointment of a new Executive Director provides an opportunity to refresh lines of communication.
- Communication should be increased not only with UC MEXUS but MRUs more broadly.

- The need to clarify the UC Mexico Initiative, which is widely disbursed around the system. This is important so that UC doesn't miss out on opportunities due to lack of communication. A suggestion was made to include UC MEXUS representatives on the Initiative's workgroups.

The rules for selecting an MRU executive director are described in the [Compendium](#). There are some large MRUs that have two directors, an "academic" director that must have a faculty appointment (as the executive director does now) and an administrative director. This might be an option to consider for UC MEXUS. ORGS staff will find out how the last director search was done.

Provost Dorr will send a letter to Director Ezcurra to conclude the review.

***Future MRU Reviews:*** There is much variability between MRUs, but Provost Dorr believes they should be looked at collectively. UC MEXUS was one of the MRUs that was more or less left on its own after staffing cuts in ORGS in 2008-09. Communication and oversight decreased in the intervening years, but with a more stable budget situation, there is now an opportunity to strengthen the relationships. UCOP can provide some development support for multi-campus initiatives, but has little capacity for fundraising. The incoming Vice President might work on formulating a strategy for funding that will coordinate the involved campuses. He or she might also want to devote some attention to the structures in place for evaluating MRUs, as there is still confusion about MRU responsibility and governance. The [Research Portfolio Review Group](#) addressed some of the concerns and a consensus was reached that only those organizations receiving systemwide funding need to go through a systemwide review. Committee members agreed that, under UC's system of joint governance, research entities that receive systemwide funding should be periodically reviewed by the Academic Senate, with UCORP as lead committee.

## **5. UC's Natural Reserve System – Update from Director**

*Peggy Fiedler – Director Natural Reserve System*

Natural Reserve System Director Peggy Fiedler gave an update on the organization's strategic planning efforts and 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary capital campaign. NRS is the largest field station operator in the world, with 39 reserves and over 756,000 acres. The 2015-2025 Strategic Plan identified eight goals comprising 40 initiatives.

The capital campaign came about as a result of the PRG ([Research Portfolio Review Group](#)) review, as calculations for that review showed a decline. NRS compiled cost estimates and fundraising goals, and is convening a board of councilors composed of influential people, mostly from outside UC. There is also an internal advisory committee with mostly faculty members. The slogan is "50 for 50" (\$50 million for 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary), and Apple has offered pro bono help in marketing.

One potential area for funding is via the state as a "trustee" agency for California. NRS is one of only four trustee agencies, along with California Department of Fish and Game, State Lands Commission State Department of Parks and Recreation. Fiedler is working with UCOP's Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC) group to find out how it might get state

funding. NRS is also participating in the Refugio oil spill clean-up, which will have some funding as restitution comes from that disaster.

NRS used to be part of ANR, but when its budget was threatened about ten years ago the network struck out on its own under ORGS. NRS engages in more basic research than applied, so felt that ORGS was a good fit. Director Fiedler serves on ANR boards and is working to collaborate on joint programs.

## **6. Consultation with UCOP – Academic Personnel and Programs**

*Susan Carlson – Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Programs*

*Amy K. Lee – Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Director*

Vice Provost Susan Carlson and Employee Relations Director Amy Lee came to talk to UCORP about new federal rules for overtime pay that become effective on December 1. The new rules and their impact on UC are spelled out in an Office of General Counsel advisory that was distributed at the meeting.

The new rules will have a major impact on two academic populations: post-docs (8,000 at UC, 6,300 are under the threshold) and “specialists” (4,000 at UC, 3,000 under threshold).

The result will be that some academic employees will end up being classified as “non-exempt” employees, and will therefore be hourly employees that are eligible for overtime compensation when they work more than 40 hours per week. This is new territory and will change what PIs will have to know about.

The proposed solution for post-docs is to raise the minimum salary to the federal threshold of \$47,476. The decision and implementation involves unions as well as academic personnel units. It is less clear what to do about the “specialist” series. The solution might be to split the series so that the two lower specialist levels become non-exempt while the more experienced receive higher salaries that would not be out of line with qualifications. OGC will be advising on issues around part-time employees, interns and residents who are not covered by the rule’s medical exception. Final decisions on UC’s course of action will rest with Provost Dorr.

UC estimates that it will cost \$36 million to raise everyone (all post-docs) up to the threshold salary of \$47,476.

## **7. Executive Session**

UCORP will talk to the new Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies about MRUs and systemwide reviews.

Work will be continued with incoming Chair Isaac Martin and Vice Chair Jeffrey Richman.

*Meeting adjourned: 4:05pm*

*Minutes prepared by: Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst*

*Attest: Judith Habicht Mauche, UCORP Chair*