

**Minutes of Meeting
November 10, 2008**

I. Chair's Announcements

James Carey, UCORP Chair

ISSUE: Chair Carey suggested that agenda Items III and VI be switched so that consideration of the MRU RFP could precede the Office of Research consultation.

ACTION: Members agreed unanimously to reorder the agenda.

ISSUE: Chair Carey updated the committee on items of interest from the Academic Council meeting of October 22, 2008:

1. University Budget: There is only bad news to report: Flat funding for the University equals a \$100M cut. A restoration of inflation-adjusted full-funding for the University would require an additional \$900M for 2009-10. Such funding would cover faculty and staff raises, employer contributions to UCRP, enrollment growth, and restored programs. Unfortunately, only cuts are expected.
2. Rehired Retirees: The University is trying to standardize its recall policies, and the Senate is submitting specific wording recommendations following its evaluation of the already Regent-approved policy.
3. Effort Reporting: A new policy is being developed which would require researchers to submit effort reporting documentation online. While an improvement from previous, paper-based policies, the process is still onerous, and the University continues to struggle with non-compliance.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that the new software was easier, but it was still a burden on time and energy. Others suggested that faculty do and will continue to object on principal to overregulation and "compliance creep." Another member suggested that the issue is not one of too much red tape, but rather one of too little explanation and education from administrators. Members who had used the new system indicated that another objection is one of having legally binding electronic signatures on dubiously secure and still largely unworkable software programs. Chair Croughan observed that antiquated payroll systems and the use of different software by campuses only exacerbate both the problem and the sense of umbrage.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Minutes of Meeting of October 13, 2008

ACTION: The minutes were approved as amended.

2. Response to UCAF Bylaw Amendments

ACTION: The correspondence was approved as noticed.

3. Response to PDPE Report

DISCUSSION: Members agreed with the tone of the letter, stating that the proposal codifies a practice initiated by non-educational entities. Members also agreed that the proposal, as written, did not justify the title of "doctorate." Others cautioned

that if UC did not regulate the new professional degrees, a less well-respected body would do so, which would not advantage anyone involved.

ACTION: The response will be revised to encourage the drafters to either strengthen the academic requirements of the proposed professional doctorate or to rename it.

III. Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) Draft Request for Proposals (RFP)

Kimberly Hammond, UCR

Phokion Kolaitis, UCSC

ISSUE: The Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) is developing an RFP to compete unrestricted research funds allocated by the Office of the President. Representatives Hammond and Kolaitis outlined their concerns with the draft RFP: that the page limit may be too low, that funding requests should be capped, and that more details regarding the matching campus funds requirement should be given (see also Distribution 1).

DISCUSSION: Members observed that holding incumbent and new MRUs to the same standards seemed unfair. Other members observed that securing matching funds for the arts and humanities has frequently been problematic. Other members were concerned that the distinctions between MRU-available funding and funding for other areas of research, such as the lab fees and California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs), were not clearly drawn.

ACTION: Members will raise these concerns with Vice President Beckwith during Item V below.

IV. Update on Lab Issues

Mary Croughan, Academic Council and Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) Chair

John Birely, Associate Vice President, Lab Management

ISSUE: AVP Birely reviewed the pit production report enclosed in the agenda (Enclosure 4), and then provided an overview of pit production in the United States. Currently, any pits produced could be used in one of three ways: placed into warheads, dismantled for research, or stored for aging research. In 1996, when UC had sole proprietorship of the labs, the federal government ordered the production of 31 pits; the first was produced in 2007, and since then, 17 have been completed. It is not known if the federal government will place another order, and AVP Birely stressed that press reports suggesting an annual production of 50-80 pits was a hypothetical exercise never implemented; the current pit production limit at Los Alamos is no more than 20 pits per year, but that number has not been requested.

DISCUSSION: Members sought clarification on the difference between production and stewardship, arguing that any new pits constituted production. AVP Birely explained the government's position, holding that stewardship necessarily involves production as destructive testing requires a replacement device. Further, the science involved in both analyzing destroyed pits and creating new ones has led to notable increases in refereed publications in the actinide sciences. Chair Croughan concurred, asserting that (1) UC, as sole manager of Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) in 1996, agreed to assume pit production following the closure of the Rocky Flats, CO, facility, and (2) stewardship and

scientific oversight have been endorsed repeatedly by the Senate. Some members were unconvinced, reiterating their position that the government's definition of stewardship was a "slippery slope" to production.

Members then asked whether the government could simply mandate that more pits be produced. AVP Birely responded that the lab's production is limited to a maximum of 20 pits per year, and that not all pits made would be certified. To produce more than 20, new facilities would need to be constructed—a capital improvement that would take both significant financial resources and time investments. Twenty pits per year is anticipated to be adequate for successful stewardship of the envisioned arsenal size. Members asked what that size was, and AVP Birely noted that, in accordance with the Moscow treaty, the size of the U.S and Russian active stockpiles will drop to approximately 1700 – 2200 deployed warheads by 2012.

ACTION: UCORP will continue to monitor events from the labs.

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

Steven Beckwith, Vice President, ORGS

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy and Legislation

Dante Noto, Director, Humanities, Arts, and Social Science Research

Vice President Beckwith updated the committee on several topics of interest:

1. The graduate deans held a joint meeting with campus vice chancellors for research (VCRs) in Santa Barbara.
2. ORGS' restructuring continues, and so far the department has shrunk by approximately 90 FTE. Significant savings were realized through the consolidation of six different peer review programs into a single unit, the Program Application and Review Center (PARC). It is expected that ORGS will absorb parts of the Industry-University Cooperative Research Program (IUCRP), the Cal-Canada partnership, and perhaps aspects of the new China and India partnerships, as well.
3. ORGS is developing ways to better advertise to lawmakers and the public the benefits of research at UC.
4. ORGS is also developing an internal list of UC research priorities.
5. MRU RFP:

ISSUE: Representatives Hammond and Kolaitis outlined the committee's initial feedback (see Item III above).

DISCUSSION: VP Beckwith noted that capping or tiering proposals by funding could be difficult given the variegation in both size and scope of projects even on the same topic. Further, as with so much else, guarantees of future funding cannot be made at present. Director Noto added that the RFP process will serve as an effective referendum on the current research projects funded by OP. Members noted their concern that requiring matching campus funds might be proscriptive. Director Noto indicated that in the past, such has not been the case.

ACTION: Representatives Hammond and Kolaitis will revise their draft response and submit it to the committee for endorsement at the December meeting.

Executive Director Auriti also updated the committee on two items of interest:

1. Stem cell research: There is a state hearing next week on the governance of the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM), which will focus on potential conflicts of interest. UCI VCR Sue Bryant will represent UC at the hearing. ED Auriti also noted that federal funding restrictions on stem cells may change in the next administration.
2. National Science Foundation (NSF) policy changes: In January, NSF will issue new policies allowing greater flexibility regarding salary allocations from NSF grants. Campus contract and grants officers will be the lead resource for campus-based researchers. One concern is that the policies may also stipulate demonstration of post-doc mentoring programs as well as responsible conduct in research (RCR) training, similar to, but broader than, current National Institutes of Health (NIH) ethics training requirements.

VI. Accountability Framework

ISSUE: The president's draft UC Accountability Framework is out for systemwide review, and each standing committee has been asked to share its ideas on how to improve the document in future iterations.

DISCUSSION: Members identified several shortcomings in the draft document, both generally and in research-specific areas. General areas of concern include the lack of statement of purpose and a lack of clarity regarding the intended audience. It was suggested that an executive summary could address these concerns. Other general comments indicted the implicit endorsement of various external university ranking programs and whether this was appropriate, especially given the omission of other, more academically rigorous rankings. Throughout, the data lack both normalization and interpretation, thus limiting their utility and perhaps encouraging their misuse. Finally, members thought that the metrics included were merely those readily available.

Research-specific feedback focused on additional metrics that should be included, such as publications and citations and a broader assortment of awards. Members also felt that the draft failed to illustrate clearly the proportional relationship between research and quality education and between research and economic vitality. It was also suggested that greater cross-referencing would enhance the draft, by, for example, indicating undergraduate research accomplishments in both the undergraduate and research sections. Members questioned the reliance on external research funding, noting that many disciplines contribute significant research absent large sums of money. Lastly, members posited that a survey of comparator institutions' research publicity mechanisms would assist the future development of the document.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft the committee's formal response and circulate it to the committee prior to submitting it to the Academic Council.

VII. Update on the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) and the Industry-University Cooperative Research Program (IUCRP) Steering Committee

Hans Schollhammer, UCORP Representative to TTAC and IUCRP Steering Committee (via phone)

ISSUE: Professor Schollhammer provided a summary of his written submission (see Distribution 2), highlighting three concerns:

1. **Restructuring:** Both TTAC and IUCRP are now under the jurisdiction of ORGS, and members of both are concerned by the lack of stated vision for the restructuring plans to which they are subject. Members have noted both a potential loss of independence and a reversal of previous centralization trends as specific worries.
2. **Finances:** TTAC received a presentation from Wendy Streitz, Director of Policy, Analysis, and Campus Services in the Office of Technology Transfer, which illustrated the breadth of UC research, along with its attendant costs. The presentation is available online [here](#).
3. **IUCRP:** The budget for IUCRP is an item of perennial concern, but especially this year. The IUCRP Fellows program is in its third year; the program has been successful, but requires \$1M/year to continue.

DISCUSSION: Members asked how UCORP could best help. Prof. Schollhammer noted that bringing light to these programs' funding situations could help. For example, noting that for small programs, a 10% cut is drastic and noting that previous years have seen IUCRP's budget poached to fund other programs might help secure their funding this year. At risk is the maintenance of the program's quality. Another way UCORP could help is by pushing for a greater explanation of the strategy of the proposed restructuring before it is approved and enacted. Members asked for a breakdown of IUCRP funding, and Prof. Schollhammer noted that at most 9% of the budget is used for administration; the remainder goes to funding grants. Members also noted that not each campus has its own technology transfer office, so devolving those responsibilities may not be feasible or result in a cost savings.

ACTION: The committee will draft a letter asking for greater transparency regarding the proposed restructuring of the units.

VIII. Synergizing the Research Enterprise

James Carey, UCORP Chair

ISSUE: UCORP continues its discussion of how to better cohere UC's research activities. Chair Carey observed that throughout UC, each week probably hundreds of seminars or talks are presented to a limited local audience; interested colleagues often have difficulty attending and potential researchers (READ students) often cannot attend or are unaware of the programs. Might not UC's research portfolio and advertising be enhanced by podcasting or otherwise electronically archiving and then rebroadcasting these talks?

DISCUSSION: Members noted that some materials have copyright restrictions if taken out of the classroom/lecture hall, and others suggested that some faculty might not welcome additional publicity due to safety and security concerns. Chair Carey sought to broaden the discussion by reframing the issue by noting a lack of coordination and even communication between, for example, nine different UC economic departments as an indicator of the absence of a systematized or complementary approach to research throughout the system. Graduate Student Representative Serwer proposed systemwide

departmental retreats, and other members suggested “simulcasting”, rather than archiving.

ACTION: The committee will continue to explore this topic at future meetings.

IX. Member Business and Planning

1. **ISSUE:** UCLA Representative Lane posed the question of whether it was true that California’s private institutions of higher education received tax exemptions from sales taxes on educational and research materials, such as microscopes, while UC pays those taxes.

ACTION: Executive Director Auriti and Analyst Feer will investigate the topic and report back in December.

2. **ISSUE:** UCSB Representative Stuart reported that on his campus, there is growing concern over legal issues surrounding copyright/fair access/open access.

ACTION: UCORP will monitor this issue.

3. **ISSUE:** UCSC Representative Kolaitis suggested hearing how other campus committees on research (CORs) govern themselves.

ACTION: Members will survey their campus CORs and report back in December, focusing on (1) the frequency of meetings and the size of the committees, (2) the role of the campus VCR (ex officio, attending regularly as guest, attending sporadically, etc.) and the committee’s relationship with the VCR, and (3) the size of campus COR budgets and the types of grants administered by the CORs.

Adjournment 3:30 p.m.

Distributions:

1. TTAC/IUCRP Summary Report
2. MRU RFP talking points

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: James Carey, UCORP Chair