

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, December 12, 2016

Meeting Minutes**1. Welcome & announcements**

Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair

Chair Isaac Martin reviewed the agenda and briefly described the idea proposed by Vice Chair Jeff Richman to request a white paper on UC's relationship with the national labs.

Chair Martin met with Director Kathleen Erwin (UC Research Initiatives) last month regarding reviving the process for MRU reviews, which was discussed at the last UCORP meeting. Director Erwin listened to UCORP's recommendation for consulting with MRU directors and will report on progress later in the day. Chair Martin noted that UCORP should continue to emphasize the importance of getting MRU's identified and on a regular review schedule.

The November 14 meeting minutes were approved.

2. ORU and Faculty Grants Processes - Campus Reports***ORUs***

The committee discussed the results of the "homework" distributed to committee members, starting with questions concerning COR involvement with organized research units (ORUs) and other collaborative research structures on campus. Issues included perceptions about the effectiveness of ORU review processes, the inclusion of "centers" and other collaborative efforts, and funding – including the extramural funding that may become available to ORUs. Campuses vary in the amount of information released publicly about ORU funding. There is no systemwide standard for review criteria or metrics.

The group thought it might be useful to document the more successful ways that campuses establish and evaluate designated organized research units and to provide the information to Vice Chancellors of Research, CORs, and/or the university community at large. Because some Academic Senate divisions are not as involved in ORUs as others, a suggestion was made for the committee to send a letter to Academic Council or Vice President Arthur Ellis urging that the divisional Senate have voice in the review of ORUs/centers/etc.

Noting that "best practices" might differ from campus to campus, the committee agreed to continue the discussion in March.

Action/homework for members: Send documents or websites to be shared (if available) to committee analyst Joanne Miller (Joanne.Miller@ucop.edu).

Faculty Research Grants

Members described the process for faculty research grants on their campuses. As illustrated in the compiled results of the survey, procedures and grant amounts varied widely by campus. At Berkeley, each faculty member receives \$4,000 (with certain restrictions). Other campuses are concerned about overhead costs for finding reviewers with appropriate expertise to evaluate proposals that are often for relatively small sums. Some campuses are structuring the grant awards to be used to further campus-wide goals such as intercampus collaboration. Members pointed out the importance of a competitive grant for a junior faculty member's CV.

Two models emerged as the primary methods: 1) minimizing overhead by widely distributing the money, and 2) a "start-up" model of supporting ideas that would otherwise not be able to get funding or to leverage additional funding.

Some CORs report grant outcome and impact information in their annual reports or other documents. Having metrics would be helpful for approaching campus administrators for more funds.

UCORP will continue discussions on the topic, and members are welcome to take the compiled information on faculty grants back to their campus CORs to consider changes locally. Chair Martin suggested that it would be useful for institutional knowledge purposes if the information discussed today was documented somewhere. Martin volunteered to write up a document that describes the various campus models and some of the considerations for faculty grant awards that could be used as a resource.

Action: Chair Martin will use the information collected on campus faculty grant processes to draft a document on the various models and considerations.

3. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Council update –

- Academic Council sent a [letter](#) endorsing President Napolitano's public statement of UC's principles in support of undocumented students.
- The pace of Senate reviews for graduate degree programs is under scrutiny by the chancellors. At least one chancellor would like to see process streamlined.
- International Thinking Day will be March 7th.
- In March the Regents will likely approve a policy on non-resident undergraduate enrollment. The administration is proposing a cap of 20% (on each campus and systemwide). Three campuses are above currently above 20% non-resident enrollment. The anticipated net revenue loss for the three campuses is estimated to be almost \$56 million. Concurrently, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is reviewing its "compare favorably" policy to be sure it's being carried out and reported properly.
- Chancellor searches continue at UC Davis and UC Berkeley.

- Chief Risk Officer Cheryl Lloyd presented information on the proposed international travel registration request for faculty at a recent meeting of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare. UCWF was satisfied that the data collected would be secure and well managed.
- The Academic Assembly meeting scheduled for December 14 was cancelled and replaced with a condensed videoconference meeting of the Academic Council.
- A recent town hall meeting at UC Riverside exposed much dissatisfaction from faculty about issues related to enrollment growth and shared governance.

Regents' Meeting update –

- At least one public commenter called for the resignation of Regent Pattiz.
- Chair Jim Chalfant's [remarks to the Regents](#) can be found on the Academic Senate website.
- Regents discussed the Budget for 2017-18, including the continuation of the Budget Framework Initiative (BFI).
- UC will be asking for funding for 900 graduate students.
- Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom gave an overview of the financial health of the institution, including the retirement fund.
- There will be an increase in the student services fee, mostly to cover mental health services, and an increase in non-resident tuition.
- Private support for the university reached a record amount this year of \$2.1 billion.

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

Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Collective Excellence Document (Draft)

A draft document, “The Pursuit of Collective Excellence in Research at the University of California,” was distributed to UCORP members prior to the meeting. The need for such a document arose from a request from campuses for assistance in recognizing faculty contributions to the value of the research enterprise. The intent was to create categories of activities that campuses could use as a guide for how to evaluate contributions to research at UC.

Members discussed issues such as proper recognition for multi-author papers, “resource authentication,” and differences between disciplines. Some members expressed appreciation for the document and noted that CAPs would find such a guide useful when evaluating contributions for merit and promotion purposes. One member noted that this type of work is also being done on campuses, with departments providing information about scholarly activity in their fields.

Suggestions were made for keeping the guidance at a general level while adding more specific examples. It should also be clear whether the document is meant for faculty evaluation or for academic units.

There is a draft of a UC Research Mission Statement on the UCORP website, but this was never approved by the university at large. Director Croughan noted that this type of guidance has been attempted before but was not universally adopted. Now might be a more opportune time for an official university document.

VP Ellis is getting feedback on the draft document from the VCRs in January and from UCAP in February. UCORP will discuss it again at its next meeting in February. Meanwhile, if members have specific wording or framing suggestions, they should send them to committee analyst Joanne Miller (Joanne.Miller@ucop.edu) or directly to VP Ellis (Arthur.Ellis@ucop.edu).

Update on The Conversation

The Conversation is a faculty-written, faculty-controlled web publication that is also available as a subscription, with daily updates sent via email. A couple years ago UCORP was very interested in UC's involvement and encouraged the Office of Research and Graduate Studies to join as a founding member. Many UC articles have been published in the past few years, and the metrics are impressive. Articles are picked up by the Associated Press and distributed to news outlets nationwide. President Napolitano's article about [science in the public square](#) is one of the most popular.

Executive Director Mary Croughan will bring metrics to UCORP in February to further inform the committee and so that members can continue to spread the word to campuses colleagues and encourage more faculty to submit articles.

MRPI Awards update

The MRPI awards were announced and committee members were pleased with the results. The committee praised the UCRI staff for their great work with the proposal review process.

MRU Reviews

Director Kathleen Erwin passed around a handout with an explanation of MRUs (multi-campus research units), a description of categories of MRUs and other systemwide research collaborations, and a timeline for the process of clarifying the status of UC's MRU portfolio and associated review process. A draft letter to the directors of these programs was circulated to UCORP on Friday. The overarching issue is that MRUs and systemwide programs are supposed to be reviewed periodically, but due to several factors reviews of some systemwide programs have fallen off schedule.

While the programs have been neatly divided into categories for the purpose of organization, the lines are not so clearly drawn. Some "category 2" programs were included in the PRG process and did have oversight at that point (in the past 2-3 years), if not formal review. Some programs receive funding through the MRPI grant program and are reviewed via that process.

In the next few weeks Director Erwin will contact the program directors, all of whom will be invited to participate in one of three conference calls to talk about the alignment of current MRU practices with UC's policies and processes (outlined in the [Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units](#) – the "Compendium"). Erwin

anticipates that some systemwide programs might choose to become an ORU or other organizational unit rather than go through the MRU process.

5. Consultation with the Office of the President - [Institutional Advancement](#)

Geoff O'Neill, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement

Heather Kopeck, Director of Development Policy and Advancement Relations

AVP Geoff O'Neill and Director Heather Kopeck came to UCORP to discuss potential procedures for establishing and reviewing endowed chairs, including the Presidential Matching Chair program and endowed chairs for Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) and the Lawrence Berkeley Lab.

With 146 chairs established just this year, the university now has more than 2,000 endowed chairs. Beginning in the 1980s it became a significant form of philanthropy for UC; chairs are seen as good way to engage with the philanthropic community. The policy and framework for Endowed Chairs and Professorships is codified in [APM 191](#). The policy for Presidential Chairs is described in [APM 265](#).

Stemming from a proposal by President Napolitano's tuition working, each campus received eight "presidential matching chairs," for a total of 80 systemwide. Donations of \$500,000 or more would get matching funds from OP to endow the chair. Recently, the President decided to extend the opportunity with five chairs each to ANR and the Berkeley Lab, and two additional chairs per campus: one specifically targeted for a field related to a Presidential Initiative and one in any field.

Campuses already have established processes for endowed chairs that include academic senates, but the proposed new Presidential chairs for ANR and Berkeley Lab are outside the control of an individual campus. The Berkeley Lab faculty have joint appointments, so review could be done via the Berkeley divisional Senate, but questions remain for faculty involvement in the ANR chairs. Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant voiced his concern about companies or industry groups essentially obtaining a 50% discount on their philanthropic contribution by providing funding in this way. The example used was the rice industry.

How the Academic Senate, or UCORP specifically, is involved in the process for systemwide endowed chairs is still to be determined.

6. Potential White Paper on UC's Relationship with the National Labs

Jeff Richman, UCORP Vice Chair

UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman contacted Kim Budil, the Vice President for the National Laboratories about the need for a white paper to describe UC's relationship with the national labs. VP Budil appreciates UCORP's involvement in communicating with faculty, and Richman thinks that a white paper about how the relationship works, and perhaps some principles to guide the relationship, would be useful, especially in light of UC's predicted re-bid for the Management and Operations (M&O) contract for Los Alamos National Labs when the current contract runs out next year.

Richman provided some background about the labs, the type of work they do, and ideas for the content, purpose, and audience of a white paper. (Richman's slides are available on the UCORP SharePoint site).

Although the paper is meant as a general background document, members noted that such a paper might be seen by some faculty as an argument in support of a UC bid for the LANL contract. There will be pushback. Members suggested including the costs borne by UC versus the benefits received, and the impact on UC when accidents happen.

Action: Jeff Richman's white paper proposal draft will be circulated to UCORP members who may get input from colleagues and will provide edits and suggestion to UCORP analyst Joanne Miller (Joanne.Miller@ucop.edu) by early February. ACSCOLI members will be asked to do the same. UCORP will discuss the white paper proposal at its February meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 4:00pm

Minutes prepared by: Joanne Miller, UCORP Analyst

Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair