

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting

May 10, 2013

I. Chair's Announcements

*Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair***Update:** Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:

- **California Senate Bill 520:** The proposal would require all 3 segments of higher education to develop 50 cross-listed online classes by 2014. The bill allows for courses created as partnerships between existing higher education segments or as partnerships between a public segments and private companies such as those offering Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). In reality, the large number of classes and aggressive timeline would almost certainly force partnerships with MOOCs. The anticipated redistribution of tuition charges and long-term business plan are not congruent with traditional notions of UC academic excellence. The entire Academic Council spoke against the proposal before the legislature last month. The bill is still going through the legislative committee process.

Discussion: Members asked if the proposal would allow UC faculty to evaluate individual courses before deciding to offer credit, and Chair Kleeman answered that the first draft allowed for review by a handful of faculty, while the revised draft allows for a more traditional review by faculty committees with expertise in domain topics. The goal is for all three segments to share 50 courses, but they could be public/public or public/private partnerships. Greater use of online education is now largely seen as inevitable, but many advocate a cautious entry.

- **Governor's proposed accountability measures:** Among the governor's proposed metrics are a 10% increase in 4-year graduation rates for each segment, regardless of their starting points or comparator rates.

Discussion: Members noted that these proposals would do little to protect academic rigor, as the intent seems to be to move students along regardless of learning. Members also noted that the proposals do not take into account time lost due to major changes or course availability.

- **UC Online Education:**
 - **Copyright:** Discussion at the Academic Council centered on whether the textbook copyright model was appropriate in this instance. Council Chair Powell may form a task force to investigate the matter more fully.
 - **Course development:** Following a workshop on May 4, an RFP will soon be released for course development. There will be two rounds, so interested parties will not have to rush.
- **National Ignition Facility (NIF):** The federal government has defunded the science portion of the program after advertised deadlines were not met. Next steps are still to be determined. Separately, the same national lab has started a voluntary separation program.
- **Compendium revisions:** The Academic Planning Council (APC) approved UCORP's recommended changes. They will now be sent for full system review.
- **Self-supporting programs:** APC has yet to issue its final recommendations; President Yudof will make executive decisions as needed in the interim.
- **UCRP contribution rates:** The Academic Council endorsed the proposed employee contribution rate with the caveat that off-setting salary increases be given in a timely manner. Retention is becoming an increasingly difficult issue as inflation continually out-paces salary growth.
- **Composite Benefit Rates:** The administration has decided to charge full benefits rates on

summer salaries. The Senate contends that charging 33% to summer salaries is wrong because summer salaries are not UCRP covered; the summer rate should instead be between 10-15%. The loss of funds due to overcharging could negatively impact support for graduate students and provides no benefit to the faculty members. An alternative proposal to divert a similar amount as the UCRP charge to a DC plan is being considered.

- Administrative burden on researchers: As discussed last month, the National Science Board, the governing body of the National Science Foundation (NSF), is asking principal investigators (PIs) about the administrative burdens on their research, and UC is developing a parallel survey for internal use. Please circulate the link widely.
- Salary equity: The submitted plans received mixed reviews at the Academic Council; some were thorough, while others required more development. The revision time line is still to be determined, and members should work to ensure that Shared Governance is incorporated adequately at their campus.
- Faculty recruitment: The recent acquisition of an entire research team from UCLA by USC is consistent with the predicted effects of reduced total remuneration at UC. UC's ability to compete in fields of cutting-edge research will continue to be affected by faculty remuneration.
- Presidential search: Reports indicate that the search process is on schedule and an appointment in early fall is likely.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Minutes of April teleconference:

Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III. Campus Updates

Berkeley: (absent)

Davis: 1) The Office of Research updated the local COR on the campuses' effort to receive AAHRPP accreditation of their reorganized IRB administration. 2) The local COR discussed undergraduate research, and suggested framing lab experience as "applied teaching." Increased undergraduate research experience would improve graduate school prospects and enhance safety. Lab capacity is currently a larger obstacle than faculty workload. 3) Local research grant applications were evaluated; a second meeting is scheduled.

Irvine: 1) To enhance 4-year graduation rates, development of a "liberal studies" major is being considered, but not all stakeholder groups support the idea. 2) Participation data for the Negotiated Salary Trial Program are not available, and no firm registration deadline has been set. 3) A proposal to make available on an open course basis make-up classes for mandatory courses is being considered. It is not yet known how copyright would be regulated or how students would access materials.

Los Angeles: 1) The funding and review processes for ORUs is changing; many in the health and biosciences fields are disestablishing, while many of those in the arts and humanities are exploring MOUs for long-term funding guarantees. COR is providing oversight of the changes. 2) Stricter enforcement of travel grant accounting is needed. 3) The internal mechanism for awarding research enabling grants broke down and is being manually redesigned.

Merced: (absent)

Riverside: 1) COR is currently reviewing grant applications; there was no change in the funding level this year, but external grant caps limit eligibility in some cases. 2) A new goal is redevelopment of a hardware replacement program. A tax on summer sessions was suggested as one possible funding mechanism.

San Diego: 1) ORUs are being reviewed with an emphasis on distinguishing good research programs from charismatic leaders and trendy topics. 2) A graduate student bill of rights was endorsed this year,

after having failed several years ago. There is speculation that it is related to proposed SB 520 (see above).

San Francisco: 1) Despite faculty concerns, plans are moving forward to construct additional academic buildings in an “open space” model. Actual impacts on research productivity and academic or clinical performance are not yet known. 2) A local resource allocation program ensures that COR grants be available to all eligible faculty; thus while there is no lifetime cap, individuals are often required to skip at least one funding cycle.

Santa Barbara: 1) A global studies program has been approved. 2) Local astronomers have been actively interacting with COR members to ensure their perspective is understood.

Santa Cruz: 1) The search for a new VCR is nearing completion. 2) An increase in COR funding is being sought; the current proposal is for a percent of a percent of indirect costs recovered. 3) The allocation of all recovered indirect costs is under discussion: only LA and Irvine remit ICR to Pis; at UCSF, they go to the department.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Revisions to APM 600s (Salary Administration)

Action: The draft response was approved as noticed.

2. Proposed Revisions to APM 241 (Faculty Administrators)

Discussion: Members noted a possible contradiction in the draft language of section 10 that could be read in conflict with section 24 regarding the appointment of MRU directors vis-a-vis pending revisions to that section of the Compendium (see above). Members also wondered if the language allowed too much centralization of appointment authority at the expense of that of local chancellors.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a response for consideration at the next meeting.

V. Online Education: MOOCs and Research

Issue: What impact will online education have on research, and how can UCORP remain engaged in a proactive manner?

Discussion: Members wondered what would be on a list of positives to include in online education platforms and programs. It is difficult to take a broad, one-size view of education and learning given that student learning styles vary widely and the appropriate medium for information transference also often varies by content complexity as well as by the type of feedback required for content mastery. Members also wondered how online education would intersect with open access efforts, especially given the dearth of precedents and business models. Chair Kleeman returned to the question of complexity, suggesting that online courses could be appropriate in many entry level courses and in certain advanced courses, but that mid-level courses that require extensive coaching and feedback would be more challenging. Members suggested that a “less commonly taught research classes” model might be a useful launch vehicle for online education, offering more opportunities to find and fix issues with minimal educational disruption. Such a model would also make it easy to exploit UC's system strengths. Others reiterated concerns that the one-size model would stifle intellectual diversity.

Council Vice Chair Jacob noted that he and UCEP will serve as the Senate vanguards on this issue next year. Members asked if specific limits, such as only X courses in a major or a department would be afforded baccalaureate credit, had been developed yet. Members also inquired how online education could intersect with extension classes. Lastly, it was noted that the role of graduate students and teaching assistants would likely need to be reconsidered, too.

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

Steve Beckwith, Vice President

1. NSF survey:

Issue: Local circulation has been slow as it is unclear whether VCRs or Senate personnel are expected to “take point”.

Discussion: Members asked how the essay answers were to be coded and reported, and it was suggested that ORGS staff could adequately handle the task. Previous UC efforts to address this problem, notably through the Commission on the Future, have not been well developed and have suffered from little follow-through.

2. Lab Fee Research Programs:

Update: 1) A first-ever symposium showcasing the research conducted under program auspices is scheduled for July 11 in San Francisco; members should expect invitations soon. 2) All lab fee programs are reported in the new RGPO progress report, along with the other programs the office administers. It is hoped this will be another useful advocacy tool.

3. Central funding for research:

Update: While the Portfolio Review Group (PRG) will advise on the appropriate overall level of funding for large research areas, old questions about internal allocation will resurface: competed funds versus politically protected projects, for example. UCORP advice on the matter will be solicited in the future.

VII. Consultation with the University of California Observatories

***Note: Item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken. ***

VIII. Follow-up Discussion

***Note: Item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken. ***

IX. Cal ISI Reviews

1. California NanSystems Institute (CNSI):

Action: Friendly amendments were submitted; the final draft will be approved via email.

2. California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2):

Action: Friendly amendments were submitted; the final draft will be approved via email.

X. New Business

1. Federal Governmental Relations:

Issue: Vice Chair Clare observed that UC has weight with legislative decision makers, and UCORP would be remiss not to explore closer collaboration with sister Senate committees to help craft political messages for external audiences.

Discussion: Members asked if Vice Chair Clare was suggesting a long-term advocacy effort on the part of UCORP, but Chair Kleeman remarked on the difference between interacting with a professional lobbyist and a UC faculty member. Timing is an open question, but lessons can be extrapolated through preparation for next year's expected visit to Sacramento.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair