

Minutes of Meeting**June 8, 2009****I. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) Academic Review – Preliminary Discussion**

ISSUE: UCORP will consult with DANR Vice President Daniel Dooley later in the meeting, and this discussion is designed to focus the committee's inquiries.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that the academic review did not contain much statistical data and did not seem to reach far enough in its recommendations. Members also noted that the review would have benefited from an explicit cost-benefit analysis, especially one that compared DANR's output to that of similar units at other institutions, as well as a clearer explanation of how the division's research funds are allocated centrally. Members wondered which stakeholders were consulted and how they were chosen. Members observed that conducting the academic review of DANR, the USDA review of the cooperative extension program, and the self-study and strategic planning processes simultaneously did not enhance clarity as there are both overlaps and contradictions between the three, specifically regarding the call for equivalent status for extension specialists.

ACTION: The committee will address these and other questions to VP Dooley during his consultation period (see Item III below).

II. Consultation with Representatives from Universities Allied for Essential Medicine (UAEM)

Connie Chen, Student, UCSF School of Medicine

Michael Lin, Student, UCSF School of Medicine

Jay Purcell, Student, Boalt Law School (UCB)

Wendy Streitz, Director, Policy, Analysis, and Campus Services, Office of Technology Transfer

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy and Legislation, Office of Research and Graduate Studies

ISSUE: The UAEM representatives introduced themselves and their organization. They noted that the UC chapter has representatives on the national coordinating committee and the state leadership team. UAEM operates as a 501.c.3 non-profit, and its goal is to distribute drugs and treatments affordably in developing countries (see Distribution 1). At UC, UAEM has eight chapters, including one at the Hastings School of Law; nationally, UAEM has partnered with Doctors Without Borders and the Gates Foundation, among others. They ask UCORP to endorse the organization's goals and its draft Global Access Licensing Framework, a template UC may adopt to help structure technology transfer agreements so that medical developments can be more cheaply and easily shared. The University of British Columbia, Yale, and Emory each have adapted UAEM principles, and none has lost revenue as a result. UCORP's endorsement, even while the issue is under investigation by the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC), would bring noteworthy attention to the issue, both within and outside of UC.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired as to the obstacles UAEM faces. Mr. Purcell indicated that normal institutional reluctance to change seems to be the biggest obstacle at present, as UAEM's goals are widely praised. Ms. Chen added that the movement appears to be gaining momentum, and UC's imprimatur could hold the group in good stead nationally. Director Streit clarified that the institutional obstacles include the development of new regulations, which may dissuade potential investors, and the surrender of quality control to unmonitored generic manufacturers. It was also noted that while UC may be a national leader academically, corporate participants may require a different mode of persuasion.

Members noted that the particulars of the proposal fall more appropriately within TTAC's bailiwick. Ms. Chen observed that TTAC is convening a subcommittee to examine the UAEM proposal, but she noted that UCORP could provide evidence of political good will and perhaps creative approaches to bureaucratic obstacles; she added that ideas are the province of the Senate, as well as the values that underlie those ideas. Director Streit stated that the TTAC subcommittee will include faculty representation.

ACTION: UCORP will await the TTAC subcommittee report before taking final action on the matter.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President: Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR)

Dan Dooley, Vice President

ISSUE: Vice President Dooley introduced himself to the committee and provided an overview of his goals for his first year on the job, each of which has now been completed: stewarding the provost's academic review, overseeing the USDA review of the cooperative extension program, and developing a new strategic vision for the Division. These processes began simultaneously last summer, with the strategic vision being promulgated in January of this year, and the reviews being completed in the spring of this year. Each was an iterative process, developed in consultation with internal and external stakeholders. VP Dooley noted that the themes from each part of the tripartite analysis match up closely: each concluded that DANR has been too narrow historically, that it has been detrimentally siloed, and that the future must see DANR become more interdisciplinary and fluid, especially in terms of breaking down walls between the campuses and the county-based advisors.

DISCUSSION: Members voiced their concern that the review did not include enough specific quantitative data, clear metrics for measuring outcomes, or clear indicators of output relative to investment. VP Dooley responded that the self-assessment documents include many such statistics, including a figure that indicates a 20:1 investment return. Members observed that the data presented in the reviews themselves do not support their recommendations, such as the call for equivalent status for extension faculty in the USDA review.

Some members asked for greater clarification on the role of extension specialists vis-à-vis general campus faculty. VP Dooley replied that the primary responsibility of extension specialists is outreach and applied technical instruction in the field. He added that the academic review did not call for equivalent status for extension specialists, but only for greater employment protections to aid in recruitment and retention efforts. Members pointed out that the USDA review calls explicitly for equivalent status, and they noted that the self-assessment materials indicate that at 90% of

other land-grant institutions, extension specialists are in their respective academic senates. VP Dooley remarked that Council Chair Croughan has indicated that a Senate task force to investigate the principles of Senate membership is beginning soon, and he assured members that the recommendations are pragmatic exercises to enhance job security issues.

Members also sought clarification as to which stakeholders were consulted and in what capacity. VP Dooley responded that the stakeholders consulted during the strategic vision process were varied, ranging from food producers to processors to consumers in the food production process area, and in the natural resources area, stakeholders included conservation groups, land owners, public safety officials, and health and nutrition groups. VP Dooley added that the academic review's call for greater diversity in DANR is, in his view, unnecessary as the strategic vision process consulted widely. Members voiced the concern that the strategic vision's coterminous completion makes UCORP's responsibility to evaluate the academic review difficult, especially when referenced interchangeably.

Members then asked whether there was any discussion of conflict of interest between the stakeholders and DANR's academic mission, noting that many DANR faculty feel constrained, politically and scientifically, in disagreeing with stakeholders who control their research's purse strings. VP Dooley acknowledged that past practices have not been ideal in the policy arena, and stated his intention to improve DANR's functions both as a firewall for individual researchers and a generator/evaluator of policy recommendations from a scientific perspective. For the latter, a new procedure will need to be developed and then codified.

Finally, members noted that the review's recommendations are for incremental improvement, not a paradigmatic shift. VP Dooley indicated that the new approaches outlined in the strategic vision process reflect new thinking within DANR, such as a systems approach to challenges, rather than an individualized disciplinary approach. For example, ecosystems should be studied, not just forests and rivers in isolation, as has been the case. VP Dooley also observed that budget-induced restructuring should be viewed as an opportunity to realign the division with new goals and approaches to achieving them.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President: Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

A. ORGS' Restructuring

ISSUE: VP Beckwith reported that his office, like others in OP, has summarily fired all employees and is asking them to apply for reconfigured positions. Overall, the offices he oversees have cut approximately half of their FTE.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether the process was having a negative impact on employee retention. VP Beckwith responded that it was a new process for him and that only time will tell how effective it is. Members also inquired which positions were new, as opposed to merely reconfigured. VP Beckwith indicated that the jobs in the Program Application and Review Center (PARC) and Program Award and Administrative Center (PAAC) were new; other sections were achieving cost savings through FTE consolidation and a redistribution of

responsibilities, such as in the Research Policy, Analysis and Coordination (RPAC) unit. Members also inquired how the new structure will impact the administration of MRUs. VP Beckwith referred members to the Research Grant Programs and Operations unit, most of whose positions are still under recruitment. Members also asked as to the scope and role of the Research Accountability and Coordination (RAC) unit. VP Beckwith indicated the RAC would oversee four areas: 1) Accountability—by evaluating research progress as an institution to ensure that UC maintains competitiveness in our research enterprise and graduate education and to demonstrate UC’s value to legislators, Regents and the public; 2) Marketing—by working with other OP units to communicate the impact of UC Research & Graduate Studies; 3) Coordination and Support—by promoting and facilitating a number of large, high-impact, collaborative initiatives that bring significant new capabilities to UC and will make UC and California world leaders; and 4) Enhanced Research Leadership—by promoting Research and Graduate Studies objectives in OP, government and public settings.

B. MRPI Awards

ISSUE: VP Beckwith reported that he has sent a letter to campus Vice Chancellors for Research, copying Council Chair Croughan, to update them on the status of the MRPI award process. A two-day meeting was held in which the first was devoted to subject area committees making recommendations, and the second was a comparative evaluation of the rank-ordered recommendations from day one in order to derive final funding recommendations. Next steps include the release of funds from the president’s office, sending feedback to all applicants, and meeting with key stakeholders to address any outstanding questions.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired how the established procedures for Senate oversight of dis/establishment of MRUs are incorporated in this new process. VP Beckwith indicated that allowing for Senate processes will serve all well, as that time, anticipated to be between six months and one year, can also be used to ramp up or down units, as needed. VP Beckwith also noted that the systemwide value added by each proposal was weighed heavily in the reviews. Subject areas that received special consideration included humanities and critical California issues.

C. Future and Continuing Issues

- Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR)

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether some researchers pay \$0 in overhead, and VP Beckwith responded yes, adding that some research is often subsidized due to social or political demands. Members also asked whether there were written guidelines for the distribution of ICR funds. VP Beckwith indicated that there is no explicit written policy; money goes to the campus executive vice chancellors, who allocate the funds. Unrecovered ICR could total up to ~\$600M, but the costs of recovery are as yet unknown and may outweigh potential gains.

- Stimulus Money

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether ORGS was developing systemwide guidelines for the acceptance, use, and reporting requirements of federal stimulus money. VP Beckwith replied that his office was not developing such

guidelines since the funds are to be used for projects that are “shovel ready”, thereby obviating any direct need for OP guidance as the funds will go directly to local users and their campuses.

- External Relations

DISCUSSION: Members inquired how OP can better communicate to the legislature the value of research conducted at UC. VP Beckwith noted that several initiatives are underway, and more will be deployed once the new External Relations unit in OP is fully staffed and operational. He added that in his office, the RAC will lead efforts to collect and advertise research accomplishments.

- Furlough/Salary Cut Options

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether ORGS had opined on the furlough/salary reduction options circulated by the president. VP Beckwith replied that yes, his office has shared opinions regarding the financial security and legal obligations for both researchers and external funders, noting the unclear benefit of saving operationally by reducing revenue.

V. DANR Review – Follow-up Discussion

DISCUSSION: Members asserted that the review’s recommendations were too abstract to be acted upon and that many of California’s most pressing issues were only given token attention. Others added that the “softness” of the recommendations could be traced to the lack of intellectual rigor throughout—inadequate specificity, data, and analytical detail was provided. One member noted that the review answered the questions, but that the questions themselves left considerable room for soft answers. Members reiterated their concerns regarding the role of industry insiders in the review, both as stakeholders and as review panelists, and many voiced concern over the lack of specific metrics by which success could be measured. Members agreed that subsequent reviews should include not only precise, longitudinal data, but also indicate that a new paradigm is evident in DANR operations.

ACTION: Analyst Feer and Chair Carey will draft a response and circulate it to the committee for endorsement prior to submitting it to the Academic Council.

VI. Systemwide Review Item: Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

ISSUE: The Board of Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has drafted a set of principles to guide non-resident enrollment practices.

DISCUSSION: Many members observed that non-resident students are often the best researchers, but others noted that UC’s duty, as charged by the state constitution, is to the students of California, despite the lack of state support for their education. Some members wondered whether defraying state budget cuts by increasing reliance on non-resident tuition might accidentally signal to the legislature that it is okay to slash UC’s budget still further, and members agreed that UC’s admissions policy should not be fiscally driven. It was suggested that decoupling undergraduate and graduate students in the principles might make them easier to endorse.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a brief endorsement of the principles and circulate it to the committee for endorsement prior to submitting it to the Academic Council.

VII. Chair's Announcements

James Carey, UCORP Chair

None.

VIII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Mary Croughan, Academic Council Chair

Harry Powell, Academic Council Vice Chair

ISSUE: Council Chair Croughan indicated that the Senate will address several research related issues next year, including usage of federal stimulus funds, research implications of general compliance matters, and of course, the on-going budget situation.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if the Senate leadership had any new information on NAGRPA-related issues. Chair Croughan noted that the topic is to be discussed at the next Academic Council meeting, but preemptively suggested separating out the request for revised guidelines for the ownership of research materials.

IX. Seminar Network

ISSUE: Chair Carey summarized the project's status and next steps, indicating that official Council feedback is still forthcoming. Nevertheless, UCORP can reasonably anticipate the Council response based on copies of the feedback received so far (see Distribution 2), and the committee should act to address the concerns indicated. Further, it is still hoped to publish the concept paper in a high-profile journal.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that changing the default status of the project to "opt-in", rather than "opt-out", should allay many of the concerns raised regarding delivery style and copyright. Members also noted that more specific cost estimates are needed, especially if the next recommended step is a pilot project to demonstrate proof of concept. Members also suggested scaling back the archiving requirement to address both cost and copyright concerns. It was posited that the pilot could be grant funded.

ACTION: Chair Carey will revise the white paper to address Council's concerns.

ACTION: Chair Carey will petition to continue on UCORP in a limited, ex officio capacity in order to steward the project to its completion next year.

X. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of Teleconference of May 11, 2009

ACTION: The consent calendar was approved as amended.

XI. Year-End Wrap Up and Planning for 2009-10.

ACTION: The committee saluted Chair Carey for his excellent leadership this year.

Adjournment: 3:00 p.m.

Distributions:

1. UAEM Overview Information
2. Preliminary Responses to Seminar Network Proposal

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: James Carey, UCORP Chair