

**Minutes of Meeting  
October 12, 2009**

**I. Chair's Announcements**

*Greg Miller, UCORP Chair*

After welcoming new and returning members, Chair Miller updated the committee on several items of interest:

1. UC Commission on the Future (aka The Gould Commission): The Commission has a deadline of March 2010, which will require rapid action on the parts of the participants. Academic Council immediate past Chair Croughan has been named co-chair of the workgroup on research, and UCORP will consult with her regularly throughout the Commission's activities (see also Item VII below). Nonetheless, the typically slow pace of Senate response is a cause for concern.  
**DISCUSSION:** Members asked whether each campus is represented on each of the work teams. Chair Miller replied that the final memberships were still unknown; Senate nominees were only recently submitted. Members voiced concern over whether Senate positions will be meaningfully evaluated/included.
2. University Budget: The state budget is expected to be still worse next year. The specific impact on the University is as yet unknown, and so the continuation of the furlough program is also unknown.  
**DISCUSSION:** Members inquired how the impacts of the furlough program could be measured, such as in terms of recruitment and retention. Chair Miller noted that the time and complexity of academic appointments makes clear attribution difficult. Vice Chair Kolaitis added that the present crisis differs from the 1992 crisis due to the then-existence of the VERIP and the better overall health of UCRP.
3. University Publicity: Many faculty have voiced displeasure over President Yudof's recent interview with the New York Times.  
**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that the interviewer has a negative reputation in many circles, but that the interview was one of the Times' leading letter generators of late. Chair Miller added that various constituencies have drafted or are drafting letters of reproach, although the Academic Senate is not such a group.

**II. Consent Calendar**

There were no items on the Consent Calendar.

**III. Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) Update**

*Hans Schollhammer, UCLA Representative and UCORP Liaison to TTAC (via phone)*

**UPDATE:** Professor Schollhammer provided an oral summary of the written report he submitted previously (see Distribution 1). Among the highlights of the report was a new office, Innovative Alliances and Services, that has subsumed the Industry-University Cooperative Research Program (IUCRP) and is under the direction of Executive Director Bill Tucker.

**DISCUSSION:** Members inquired as to the cost trade-offs between patent filing and the resulting income generation, noting that most US patents cost upwards of \$10K and many do not yield measurable income from licensing, etc. Prof. Schollhammer indicated that the costs of patents do vary and the lack of a standardized international intellectual property jurisprudence further complicates matters. Members also inquired as to the future of the Discovery Grant program, formerly administered by IUCRP. Prof. Schollhammer replied that the funds would be administered centrally, as part of campuses' block grants.

Members then asked whether TTAC had issued its recommendation regarding the Universities Allied for Essential Medicines (UAEM) proposal UCORP heard previously. Prof. Schollhammer reported that TTAC continues to evaluate the issue, noting potential trade-offs between the principles espoused in the documents and the modification of University policies. TTAC also remains concerned about industry buy-in and potential negative impacts on sponsored research. The TTAC investigation is continuing, however, and more details will be available soon.

Members also queried whether TTAC evaluated patent disclosure and conflict of interest policies regarding outside consulting, noting that the agreements faculty must sign are frequently inconsistent and could cause problems, such as the current Stanford case. Prof. Schollhammer will raise the issue with TTAC when they next meet.

Finally, members asked for a campus breakdown of UC patents, which Prof. Schollhammer will circulate when available.

#### **IV. Furlough Impacts**

*Greg Miller, UCORP Chair*

**ISSUE:** Over the summer, correspondence from the Office of the President intimated that research was optional and not as important as other aspects of UC's mission, such as teaching. UCORP authored a letter in response, and submitted it to the Academic Council. The Council has requested that UCORP amend its letter by not highlighting specific language, but rather addressing only the thrust of the statement.

**ACTION:** The suggested revisions were adopted unanimously by the committee, and Analyst Feer will re-submit the letter to the Academic Council.

**ISSUE:** In order to off-set the impacts of the furloughs on lesser-paid faculty, some campus Councils on Research (CORs) are contemplating using their travel grant budgets as buffers. This potential use of campus funds has been met with mixed reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** Issues of equity are of primary importance: if the COR funds should be released, then they should only be available to those without extramural funding and who thus cannot participate in the Furlough Exchange Program (FEP). At Berkeley, for example, the current draft of the program limits participants to those whose base salary is under \$85K and who receive less than \$25K in extramural funding. It is being packaged as a "summer research grant" not to exceed a summer ninth; prohibitions on using COR funds for salaries, however, complicate matters. Other campuses reported that their COR budgets had been partially or fully seized by central administrations for use elsewhere. Members voiced concern over the loss of COR autonomy and uncertainties regarding the various proposals being circulated. Some members noted, however, that fairness is rarely objective and that in absolute dollar terms, reaction may be disproportionate.

**ACTION:** Members will report on the exact status of campus COR funding and any other (negative) impacts of furlough implementation.

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

*Martha Winnacker, Executive Director*

**ISSUE:** Ms. Winnacker reported that the differential fee item previously circulated for expedited review has been pulled from immediate consideration; the committee is welcome to submit comments nonetheless. The proposal will instead be evaluated by the UC Commission on the Future, whose Senate members should be confirmed and announced soon.

Ms. Winnacker also provided an overview of Senate policies, including reimbursement and travel protocols. She encouraged members to be mindful of issues of confidentiality, especially regarding draft positions.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Miller asked how much support was available to working groups and subcommittees that may arise during the year. Ms. Winnacker indicated that support was available, but that specific inquiries would need to be accompanied by justifications.

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

*Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President*

*Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy, Analysis, and Coordination*

Executive Director Auriti updated the committee on several items of interest:

1. ORGS Reorganization: The unit continues its restructuring, and Ms. Auriti has subsumed responsibility for some aspects of technology transfer. The new RPAC unit will continue to issue research policy guidance and implementation guidelines. The unit's current priority is updating status quo policies, beginning by cataloguing them and calendaring them for annual review.
2. ICR Waivers: Vice President Beckwith is examining the waivers of indirect costs as a means of capturing greater revenue.
3. Researcher Safety: ORGS continues to work with the campuses to develop best practices for responding to safety incidents, particularly those attributed to animal rights activists. The faculty-led group PRO-Test continues its work and recently received a statement of support signed by the president and the chancellors. The impact of new legislation will be monitored closely.
4. ARRA Funding: The reporting requirements associated with federal stimulus funds are significant; recipients should contact their campus research policy units for guidance and support.
5. Furlough Implementation: Implementing the furlough plan has proved more complicated than originally envisioned. Local officials were notified of plan particulars thought to have been too complicated for general distribution; this material can be made available more widely. Questions should be referred to local academic personnel offices.
6. TTAC and UAEM: The global access proposal is also being investigated by ORGS; further updates will be made as more information becomes available.

Deputy Gautier also updated the committee on several items of interest:

1. UC's Research Profile: Deputy Gautier give a brief overview of the communications goals of her office (see Distribution 2), noting that there was a new research communications position in the office of external affairs. The first task is to define the message and then to develop metrics to measure the success of subsequent communications.  
**DISCUSSION**: Members noted that demonstrating local impacts needs to be a key aspect of any strategy, and they inquired which office was to take the lead in research communications. Deputy Gautier replied that the new external affairs unit has a systemwide focus but that her office could help bring items into high relief. Members also asked how the immediate costs of research and under-recovery of indirect costs could be presented against the long-term benefits and investments that result. Deputy Gautier agreed that was a difficult task and suggested emphasizing the investment aspect of research, noting the need for specific numbers and perhaps even a new vernacular. Members noted that another part of the research story that needs explanation is how research funds are actually used; it is not just the public that is unclear on how research at UC is conducted.
2. MRU/MRPI Funds: Deputy Gautier reported that where feasible, winners of the recent MRPI RFP were being funded.  
**DISCUSSION**: Members asked when the next RFP would be issued, and Deputy Gautier indicated that since most of the winners submitted multi-year proposals, no fungible moneys were expected until 3-5 years had passed. Members also asked when the RFP losers would be de-funded and when they would receive the written feedback promised during the RFP process. Deputy Gautier said that not much written feedback was available and that funding questions should be addressed to Vice President Beckwith.

## **VII. Consultation with the UC Commission on the Future – Research Working Group**

*Mary Croughan, Research Group Co-Chair*

**UPDATE**: Professor Croughan indicated her hope that at least half of the working group's members would be Senate faculty. Early goals for the work group include: ensuring rapid and meaningful feedback from as many constituencies as often as possible during the group's deliberations; exploring means of securing greater overhead from low-paying agencies and foundations; defining better the role of students in research; codifying responses to safety issues and threats; defining better the role of research in recruitment and retention; defining better the role of industry partnerships; and improving media messaging. It is hoped that policies issuing from the Commission's work can be in place by July 1, 2010, so the committee is encouraged to work hard and fast. Updates will be posted on the Commission's website, and feedback will be accepted there, too.

**DISCUSSION**: Members inquired how local meetings and site visits would be noticed to the public, and Prof. Croughan indicated that messaging would be centralized. Members also noted the apparent inequities at the University between perceived to be highly and less-highly research-intensive fields. Prof. Croughan added that other aspects of research, such as delivery via sales and services, should also be accorded a higher place in the research portfolio of the University. Members encouraged Professor Croughan to

keep compliance issues before the Commission, specifically noting that corporate and university requirements can and should be different, as appropriate. Members also asked Prof. Croughan to keep Senate processes in mind when establishing deadlines for feedback.

### **VIII. Follow-up Discussion**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

### **IX. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Academic Review Follow-Up**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

### **X. Overhead Costs**

**ACTION:** Representatives Henry (UCSF) and Kleeman (UCD) will join UCPB representatives on the investigatory work group.

### **XI. Seminar Network Update**

*James Carey, Immediate Past UCORP Chair (via phone)*

**UPDATE:** Professor Carey summarized recent events regarding the 08-09 committees' submission to PLoS Biology of its concept paper regarding the creation of a UC Seminar Network. The reviewers' recommendations are fairly straightforward, but there seems to be some confusion surrounding a standard article and a community page submission. Nonetheless, Prof. Carey will continue to liaise with local and systemwide IT officials to further develop both the submission and the pilot alluded to therein. Professor Carey will continue to keep the committee informed on developments.

### **XII. Systemwide Mentoring**

*Laura Serwer, Graduate Student Representative (UCSF, via phone)*

**UPDATE:** Ms. Serwer reported on her work to develop a systemwide mentoring program that would match students and faculty regardless of campus affiliation. A survey is available online through a UCSF-hosted website.

**DISCUSSION:** Members suggested other models for Ms. Serwer to consult, such as MentorNet. Members also asked whether confidentiality issues had been considered, since ostensibly applicants would share some personal information. Similarly, members suggested investigating grievance remediation procedures should such become necessary.

### **XIII. Campus Issues**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

#### Distributions:

1. Report on meeting of TTAC, September 23, 2009
2. Research Communications Goals

Adjournment: 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Greg Miller, UCORP Chair