

**Minutes of Meeting
November 15, 2010**

**I. Consultation with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS):
MRUs and MRPIs**

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office (RGPO)

Kathleen Erwin, Director, Program Application and Review Center (PARC)

ISSUE: Chair Kolaitis noted that the committee will seek an extension from the Academic Council until March 31, 2011, for submitting recommendations regarding the MRUs section of the Compendium; this will give the committee time to explore the issue in depth and arrive at a comprehensive set of recommendations. Executive Director Croughan presented a recent history of all multi-campus research efforts, noting that they were disparate in scope, origin, and funding source. In the first MRPI RFP, all but three current MRUs were eligible to compete for funding (the exceptions were the White Mountain Research Station, the Lick Observatories, and UC MEXUS). The MRPI should be thought of only as a funding mechanism, not a category of research program. Director Erwin provided more detail on the types of multi-campus research efforts and their origins, highlighting four different types of entities. Chair Kolaitis thanked Executive Director Croughan and Director Erwin for compiling the information regarding multi-campus research entities in the UC system.

DISCUSSION: Members asked for written standards and descriptions of each type of multi-campus research effort, and ORGS personnel agree to provide all that information that is available. Members also asked for clarification on level of formality of each type. VP Beckwith answered that some units follow Senate processes while others are the creation of state or University officials and operate beyond the scope of Senate oversight. Executive Director Croughan added that official MRUs and ORUs can provide directors with stipends. Members agreed that all research at the University, regardless of origin, needed academic and fiscal integrity checks. VP Beckwith wondered how the governor and legislature could be made to follow Compendium establishment procedures. Director Erwin added that since not all internally created research groups sought OP funding, even regulating those units created by UC personnel could continue to be problematic, too.

Members wondered if adopting an NSF-like funding model would work, and VP Beckwith noted that success depended upon identified goals. Director Erwin suggested that externally funded groups might not necessarily be receptive to OP dicta. Chair Kolaitis agreed that lax enforcement/easy work-arounds and poor understanding of status quo rules continues to undermine broader efforts at consistency and improvement. Nonetheless, the brand value of "UC" to a research unit should not be underestimated.

II. Consultation with ORGS, continued:

- Stanford v Roche and IP Agreements
Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)

Wendy Streitz, Director, RPAC

ISSUE: The case has been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, but regardless of the decision, UC will have to change its IP agreements. The current proposal is to ask all researchers to sign a new agreement with new language, specifying that the change is not a change in policy or intent, but in verb tense.

DISCUSSION: Members asked what was new since the last time UCORP heard on this issue one year ago. Director Streitz indicated that there had been no change in the draft language since last year. Members voiced concerns regarding top-down enforcement, noting that most faculty members will not be impacted by the change any time soon. Members also wondered whether this might be considered a change in terms of employment, despite administration claims to the contrary. Members queried whether outside professional activity (OPA) agreements might also come under heightened scrutiny, and Director Streitz noted that the Office of General Counsel has indicated that such are personal choices.

Note: continued in Item VIII.1. below.

- White Mountain Research Station (WMRS) Status

Peggy Fiedler, Director, Natural Reserve System (NRS)

ISSUE: VP Beckwith noted that WMRS only has an annual budget of \$600K/yr, but is home to a unique ecosystem. Director Fiedler then provided an overview of the NRS and its operations. WMRS is thought to be a good match for NRS as it meets each of the three criteria for membership: 1) it has a unique ecological component (the bristle cone pine is indigenous only to White Mountain), 2) it carries guaranteed local, long-term funding, and 3) it has local stewardship. Next steps include receiving a positive review from federal agents and a competition to determine the host campus. Finally, internal permissions from UC oversight bodies must be secured. Formal disestablishment as an MRU would follow naturally from the retirement of the PI and the change in status of WMRS to an NRS acquisition, although it will be up to the Senate to decide how they want to address the existing MRU.

- UC Observatories Review

Steve Beckwith, VP

ISSUE: VP Beckwith provided an overview of observatory operations at UC, highlighting that of the \$20M annual budget, the California Association for Astronomical Research (CARA, comprised of UC, Caltech, and the W.M. Keck Foundation) will continue to receive ~\$12M/yr through 2018, with Lick receiving \$1.5M/yr for operations and \$6M/yr for salaries. UC's long-term plans here focus on the 30-meter telescope (TMT) project, which will also be at the Keck Hawai'i location and which will probably need \$100M/yr or more for operations, assuming scaling with other large scientific facilities. The question UC faces is whether this is the best use of the systemwide astronomy funds.

DISCUSSION: Members wondered how the high cost of astronomy research could be compared to other research efforts most meaningfully. VP Beckwith added that a full review committee will be convened soon, and the Senate will be asked for reviewer nominations.

III. Chair's Announcements

- Academic Council of 10/27/10
Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair

UPDATE: The Council passed a final resolution on the post-employment benefit options to memorialize the Council's position, even though President Yudof had previously announced his planned recommendation to the Regents. The Council also passed a resolution on faculty salaries that suggested that any available monies be split between scale adjustments and added merit bonuses; it will be considered by the Academic Assembly on December 1. The campus executive vice chancellors visited, and discussed a number of topics affecting the campuses with the Council.

- Academic Planning Council of 11/9/10
John Crawford, UCORP Vice Chair

UPDATE: The Academic Planning Council has been re-convened by Provost Pitts and asked to consider, in detail, the implications of downsizing the University. State-supported students cannot be cut, and increasing student-faculty ratios might be off-set with greater reliance on lecturers or online/distance learning. The underlying assumption is that the budget situation is dire and that UC will not rebound absent careful planning. A complete lack of research from the planning agenda was alarming.

DISCUSSION: Members raised concerns regarding any plans that might create a two-tier faculty. Vice Chair Crawford noted a third class, an entrepreneurial one, might arise, too.

IV. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of October 11, 2010

ACTION: The minutes were approved as noticed.

- Effort Reporting Feedback

ACTION: The memo was approved as noticed.

V. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Amendments to APM 010 and 015

ISSUE: The University Committee on Academic Freedom has proposed these amendments following the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Garcetti v. Ceballos case, as well as the Hong v. Regents case, of faculty grievances regarding perceived targeting after public disagreements with administrators over recruitment and retention practices.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the principle of academic freedom should include "freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance", as suggested by the University Committee on Academic Freedom.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft an endorsement of the amendments for committee approval.

2. Report and Recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership

ISSUE: Whether and how to expand Senate membership is the subject of this preliminary discussion, and the committee will return to this topic at future meetings.

DISCUSSION: Members wondered just how the work and focus of the Senate might change if medical school faculty were given greater representation, and why some faculty seem to fear an increase in medical school influence on the Senate.

3. Review of Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Note: Item not addressed.

VI. MRUs, ORUs, MRPIs, The Compendium and The Regents' Research Policies

Members

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that a coherent policy has to be in place within a flexible, but clearly defined, structure. Some members suggested two competitions: one for the UC imprimatur for new projects and another for extant units and projects. Others posited that sunset reviews were essential, and still others insisted on local vetting and involvement. Members also noted that non-comparable ideas would continue to be difficult to compare, especially if the observed practice of “B+” reviews continued.

Members wondered whether formal MRUs were worth maintaining. It was noted that official MRUs have named directors who receive stipends, and that official MRUs and ORUs have traditionally been expected to perform at a higher level. But in the case of units that do not want central funding, those hurdles do not seem worth overcoming. Other members noted that “multi-campus” research might be delimiting vis-à-vis multi-institutional or multi-national research projects.

Discussion turned to preliminary consideration of portfolio reviews versus funding decisions and varying degrees of local COR involvement, as appropriate, as well as varying lengths of funding to incentivize certain outcomes.

ACTION: UCORP will return to this topic next month.

VII. Campus COR Updates

Members

UCB: Changes to the small grants program are forthcoming, and IRBs and human subjects approvals continue to be fractious.

UCD: The new VCR has lofty research income goals and has prioritized development of the UC Davis research brand.

UCI: Irvine also has a new VCR, but COR work has been slow to start following last year's budget woes.

UCLA: Los Angeles, too, has a new VCR, and is also revamping its small grants programs due to underutilization last year.

UCM: [No representative has been named.]

UCR: The local COR has been increasingly active in providing RFP advice to the VCR after requesting greater participation last year.

UCSD: A new VCR will be coming to UCSD soon, too.

UCSF: [Absent.]

UCSB: The COR has received no word yet on its budget or expected changes.

UCSC: Members are unsure what rate to use for benefits on new grant applications.

VIII. New Business and Planning

1. Follow-up item: IP Agreements:

ACTION: UCORP will resubmit last year's recommendation, as the situation has not changed. The committee will add an "expediency" clause for high-risk/high-productivity researchers.

2. Announcements from Academic Council Chair Simmons:

Dan Simmons, Academic Council Chair

UPDATE: The president's post-employment benefit recommendation was widely lauded, even though the long-term contribution rate for current employees to remain in UCRP status quo ante is still unspecified. The current Regents budget includes both an 8% fee increase and \$87M for faculty and non-represented staff raises, though the exact allocations remain to be determined. The state budget increased UC's allocation 12% over last year, but a special legislative session is being convened in December. Other topics of note for this year include further talks about downsizing the University, transfers and curricular alignment, and capital projects and internal funding priorities.

Adjournment: 4 o'clock.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair