

**Minutes of Meeting****March 8, 2010****I. Chair's Announcements***Greg Miller, UCORP Chair*

Chair Miller updated the committee on events of interest at other meetings:

1. Academic Council Meeting of February 24:

- Post-employment benefits (PEB) are the subject of much interest: the underfunding is significant, and state funding would be inadequate, even were it forthcoming. Many Council members are concerned that the paucity of information will only worsen internal relations. The situation is dire enough that vested rights might potentially come under question. Watch for upcoming campus visits both by systemwide Human Resources and Benefits and by Academic Senate leadership.
- Regent Gould met with the Council, and heard Senate positions on PEB funding, faculty salaries, and the impact of both on morale.
- A new item on professional degree fees is headed toward the Regents.

**DISCUSSION:** Members voiced several concerns over any potential changes to the professional degree fee policy, including that most external funds cannot be used to cover fees, thus changes could disadvantage low income students still further. The policy is intended to give professional schools a larger pool of comparators against which market rate fees can be more easily derived. Nonetheless, members voiced concerns over potential "slippery slope" issues and the trending foci of University coursework.

2. Academic Assembly Teleconference of February 26:

**SUMMARY:** President Yudof spoke to the Assembly, and most of his remarks were directed toward the recent spate of race-based negative incidents at some of the campuses.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked whether the Assembly opined on the value of the accompanying teach-ins. Vice Chair Kolaitis, who participated in the call in lieu of Chair Miller, noted that most reports reflected good attendance, though attributing change to such events is more problematic.

**II. Consent Calendar**1. Minutes of Meeting of February 8, 2010

**ACTION:** The minutes were approved as amended.

**III. Indirect Cost Recovery Investigation Update***Mike Kleeman, UCD Representative**Roland Henry, UCSF Representative*

**ISSUE:** The joint UCPB-UCORP subcommittee investigating indirect cost recovery (ICR) has nearly completed its work, and there are two identified problems: 1) the flow of funds from UCOP to the campuses and 2) the flow of funds once they are on a

campus. While the former seems solvable, the latter is again a stumbling block, and the idea of “isotope-tracking” ICR funds is considered as a double-edged sword: departmental rivalries could be exacerbated. Improvements to processes here could rebound in other areas: the “cost” of doing research is calculated by the rate negotiators, but when the “cost of doing research” is under discussion, vague numbers are used.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that local isotope tracking could backfire: recruitment packages and laboratory upgrades could be targeted. Moreover, usage restrictions imposed by some fund sources suggest that keeping ICR monies fungible helps the entire research enterprise. Members asked how the subcommittee work might intersect with the Commission on the Future work. UCI Representative Crawford, who also sits on the Research Strategies Working (RSW) Group, indicated that while the RSW was looking forward to the joint report, ICR is also under consideration in the funding strategies group; the various reports have not yet been aligned.

**ACTION:** Chair Miller will ask that the lead authors augment the call for transparency and reinvestment in research from ICR dollars.

#### **IV. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) Review Metrics**

*Greg Miller, UCORP Chair*

**ISSUE:** Specific metrics have been generated that should lend greater focus to upcoming DANR reviews and self-studies.

**DISCUSSION:** Members sought clarification on how the new metrics were to be used, since the academic review was completed last year. Chair Miller explained that the new metrics should be answered and held in abeyance to serve as benchmarks for future reviews. It was also suggested that although DANR is unique, many of the metrics would apply to other units, such as MRUs and the Cal ISIs. Members felt the budget metrics should be expanded.

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will update the metrics and recirculate the draft for final approval.

#### **V. Lab Issues**

*Bill Eklund, Office of General Counsel*

**ISSUE:** Counselor Eklund provided an overview of the labs’ LLC governance structure and the roles UC plays within it. Most of the details are also explained in the LLC synopsis online [here](#).

**DISCUSSION:** Members had several questions on the management fees UC collects, and Counselor Eklund clarified: UC collects about 30% of the LLC fees, which are performance based (using safety and output metrics). Last year, the fee recovered by UC was ~\$20M. Many members wondered why UC is a partner for so little reward, especially if UC continues to be pilloried in the press for lab management snafus.

Senate Vice Chair Simmons, who also serves as chair of the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues, elaborated: the budget of the labs has increased under the LLC structure, but that is due to safety and compliance concerns; UC’s net share of the fees has not risen. The areas of operation in which UC is most involved, research quality standards and human resources policies, have not seen cost increases which would have commensurate fee increases. This process is further complicated by federal budget scheduling, requirements, and fund availability, as well as policy changes dictated at the highest level. Nevertheless, from an HR perspective, the transition has been rough

and employee morale at the labs is low: changes to the benefits structure seem to have lowered expectations regarding loyalty. The National Academies of Science will conduct a transition study, which should commence soon.

Members then returned to the value-added to UC by the labs, especially in the LLC structure. The benefits of UC to the labs are readily apparent; the reverse is still unclear. Members also asked what manner of redress was open to UC, given the constraints of the management contracts. Both Vice Chair Simmons and Counselor Eklund indicated that those procedures continue to evolve. Senate Chair Powell added that a new strategic vision for the labs, UC, and the LLCs is needed.

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

## **VI. Commission on the Future – Research Strategies Working (RSW) Group**

*Mary Croughan, Co-Chair, RSW*

*John Crawford, UCI Representative and RSW Member*

*Margaret Schoeninger, UCSD Representative and RSW Member*

**ISSUE:** Co-Chair Croughan summarized the time line of the Commission and recapped the topics under consideration by RSW. UCORP is asked for preliminary feedback.

**DISCUSSION:** Members had several specific suggestions, such as noting that “securing new funding streams” places priority on revenue, not research. Others suggested that calls for the state to increase funding, realistic or not, must preface any other recommendations. Members added that the recommendations, which vary in terms of scope and impact, are all presented with equal weight, and Co-Chair Croughan responded that the final report would be rank-ordered. Members suggested defining better “cutting edge” research.

Members also noted that a recent AAU report stated that the administration costs of research are over 60%, well in excess of the 26% cap. Members asked about specific recommendations for HABSS fields, and Chair Croughan noted that the zero-sum funding pot at the campuses could make top-down resource redirection unwise. Some suggested that “risk management” become “creating a positive research environment”.

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

## **VII. Systemwide Review Items**

### 1. UCPB White Paper on Non-Resident Tuition and Differential Fees

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft a letter of endorsement for the white paper.

### 2. CITRIS Review Protocol

**ISSUE:** CITRIS is the third Cal ISI to undergo its 5-year review. UCORP is asked if the draft review protocol is adequate.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Miller noted that the protocol is largely unchanged from previous CalISI reviews, which were not well-received by the Senate. Members agreed, though, that if followed, the protocol is adequate.

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft a letter of support for the protocol, noting previous review shortcomings, and circulate it for electronic approval.

## **VIII. MRUs and the Compendium**

**ISSUE:** The revised Compendium will soon be released for systemwide review, but the section dealing with MRUs has been tabled. UCORP discusses how to close this persistent loop.

**DISCUSSION:** Many members felt that Compendium reviews and processes should be automatic, regardless of the *nomme de jure* of MRUs, lest another new acronym be created to circumvent Senate processes. Others wondered, though, if there were qualitative differences that necessitate separate processes for varying types of research units; similar concerns were voiced regarding establishment versus review. The many different types of MRUs (and ORUs) present in the system already might preclude a one-size-fits-all solution, as might the distinction between academic merit (as evaluated by the Compendium) and fiscal viability (as indicated by external funding opportunities, for example). Members bandied various ideas, although none was finally endorsed: to create two tracks for MRUs- one for internally funded and one for externally funded; to separate the application process and requirements from the review and renewal processes and requirements; to mandate self-sustaining business plans; to sever Lick Observatories and White Mountain; to include ORUs.

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will investigate workable outcomes and report back.

#### **IX. New Business and Planning**

None.

Adjournment: 3:30 p.m. (early due to fire alarm)

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Greg Miller, UCORP Chair