

**Minutes of Meeting
March 14, 2011**

I. Chair's Announcements

Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair

John Crawford, UCORP Vice Chair

1. Academic Council of February 23, 2011:

UPDATE: Chair Kolaitis updated the committee on several items of interest from the meeting: 1) All Senate respondents to the Funding Streams proposal expressed concerns for the lack of graduate student funding protections and encouraged a comprehensive approach that will combine the implementation of the funding streams proposals with rebenching. 2) The Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) was established, and its charge and membership approved. Vice Chair Crawford will be UCORP's representative. (See also Item VIII below.) 3) Campus plans for administering funding cuts are due, but divisional priorities do not always align with systemwide planning goals. 4) UC's accreditor, WASC, is exploring tiers of accreditation.

2. Academic Planning Council of February 22, 2011:

UPDATE: Vice Chair Crawford updated the committee on several topics discussed at the recent Academic Planning Council meeting: 1) If the taxes extensions do not pass or do not even make the ballot, UC's \$500M cut could double. 2) Educational outcomes are being pushed as a means of accountability, but academic freedom and research concerns remain. 3) No external money has been secured for the online education pilot project approved by the Regents, but the pilot is going forward in the hopes of gaining support later. 4) New rules are being drafted for self-supporting programs as they are expected to grow in number and scope. 5) The proper balance between Senate oversight and market needs in professional degree programs is being further explored.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if any online degrees were being offered in the online education pilot project, and Vice Chair Crawford answered no, only individual classes at present. The courses being designed are intended to be systemwide. Members also asked where intellectual property would reside, and Vice Chair Crawford indicated that any IP will continue to reside with the creating faculty member. Members wondered whether low enrollment courses would be forced online, possibly jeopardizing instruction-intensive classes or advanced research courses. Vice Chair Crawford noted that the courses under development are for undergraduates only, and Chair Kolaitis added that several accrediting agencies have online quality monitoring protocols in place.

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of January meeting

2. DRAFT Minutes of February Teleconference

ACTION: The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

III. Update: Seminar Network

James Carey, UCORP Chair 2008-09

Lynn Burnstan, Director, UCTV

ISSUE: The 2008-09 UCORP authored a [paper published in PLOS Biology](#) calling for a strategic approach to recording, broadcasting, and/or archiving the hundreds of seminars that take place on UC campuses each week, and a pilot project was initiated. Since then, 2008-09 UCORP Chair James Carey has continued to develop the project, recently teaming with UCTV to improve access and standardize platforms. This expansion will help enable UCTV not only to fulfill its public service mission, but also to become a scholarly resource.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether the project could be self-financing, and Director Burnstan indicated that to date, funding is centrally provided and the intent remains to engender goodwill and further raise UC's media profile. Members also asked about curatorial procedures and costs. Director Burnstan noted that small file sizes common in industry standard technologies help keep cost and bandwidth low, and UCTV has its own servers for long-term storage. Members asked about copyright concerns and editing. Professor Carey responded that participation was entirely voluntary and that the software being used in the pilot allowed for redaction of selected audio segments and supplementary materials, such as slides or graphs. Members then asked about search features, given that there are potentially thousands of lectures that could be archived. So far, title keywords and speaker names are the only searchable fields, but that is expected to improve. Members asked whether the larger budget situation was a cause for concern, especially long-term. Director Burnstan replied that various revenue generating options are being explored, but that nothing had been decided. Finally, members asked whether UC was truly the trailblazer in this type of effort, and Professor Carey said yes, there were no university models to adapt.

ACTION: UCORP will ask the Academic Council to endorse the next stages of the project at an upcoming meeting of the Council.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

1. MRUs:

ISSUE: UCORP has been working on a proposal to revise the MRU guidelines in the relevant section of the Compendium. An almost final draft was circulated to the UCORP members following the February UCORP teleconference. Discussions continue on finalizing UCORP's proposal.

DISCUSSION: Executive Director Croughan suggested that the PI threshold for MRPs had been set too high, observing that adjunct faculty would be disallowed as would other non-Senate researchers in the health sciences. She added that such faculty could receive special dispensation from their campus for federal grants and proposed that standard for MRPs, as well. UCORP accepted Director

Croughan's suggestion to expand eligibility for PI of an MRP to any person with PI status on her/his campus. VP Beckwith inquired why MRPs would only be eligible to apply twice for UCOP research funding, and sought clarification as to the role expected of the ORGS VP in overseeing MRUs and MRPs. Chair Kolaitis explained that the MRPs are intended to be shorter-term projects; long-term projects should have an academic interface and become MRUs. The VP ORGS' role would be to steward review documents and proceed to disestablish underperforming units and programs.

2. Cuts to UC's Centrally Funded Research Portfolio:

ISSUE: Discussion continues on how to pare back UCOP's centrally funded programs, given external budget pressures. These include UC's centrally funded research programs; the present target represents a substantial percentage (25%-30%) of ORGS's current research budget.

DISCUSSION: Members asked what the next systemwide research opportunity would be. VP Beckwith reminded members that the MRPI funds have been pre-awarded for this year and that the lab fees will be used to off-set state budget cuts. The Discovery Grants program is on partial hold, but there remains considerable interest from industry. VP Beckwith added that no already allocated funds were being recalled; no new allocations will be made in these areas.

Members then asked how closely ORGS worked with the Budget Office in persuading Sacramento of the value of UC research to the state. VP Beckwith indicated that the two offices do not coordinate closely. Executive Director Croughan added that it was her impression that most high level funding discussions focused on education access and fees, not research.

VP Beckwith reported that some of the shifts in State funds could be beneficial: state funding for AIDS research, for example, was once essential to the field, but today, industry and federal funds have surpassed state funding in the area by a significant degree. As a result, that state money could be usefully repurposed without damaging UC's AIDS research efforts. Moreover, the impressive return on investment from programs like the Discovery Grants suggest that area as a strategic investment. Members then asked whether restricting institutional funds to academic areas where industry support was slim was workable. Members also asked whether all of the campuses saw the benefit of centrally funded research programs. Executive Director Croughan indicated that many campus officials were surprised to learn of the costs of taking over projects and programs from the Office of the President.

Finally, members asked whether the divisions could "piggy-back" on ORGS' application review teams. VP Beckwith indicated that a process template could be made available or greater services – for a discounted fee.

3. Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) Negotiations:

ISSUE: The Santa Cruz campus has sent out a space usage survey on the grounds of updating records for federal indirect cost recovery rate negotiations.

DISCUSSION: VP Beckwith indicated that his office was not involved in this effort; many campuses conduct negotiations directly with the federal government. Concerns should be addressed locally.

4. State Research Contracts:

UPDATE: ORGS is helping develop a standard contract template for use between UC and the state. At present, each new project requires a contract that is drawn up from scratch, costing both time and effort. The generic contract being sought must first overcome an ICR impasse: the state will not go higher than 15%. More broadly, various national organizations, including Council on Governmental Relations (COGR), the Association of American Universities (AAU), and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), have taken up low ICR rates, stressing the seemingly arbitrary, yet clear discrepancies in rates from cognizant agency to agency.

V. Research Strategies Working Group Follow-Up

John Crawford, UCORP Vice Chair

ISSUE: The Commission on the Future and its Research Strategies Workgroup made several recommendations to improve research at UC as well as UC's research profile. Unfortunately, budget and other considerations prevented many of the recommendations from being endorsed by the Regents, and in many cases, from even being heard by them. Should UCORP move forward with some of the recommendations, such as developing a systemwide research mission statement?

DISCUSSION: Members wondered whether a "grand challenges" approach would be appropriate currently, and if so, how projects would be prioritized. Members asked if the Commission on the Future would be reconvened or if a successor body was envisioned. Vice Chair Crawford indicated no, but some of the topic areas had been subsumed by the Working Smarter initiative or were echoed in the report of the "Powell Committee" and the recommendations therein. Nonetheless, placing research priorities relative to other priorities is thought to be a useful exercise. It was noted that UC's basic research infrastructure and research programs were not being adequately nurtured, and that if this trend continues, the overall quality of the UC system will be undermined.

ACTION: UCORP will return to this topic at its next meeting.

VI. MRUs

ISSUE: The committee continues discussion from IV.1. above.

ACTION: The final draft will be transmitted to the Academic Council for review and possible endorsement by the Council; after this, it will be transmitted to the Academic Planning Council.

VII. Implementation of Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGRPA)

Mike Kleeman, UCD Representative

Ellen Auriti, Office of General Counsel

ISSUE: Previous UCORPs have elected not to opine on open NAGPRA cases, but one case has proven protracted and contentious. UCORP discusses UC's NAGPRA processes and how they might be improved, given reports of non-responsiveness and selective enforcement as well as academic freedom concerns.

DISCUSSION: Counselor Auriti reported that the governing regulations have changed, and now institutions must make disposition of remains, even if tribal affiliation cannot be irrefutably established. In the present case, the local tribe seeks disposition and the local

chancellor supports the disposition. Yet the factual analysis continues. While analysis continues, researchers are not allowed access to the remains; disposition would likely block any future access, as well. Members asked what specific processes the NAGPRA board followed, but Counselor Auriti indicated that UC only has implementation guidelines. The question becomes, if not required by law or policy to proceed with disposition, what is the best research outcome and course of action? Members agreed that the best course of action was to comply with all relevant laws and UC policies, but to support the rights of Academic Senate members to conduct research within those boundaries. Members also agreed that all decision-making processes related to such issues should be completely transparent.

ACTION: UCORP will communicate to ORGS VP Beckwith, chair of UC's NAGPRA council, their desire to see more transparency in decisions made by UC officials on matters concerning NAGPRA processes.

VIII. Consultation with Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)

Barbara Allen-Diaz, Associate Vice President

ISSUE: AVP Allen-Diaz provided a summary of ANR's strategic vision and plan, and welcomed the committee's feedback.

DISCUSSION: Chair Kolaitis asked when the Senate could expect a reply to its follow-up from ANR's recent academic review, in which the Senate asked for more quantitative data and qualitative benchmarks against which improvement could be measured. Chair Kolaitis emphasized that this problem has been found to be ubiquitous to institutional reviews, and is not limited to ANR specifically. AVP Allen-Diaz indicated that budget-induced layoffs and internal restructuring interrupted the process of providing the requested materials, but that a response could be expected by summer. She added that any future changes/cuts to ANR will be made according to the plans outlined in the division's strategic vision, such as continuing to combine administrative units and tasks while protecting field research and faculty. Members then asked how ANR faculty were defined. AVP Allen-Diaz indicated that at the Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES), there are ~600 faculty at Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside, most with split appointments on a general campus, but that county-based advisors and extension specialists were also counted.

Members asked how the strategic plan and day-to-day operational plans were determined. AVP Allen-Diaz said that both plans involved the same processes and players: The ANR program council made the final decisions after soliciting feedback from stakeholder groups via local roundtables and executive communications. Members asked who represented the Senate on the ANR program council, and AVP Allen-Diaz stated that the four program deans (the college of agriculture and natural resources deans at Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside, and the dean of the Davis veterinary medicine school) were Senate members and were involved in all key decisions. It was noted that these deans may not have systemwide Senate interests forefront in their minds during ANR deliberations, nor do they report to the Senate via any official mechanism.

Members then asked about possible changes to the endowment funds administered by ANR. AVP Allen-Diaz explained that the endowment funds in question are administered by an advisory council whose memberships rotate every five years. As

the current cycle expires, it is customary to issue a new RFP for administration of the endowments, rather than assume continuation of the current payout as an entitlement. That is, the payouts are not legacy funds to a particular campus or department.

Members also asked about the remainder of the ANR budget, and how it was allocated. AVP Allen-Diaz reported that the AES funds are awarded to EVCs, but that the funds are “green” and susceptible to internal redirection. Members inquired after ANR’s ICR rate, and AVP Allen-Diaz noted that ANR’s 0% ICR rate was a legacy from the USDA, and not likely to increase soon, despite widespread and repeated calls for change.

Members emphasized that the involvement the Senate seeks through the recent establishment of an Academic Council Special Committee on ANR should not be interpreted as an indictment on the decisions reached, but as a desire to join the process. ANR’s highly visible public face and natural alignment with Senate interests should be leveraged for mutual benefit.

IX. Campus Updates

None.

X. Further Discussion and New Business

None.

Adjournment 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair