

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, May 8, 2017
Meeting Minutes

Members attending	Isaac Martin (Chair, UCSD), Jeffrey Richman (Vice Chair, UCSB), Kimmen Sjolander (UCB), Janet Foley (UCD), Raju Metharate (UCI), Leif Havton (UCLA), David Noelle (UCM), Andrew Baird (UCSD), Janet Myers (UCSF), Jianwen Su (UCSB), Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Chair, UCD), Shane White (Academic Council Vice Chair, UCLA)
Members absent	Richard Arnott (UCR), Steve Whittaker (UCSC)
Consultants, Guests, and Staff	Arthur Ellis (Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies), Mary Croughan, (Executive Dir., Research Grants Program Office), Kathleen Erwin (Director, UC Research Initiatives, via phone), Emily Rader (Portfolio/Strategies Manager, Research Investments), Nick Anthis (Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)

1. Chair's report, announcements

Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair

Meeting minutes from April 10, 2017, were approved.

Along with Isaac Martin, Janet Foley (UC Davis) has agreed to serve on a new Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR).

As background for the upcoming MRU reviews, the committee discussed how ORU reviews are conducted on the campuses. On some campuses, small committees composed of Senate members and external scholars may be formed specifically to review an ORU. The committee conducts interviews with the unit's leadership and the PIs who are involved with the ORU. The ORU may take responsibility for obtaining external review letters or conduct a survey of experts in the field.

The committee compared the ORU/MRU review process to the models used for tenure and departmental reviews. The MRU review process seems involve elements of both. UCORP is free to make recommendations to ORGS about the review process. Any recommendations should consider which elements are truly valuable as well as the workload vs. benefit.

2. ACSCOLI meeting recap

Jeff Richman, UCORP Vice Chair

UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman reported on the April 18th ACSCOLI meeting, where there was a discussion of the white paper that UCORP proposed last month to Vice President of the National Laboratories Kim Budil. VP Budil was happy to get the faculty perspective and appreciative of the faculty's attention to the issues and the ongoing relationship. ACSCOLI members wanted to be sure the paper covered the full breadth of the work of the labs, including the future of national security. Some had concerns that the release of the white paper might create a backlash against the labs.

Director of Lawrence Berkeley Lab Mike Witherell joined the meeting to provide an update on the capital and budget planning at LBL, and also on his interactions with and impression of the new Secretary for the Department of Energy, Rick Perry.

3. Campus Reports

Round-robin

UC Berkeley: Bear grants are being continued after a three-year pilot, with some revisions. Every eligible faculty member will receive \$4,000. Faculty who receive \$10,000 or more from external grants will no longer be eligible. Carry-forward will be permitted up to \$6,000 per year. The administration had no response to COR's request for more funding for emeriti.

UCLA: UCLA's faculty grant process had been long and involved until this year, when a new simplified application and lightweight review process are being tested. The review committee is a small group from within the Academic Senate. Faculty who have external grants of \$100,000 or more are discouraged from applying, and grant recipients are expected to report on whether the campus research grant generated additional funding. The new process will be reviewed at the end of this year.

UC Davis: The administration announced a few weeks ago that it is proposing a new tax on clinical income (e.g., medical and veterinary) and on external grant funding. There was no faculty consultation. The funds would go to the Provost's Office to spend on teaching and anything else that the administration deemed necessary.

UCSD: There is a new Academic Senate task force at UCSD that is reviewing the ORU model. There has been ongoing discussion of issues such as the perception that existing ORUs are locking up funding, that applying neutral rules across fields privileges the sciences, and the question of whether reviews should differ across disciplines due to differences in the availability of outside grant funding. UCORP Chair Isaac Martin was on a similar task force a few years ago.

An idea that has come up repeatedly at UCSD is the creation of institutional alternatives to ORUs that would receive different types of funds and use different review metrics.

UCSF: The administration has said that warehouse-type spaces will be retrofitted, but the funding for doing so is uncertain. A consultants' report justified faculty's concerns about space issues.

UCM: There are reports that some faculty are struggling to find funding to support the mandatory increase in post-doctoral salaries.

UCI: In response to UC Merced's concerns, the Irvine representative noted that NIH has come through with extra money for training grants.

4. Systemwide Review Items

- Draft letter: Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls (Comments due May 17, 2017)

UCORP will send a letter expressing the committee's concerns with the proposed policy.

- [Proposed Revisions to APM - 285, 210-3, 133 and 740](#) (Comments due June 21, 2017)
Concerning changes to Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) Series.

Some UCORP members objected in very strong terms to the proposed name change from LSOE to “Teaching Professor.” Their concerns included that the creation of a Teaching Professor title might appear to define the regular Professor series as non-teaching by contrast; that the name change alone might change expectations in ways that would burden incumbents in the series, for example by increasing the demands for graduate student mentoring; and that there was no well-defined problem that would be solved by this name change. The members of UCORP were not uniformly opposed to the name change, but no one was very strongly for it, and some members were very strongly against it. No one knew for sure why the name change was being proposed, though members speculated about the reasons.

Chair Martin will draft a response letter to circulate for committee review before the deadline.

5. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

Chair Chalfant talked briefly about the recent state audit of UCOP. The Academic Senate will most likely issue a statement in response.

The Regents will be discussing an undergraduate nonresident enrollment policy that caps the portion at 18 percent systemwide.

6. Consultation with the Office of the President – Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)

Glenda Humiston - Vice President

Vice President Humiston reported on the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources’ strategic planning process, which was done at the request of President Napolitano. Other requests from the President (listed on page 7 of the plan) ask ANR to review and streamline administrative services, increase efficiencies, finalize MOUs with campuses regarding CE specialists, and increase the diversity of the workforce.

Right now, ANR is conducting an in-depth review of all programs that includes salary equity, staff training and development, and volunteer management solutions. VP Humiston said that ANR has 20,000 volunteers. The division is also focusing on strategies for financial stability, including the creation of a funds development office and increased cooperation with campus partners (Berkeley, Davis and Riverside).

Questions for VP Humiston centered on ANR’s process for conducting evaluations and independent evaluations of quality. The division includes advisors, specialists, and faculty who do research and serve communities throughout California. It has advisory boards with external representation, and reviews are released for public comment. All grant proposals and researchers who apply for funding go through a peer review process.

VP Humiston briefly described Agricultural Experiment Stations vs. UC Cooperative Extension. AES funding, which is around \$104 million, is distributed to approximately 600 Senate faculty and is controlled by department deans. VP Humiston noted that AES funding underwent a separate financial audit.

ANR is unique in the state, and has been in existence as long as the university. It includes a cooperative extension as well as agriculture experiment stations and research extension centers

(RECs). ANR has hundreds of thousands of acres throughout the state where researchers conduct agricultural and environmental research. The biggest centers are in the Sierra Foothills, San Joaquin Valley, and Fresno County (the Kearney Research Center). There is one by Oregon border and one on the Mexico border. The state's second largest herd of sheep is at the Research Extension Center in Hopland, Mendocino County. Humiston noted that the division is not taking money generated from the marijuana tax or doing marijuana research because it would jeopardize its federal funding. VP Humiston suggested that committee members explore the ANR website (<http://ucanr.edu/>), which has detailed information on CE specialists, workgroups, program teams, and county offices too.

7. 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 Dir., Research Grants Program Office
Emily Rader, Portfolio/Strategies Manager, Research Investments
Nick Anthis, Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives

- MRU reviews and SciVal

The group discussed upcoming MRU reviews and some of the best practices for evaluating quality. In general what would be expected from an MRU is scholarly merit over and above what the members could accomplish individually. After a brief demonstration of the capabilities of SciVal, the committee discussed whether the tool would be useful in contributing to the MRU reviews. Although it seems that the metrics provided by SciVal have value for departments or individual researchers, it was not clear that the metrics would be useful for MRU evaluation.

Meeting adjourned: 3:45

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCORP Committee Analyst

Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair