

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

## Minutes of Meeting

May 14, 2012

**I. Announcements**

1. The Academic Council met and discussed several items of interest:
  - A researcher protection statement was endorsed;
  - The governor will release his May revision of the state budget today; how UC fares is still unknown;
  - A new task force on Senate membership has been formed in response to the UCSF question; its time line will extend into the next academic year;
  - The recommendations of the Faculty Salaries Task Force have not received unanimous support from any group of stakeholders, including a split faculty opinion;
  - The Council voted to dissolve the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) and re-assign its duties to other committees; the full Assembly must vote on the question at its upcoming meeting;
  - The salary equity study feedback continues to be processed, but the larger point should not be lost: UC has a salary equity problem;
  - The UC Online project continues to encounter problems regarding budget and academic planning.
2. The Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) has not met since UCORP's last meeting. Participation on the ANR program council requires a 28-day/year commitment, which is prohibitive to many interested parties.
3. The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLD) has not met since UCORP's last meeting, either, but the lab fees have been returned to research-related uses only this year, after being available for general usage last year.

**II. Research Mission Statement**

**Issue:** Discussion continues in-person, following a preliminary electronic vetting of changes suggested by the administration to UCORP's Research Mission Statement.

**Discussion:** Members wondered if the suggested edits made the statement too broad, and sought to hide the still-visible cuts to the research budget. Specific textual changes were suggested and debated.

**Action:** The agreed-upon edits will be recirculated electronically for final approval.

**III. Systemwide Review Items**

1. Proposed Technical Revisions to APMs 035 (Affirmative Action) and 190 (Whistleblower Protections):  
**Action:** The committee elected not to opine.
2. Proposed Revisions to APMs 010, 015, and 016 (Shared Governance and Academic Freedom):  
**Action:** The committee elected not to opine.
3. Faculty Diversity Report:  
**Discussion:** Members noted that committee service fatigue is a concern in many locations. Actual proportional representation was discussed, as opposed to ideal pipeline representation.  
**Action:** UCORP will encourage further, more nuanced study of the topic.

**IV. Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC)**

*David Ernst, Chief Information Officer*

**Issue:** CIO Ernst provided the committee with a recent history of ITLC, focusing on events surrounding the 2008-09 research cyberinfrastructure shared computing proposal. Although there was widespread support, the coterminus funding crisis effectively scuttled the project by redirecting funding away from new projects in support of maintaining current efforts.

**Discussion:** Members asked how current IT resources and staff would be allocated if central funding continues to diminish. CIO Ernst indicated that staff would be shifted to contracts and grants, where feasible, and that host campuses could purchase extant hardware. Members also asked what efficiencies shared computing proposals bring to UC. CIO Ernst noted that the customer for central services is central finance, not individual researchers: the goal is to lower total local costs, but individual bandwidth and security needs outweigh cost-sharing savings in some instances. Members then asked how CIO Ernst's office was involved in the Simon Foundations recent \$60M grant to UC Berkeley to study the theory of computing, and CIO Ernst indicated it was a local project only. Members suggested that future proposals include more thoughtful data management and workflow outlines, as well as more detailed business plans. Members further suggested that industry best practices be surveyed and incorporated where applicable.

## **V. Open Access**

*Chris Kelty, Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)*

**Issue:** Chair Kelty visits UCORP in follow-up to this spring's consultation and in advance of his committee's May 25 meeting, wherein the final draft proposal will be approved. The proposal has two goals: 1) to make UC research more available, and 2) to encourage UC faculty to submit materials to the California Digital Library or other field standard repository.

**Discussion:** Members asked what type of "scholarly articles" were targeted by the proposal. Chair Kelty indicated that it should be interpreted as it is in similar, extant policies, but the term typically denotes peer-reviewed works. Members asked who retained copyright in the status quo, and Chair Kelty estimated that fewer than 10% of faculty retain copyright at present. Members asked how local CAPs would be instructed to evaluate submissions to OA repositories. Chair Kelty noted that quality was not determined by modality. Chair Crawford posed two outstanding questions: 1) Should the default be opt-in or opt-out? 2) How can unintended consequences, like limiting legitimate commercial re-use of materials, be avoided? Members added a third topic: the future of professional societies that depend on dues and such for subsistence.

**Action:** Analyst Feer will draft a summary of UCORP concerns for transmittal to UCOLASC.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President, Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)**

### **1. Indirect Cost Recovery:**

*With Wendy Streit, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)*

**Issue:** Director Streit summarized the proposed changes to UC's indirect cost recovery policy: 1) greater delegation to the campuses of authority; 2) increased use of "class waivers"; 3) on-going re-assessment of actual costs; 4) issuance of a policy statement targeting full cost recovery; 5) the establishment of minimum costs for certain practices; and 6) direct charging when possible, including administrative support for smaller grants, and additional allowable local options such as infrastructure fees. The boldest recommendations call for a higher rate for industry-sponsored research to off-set deflated federal reimbursement rates and asking the state of California to begin paying indirect costs.

**Discussion:** Members asked how "full costs" were to be determined, and how "full recovery" goals could be achieved. Director Streit indicated the full cost would vary by campus due to local energy, real estate, and labor markets, among other factors. Full recovery would be of the

determined rate for each broad research field. Members asked why clinical trials received an exception to the suggested rate guidelines, and Director Streitz noted that modified total direct cost (MTDC) calculations and NIH rates superseded UC preferences. Members wondered whether too much flexibility could lead to unhealthy competition between the campuses. Members also asked how equipment re-use was considered in the proposal, and Director Streitz indicated that in-kind waivers would be accepted. Lastly, Director Streitz noted that direct feedback would be accepted, in addition to the committee's official response.

2. Lab Fee Usage:

*With Kathleen Erwin, Director, Program Application and Review Center*

**Update:** Director Erwin reported that the review committees met in April, convened in six content groups and one large project group. In total, there were nearly 575 applications and over 80 readers. Each group submitted rank-ordered lists, and the final selection committee will soon meet to determine overall winners; applicants will be notified in advance of the public announcement.

## **VII. Task Force on Principles, Processes, and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments (PPA)**

*Jenny Gautier, Deputy to ORGS Vice President*

**Update:** The current draft includes edits from last week's teleconference, including the addition of established metrics to the suggested RFP template.

**Discussion:** Members suggested that the comprehensive nature of the portfolio itself be specified, ranging from MRUs and ORUs to UCO to the Cal ISIs to the lab fee program, all UC research endeavors would be considered as a composite whole. Members also suggested that glossary and approval process maps be added. Quality, as distinct from efficiency and applicability, should be a specific program goal. Balance of the composite whole, as well as balance within buckets, should be an enumerated goal.

## **VIII. Proposed Compendium Revisions**

**Issue:** Chair Crawford summarized the previous UCORP's work to establish guidelines for short- and long-term projects, local and system projects, and the like, which have now been converted into policy in the form of a revised draft Compendium.

**Discussion:** Members wondered which should come first: a revised Compendium or a revised portfolio? More broadly, the question of ideal practices balanced against real-world practices was discussed, as was preservation of the role of faculty in priority setting, not just in implementation processes.

**Action:** Discussion will continue electronically.

## **IX. Campus Updates**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

## **X. New Business**

• UC Astronomy Board Draft Charge:

*With Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the ORGS Vice President*

**Issue:** Acting on the recommendation of the both the external review committee and UCORP, and at the behest of the Provost, ORGS personnel have drafted a charge for the advisory board envisioned to oversee interactions between the Office of the President and UCO.

**Discussion:** Members asked for clarification of the role of the Academic Senate, as distinct from the role of faculty, generally. Deputy Gautier noted that the Academic Senate could send nominees to the Vice President for consideration for membership. Members also asked how

long the review period was, and Deputy Gautier indicated that sooner was better, and that there were no circulation restrictions on the draft. The University astronomy and astrophysics community will also be contacted to provide direct feedback on the draft. Members noted that the draft charge contained language that could be considered conflicting with the draft language in the PPA document, especially regarding the role and profile of “big science” activities. Deputy Gautier replied that this framework would be subsumed in the larger, portfolio charge discussed above. Members then asked how direct supervision and reporting would be handled, within the portfolio; would UCO have separate reporting lines from other system research projects and programs? Deputy Gautier indicated that the final details of the new administrative structure had not yet been finalized.

*Note: The remainder of the discussion occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.*

Meeting adjourned at 3:30. Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst.  
Attest: John Crawford, UCORP Chair