UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting
December 8, 2008

I.   **Chair's Announcements**
James Carey, UCORP Chair
John "Chris" Laursen, UCORP Vice Chair
ISSUE: Cancellation of January 12, 2009 Meeting
ACTION: The committee unanimously elected to cancel the January 12, 2009, meeting.

UPDATE: Academic Council meeting of November 24, 2008
Vice Chair Laursen provided this update as Chair Carey was unable to attend the November Academic Council meeting. Topics discussed of interest to UCORP included:
1. QB3 Review: The review response has been vetted by Council and will be forwarded to the Provost for consideration. Other respondents echoed UCORP's calls for greater specificity and adherence to the review protocol.
2. University Budget: President Yudof submitted a fully-funded budget model to the State; significant cuts are expected.
3. Faculty Salaries: Funding for Year 2 of the faculty salary plan is included in the submitted budget, but it is not expected to survive the cuts. Recently, the chancellors forewent their annual raises.
4. Freshman Eligibility: The Regents are still considering the Senate-generated proposal to reform freshman eligibility. The President seeks the inclusion of language that would specify a 3.0 GPA (weighted) is required, rather than an un-weighted 2.8 GPA.
5. Capital Funding Bonds: The Senate will oppose the current proposal as it places the financial onus for a single campus's capital improvements on all divisions and as formal Senate consultation was omitted.
6. Differential Fees: The Senate will continue to oppose differential fees as it may lead to stratification, thus undermining the "One University" identity of UC.

ISSUE: Members queried as to the availability of competed MRU funding for the humanities and social sciences in the new RFP model being implemented by the Office of the President (OP).
DISCUSSION: Members voiced concern that not all MRU personnel understood the purpose behind the new structure and would still be expecting continued funding. Others noted that the metrics of success in humanities research and the hard sciences are different, as are extramural funding opportunities; members posited that successful humanities research is not necessarily marketable in the conventional sense. Some members wondered whether the humanities would have "earmarked" funds, as was done in the recent lab fee RFP.
ACTION: The committee will follow-up with OP personnel on these issues.

II.   **Consent Calendar**

1. Minutes of Meeting of November 10, 2008
   ACTION: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III.   Campus Committee Updates

ISSUE: Members were asked to report on their campus counterpart committees, including meeting frequency, membership, and types and sizes of grants administered, as well as new issues that may be of interest to UCORP.

DISCUSSION: Members reported their findings, but differences were noted in the role of the Vice Chancellors for Research: some were members of the campus committees, while others were only consultants. Differences were also noted in the types and sizes of grants administered: some campuses have a separate grants subcommittee, some award travel grants on the basis of distance, some award grants to emeriti, some weight humanities proposals to off-set the lack of extramural funding opportunities, etc. Chair Carey proposed the creation of a matrix to facilitate easy comparisons and clarity. Members also asked as to the potential of using some of the lab fees for campus research committees.

ACTION: The committee will return to this issue and follow-up on the comparative table.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President
Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Legislation and Policy
Vice President Beckwith updated the committee on several items of interest, including:
1. Presentation to The Regents: ORGS is preparing a presentation to The Regents to describe the breadth and depth of research at UC, as well as its benefits to the state. It is hoped that the presentation will be delivered in February.
2. MRU RFP: The draft RFP has been posted online, and feedback may be sent in via the website. Among other issues still being resolved is how much to revise guidelines governing humanities and the social sciences: Some entities may not technically meet the definition of an MRU but still provide notable systemwide benefits. And although regranting bodies are more viable under this RFP than the lab fee one, the underlying concern still focuses on funding continuation programs (entitlements) versus funding more cutting edge research. Further, fiscal timing constraints necessitate the hastening of the review period.

   DISCUSSION: Members reiterated their concerns on the potential dismantling of worthwhile humanities enterprises and inquired whether alternate funding sources would be available to such researchers and/or whether money could be earmarked by area as was done previously. VP Beckwith noted that those specifics are being revised; he added that the lab fee RFP could serve as a model, observing that every dollar invested in the humanities is valuable. Members also noted that the phrase "seed money" implies a one-time only funding opportunity, and others added that capturing funding is not necessarily the mark of good quality or a successful research enterprise. VP Beckwith stated that basic research would not be placed in jeopardy as a result of this process.
3. Lab Fee Awards: VP Beckwith reported that the winning, as well as the losing, PIs were being notified of the outcome of the peer review process. He added that

a small "bubble list" was created in case selected winners cannot accept their awards. The exact amount of each award is still being worked out, but should be finalized by January 1, 2009. The final list of awardees will be posted online when it is available: http://www.ucop.edu/research/lab_fees.html .

Executive Director Auriti updated the committee on one item:
1. Stewardship of Research Data: New guidelines governing access to and management of research data are being developed in conjunction with research compliance officers. The new guidelines are in response to a request for greater clarification on what happens to data when a researcher, post-doc, or graduate student leaves.

V.   Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Mary Croughan, Chair, Academic Council
Harry Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Council
Chair Croughan discussed two issues with the committee:
1. Stewardship of Research Data:
   DISCUSSION: Members asked whether the proposal being developed included such issues as animal researcher protections and sunset clauses on when data would no longer need to be stewarded. Chair Croughan indicated that concerns such as conservatorship costs are being addressed. Members also asked how competing claims to data ownership might be resolved. Members suggested that dispute resolution procedures, such as mediation, should be outlined in the new policy, along with usage statements/limitations on data stored on no longer accessible media. Chair Croughan noted that some data and practices might be "grandfathered" or might be partially protected, but that penalties for violations were also be discussed.
2. University Budget: Chair Croughan reported that the state's fiscal profile had continued to deteriorate. As a result, The Regents will meet in January to discuss curtailing freshman enrollment. Other measures may be considered in the future.

VI.   UCORP Business
1. TTAC/Restructuring Statement
   ISSUE: UCORP's representative to the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC) has forwarded to UCORP a statement drafted by TTAC asking OP to more carefully plan its restructuring, especially in areas impacting research and technology.
   ACTION: UCORP elected to stand by stated Senate positions on this issue.
2. UCORP Handbook
   ISSUE: Chair Carey has compiled a UCORP Handbook, covering topics such as University administration structures, common acronyms, and UCORP's roll and place in the Senate and shared governance.
   DISCUSSION: Members praised the work done, and suggested expanding the section on the natural resources programs to convey why UC employees worked in this area and how it enhanced the University's research profile.

ACTION: Chair Carey will continue to revise the handbook in light of this and other suggestions submitted electronically.

3. Synergy Project

ISSUE: The committee continues its on-going investigation into methods to enhance inter- and intracampus collaborations. Two issues are considered: (1) broadening access to seminars and (2) facilitating cross-disciplinary interactions.

DISCUSSION (1): Chair Carey proposed a seminar network, consisting of streaming broadcasts via the web to multiple campus locations, multiple campuses, or directly to individual's computers, after which the talks could be archived. Members wondered whether there was demand on the campuses to support such a program. Others noted that small versions of this are occurring on some campuses and in private industry on a for-fee basis. Members also inquired as to who would bear to onuses of maintaining audio and video quality, hardware, and stewardship. It was suggested that ORGS might provide seed funding, if asked. Finally, it was noted that some disciplines might require bandwidth or hardware upgrades in order to make distance collaboration worthwhile.

DISCUSSION (2): Members noted that intercampus travel programs have helped address part of this concern, as have the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). Members also commented that having better cross-campus and cross-discipline networks would aid both new hires and incumbent faculty looking to broaden the scope of their research.

ACTION: UCORP will continue to develop these ideas and return to them at the next meeting.

VII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Information Resources & Communication (IR&C) Principal Investigators and Shared Resources

David Ernst, Associate Vice President and CIO (via phone)
Francine Berman, Director, San Diego Supercomputer Center (SCSC)
Richard Moore, Deputy Director for Production Systems, SCSC
Tammy Welcome, Deputy Director for Information Technology, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)
Greg Bell, Chief Technology Architect, LBNL
Jim Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, UCLA (via phone)

ISSUE: Some research requires greater computing capacity than can be found in laptops or desktops, though not a supercomputer's capacity. Accordingly, it is proposed that many meta-level computing needs can be addressed by sharing resources. Vice Chancellors for Research (VCRs), Chief Information Officers (CIOs), and Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs) have been involved in the development of the proposed pilot project, and they have presented it to the Council of Chancellors. Administration is prepared to move forward with the pilot, pending positive reviews from key constituencies. The benefits of sharing resources include increased competitiveness, long-term enhancement of the University's research portfolio and prominence, and leveraged economies of scale.

DISCUSSION: Members sought clarification as to what projects might need these resources, as well as more information on how the pilot was developed. Director Berman indicated that some seismic studies, for example, might benefit from the shared

resources. She also noted that a detailed business model has been developed and will be circulated after the meeting. Pilot participants were nominated by their VCRs and/or CIOs. Members inquired as to the fate of UC's current IT infrastructure and what measures were envisioned to guarantee that access and responsibilities were distributed evenly. Deputy Director Moore replied that cost savings in energy and building maintenance could off-set out-of-pocket expenses once the project was in wide use. He added that the plan in the short term is to have participants pay by use, rather than through a centrally funded library model, although that may be a good end goal. Members also asked how industry was trending in terms of meta-level computing needs, and Director Berman said that several private companies and competing educational institutions are examining similar cluster upgrades and resource pools.

Members then asked about the costs of upgrading these clusters, perhaps every five years. AVP Ernst indicated that this project is part of the University's overall long-term strategy to re/invest in infrastructure; as such, many costs would be funded centrally and systematically, rather than in a piecemeal and ad hoc fashion. Director Berman then emphasized that the current project is only a pilot, and that future implementation decisions will be made only after a careful evaluation of the pilot's outcomes – such as user feedback.

Members also asked what the typical faculty person would need to do to use the new mini-clusters being piloted. Deputy Director Welcome noted that much of the necessary software could be acquired off-the-shelf. She also noted that the project's governance committee would help in educating faculty and prioritizing requests. Additionally, Director Berman observed that CENIC would help communicate with users about the program.

Finally, the guests encouraged members to review the pilot and send any questions/concerns as well as suggestions on how to make this an effective stepping stone project.

VIII. Executive Session
Note: No notes were taken during executive session.

Adjournment: 3:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst
Attest: James Carey, UCORP Chair