UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting
November 5, 2012

I.   Chair's Announcements
Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair
Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:
1.   Academic Council meeting of October 24: The Council agrees with UCORP that new lab safety regulations are more stringent than some feel necessary, but there is a balance between legal requirements and real-world applications. Dan Hare, Chair of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), gave a presentation on total remuneration, highlighting the impacts of changes to the benefits programs on total remuneration, not just cash compensation. The Council had similar concerns regarding the Negotiated Salary Trial Plan (NSTP, see also Item III below): unanswered questions from the APM 668 review remain, there are no criteria for success, and the process to end the program is still undefined. Provost Aimee Dorr spoke about declining quality indicators such as the growing student-faculty ratio, and the necessity of pursuing capital projects and competitive compensation, even during difficult fiscal times. The charge to the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) was changed to make the Council chair the ACSCANR chair; nominees for new members will soon be requested. Senate nominees to the Portfolio Review Group (PRG), which will be charged to advise the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies on the best allocation of central research funding, are being vetted by the University Committee on Committees (UCOC). Members are reminded to vote in the election tomorrow; the impacts to University funding from the failure of Proposition 30 to pass could be devastating.
2.   Merced Representative Cleary will continue as UCORP's liaison to the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee.
3.   Lab Safety: Vice Chair Clare reported that a recent lab safety webinar was hosted by Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) and drew heavily from the findings of the American Chemical Society's model. A top-down model of the desired culture is needed.

II.   Consent Calendar
1.   October UCORP minutes.
        Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.

III.   Systemwide Review Items
1.   Negotiated Salary Trial Program:
        Discussion: Members asked on what basis salaries would be determined under the proposal, and Chair Kleeman indicated that individual discussions between faculty members and deans would determine new salaries. Members felt that such a basis would be too malleable to benefit the system as a whole. Members were also unclear as to the specific need being addressed. Anecdotal reports of perceived inequities between general campus biological science department faculty vis-a-vis medical center faculty with similar appointments in similar departments spurred the proposal. Members noted that negative trade-offs with graduate student funding could result, as the program incentivizes fund-raising, rather than academic merit. Members again noted the absence of success or failure metrics, but agreed that a 5% subscription rate could serve as one indicator.
        Action: Analyst Feer will draft the committee's response and circulate it electronically for

approval.
2. <u>Rebenching:</u>
   Action: The committee elected not to opine on this item.
3. <u>APM 700 (Leaves of Absence)</u>
   Action: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

IV.   Executive Session
During executive session, no notes are taken.

V.   Consultation with the Office of the President – Provost
Aimee Dorr, Provost
Provost Dorr discussed several items of interest with the committee.
- <u>Composite Benefit Rates</u>: Chair Kleeman summarized the Senate concerns with the proposal as written and presented to date: for faculty with summer salary, the burden is disproportionate to the burden; there must be more than two categories to accurately reflect the population that receives benefits; the external, anticipated deadlines seem arbitrary; answers to internal deadlines suggest larger, systemic problems with the UCPath project. Provost Dorr responded that discussions with other Office of the President leaders on this topic are occurring daily and that she would present these concerns. She agreed that it would be unwise to create a system that will not meet our long-term needs. She also noted that the UCPath project is already behind schedule, and that further delay would increase cost and could erode confidence. Council Vice Chair Jacob indicated that the consultant report upon which the Office of the President is developing its recommendations contains several factual errors and misleading conclusions; a slow and thoughtful review process is needed.
- <u>Program Review Group</u>: Provost Dorr thanked the committee for their role in developing the PRG and its parent document and process, the PPA Task Force. The model has been well received on many fronts, and will be replicated in the budget arena.
- <u>The Compendium</u>: Chair Kleeman outlined the remaining issues in the Compendium revision: appointment of MRU directors, the inevitable emergence of new research entities beyond the current nomenclature, whether to include current advisory structures, and guidelines for ending MOUs/embedding sunset clauses. Provost Dorr remarked that she helped write the first Compendium during her term as Council Chair. In addition to the issues noted, she added that some language regarding the disestablishment of undergraduate programs also needed updating.
- <u>State Support and Master Plan</u>: In response to queries of whether the University needs a mission statement or whether the Master Plan needs rewritten, Provost Dorr indicated that while the Plan is dated, it is not entirely broken. The present political environment in Sacramento, however, precludes redress. Graduate studies and research are often given short shrift in public discourse, partly because the story is more complicated and nuanced than undergraduate admissions and fees.
- <u>Lab Safety</u>: Provost Dorr noted that lab safety should be a daily concern for everyone in the research enterprise. Members noted that UC's lab safety rate is already extremely good and that concerns about overzealous application of new standards could be counterproductive, not just administratively burdensome.

VI.   Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies
Steve Beckwith, Vice President
1. <u>Portfolio Review Group</u>:
   Update: Vice President Beckwith reported that although the PRG is to be advisory only to the administration, at least half of the membership will consist of Senate faculty. The

administration members will consist of Vice Chancellors for Research and Executive Vice Presidents for Planning and Budget. The PRG will also be asked to consider as-yet still unreviewed research programs. Developing relative valuations that are comparable with each other will be the first challenge the PRG faces.

Discussion: Members inquired how the additional research programs will be considered, and VP Beckwith replied that political sensitivities must be considered in addition to academic merit. It was also noted that modeling portfolios is itself a research area, and that many best practices from the MRPI process can be adapted and used.

2. Upcoming Reviews:
Update: VP Beckwith reported that the evaluations of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs) continue to be slow. CITRIS and CalIT2 campus responses are being evaluated, while the CNSI campus response is still pending. Although the CalISIs were a gubernatorial initiative, state funding has been dropping year after year, and in a manner that seems unrelated to any review processes.

Discussion: Members asked if the CalISIs might be competed, and VP Beckwith indicated that such a discussion has yet to occur; hopefully the PRG will hold it.

3. Systemwide Research Budget:
Update: There are two buckets: the funds that ORGS controls directly, and the funds that are taken from the Office of the President on an off-the-top basis. The funds that ORGS controls directly have been cut nearly in half over the past three years. *Note: Discussion continues in Item VII.2 below.*

VII. UCORP 2012-13 Goal Setting

1. Compendium:
Note: See Item V above.

2. UC Research Portfolio Budget:
With Kathleen Erwin,
Issue: Director Erwin provided an overview of the current central research portfolio budget allocation. Regardless of the passage or failure of Proposition 30, the central budget will be cut by $5M next year. This cut is in addition to the elimination of the Discovery Grant program, whose uncommitted funds were diverted to the Cal ISIs. It is estimated that as much as 66% of the budget must be gained in order to meet extant commitments. Director Erwin also reported that the lab fee program, which funds on a three year cycle, held its second competition last summer. These funds are from the federal government and come to UC as part of its management contract for the Department of Energy national labs. Out-year funding is dependent on management performance and any future contract amendments.

Discussion: Members wondered whether any legacy programs could be easily identified and speculated as to relative priorities: The MRPI program was lauded as being able to embrace emerging ideas, as well as being nimble. Difficult discussions are expected, but research is UC's middle name, so a productive way forward must be found and followed.

3. Spring visit to Sacramento:
Discussion: In preparation of visiting with state legislators in the spring in Sacramento, the committee discussed how to structure messages, and what those messages should be. It was suggested that messages should follow a "strength, weakness, opportunity" structure, but it was noted that UC is often the victim of its own success insofar as the negative impact of budget cuts are often delayed. One goal of the visit should be to better educate legislators regarding the importance and value of research to the state, specifically in terms of economic impact and social mobility.

VIII. SharePoint Orientation

Todd Giedt, Associate Director, Systemwide Academic Senate

Issue: Associate Director Giedt presented an overview of the committee's SharePoint sight, how to navigate it, and how to perform essential functions.

IX. Campus Updates

<u>Berkeley</u>: The local COR is discussing possible cuts to emeriti grant funding. About half of active applicants can be funded, and decisions are soon forthcoming.

<u>Davis</u>: COR grant budgets for small and large projects are still to be determined. The COR is also discussing the impact of possible budget trade-offs between open access efforts and libraries. Lab safety is also receiving considerable attention.

<u>Irvine</u>: Many questions and concerns regarding open access are being voiced, and some contend the NIH precedent is inapt as it is a narrower policy. An exploratory committee has been formed to examine more closely whether to recommend participation in the Negotiated Salary Trial Program.

<u>Los Angeles</u>: COR attendance has been poor, and its budget is still to be determined. Members are discussing possible conflict of interest for faculty involved in both the 30 meter telescope planning and the newly formed UCObservatories advisory board. External models are being considered for recommendation. The proposed APM 430 (Visiting Scholars) conflicts with the "student researcher" title, and the proposed intellectual property agreements in the open access proposal have not been well received.

<u>Merced</u>: No report.

<u>Riverside</u>: COR is examining the limits of OMB Circular A-21 to determine the exact limits of allowable facilities and administration costs. Items such are software are not explicitly addressed. COR is also concerned about the impacts of open access on page fees and professional societies.

<u>San Diego</u>: All campus ORUs are being reviewed, and questions regarding co-authored works and open access have arisen.

<u>San Francisco</u>: UCSF already has an open access policy; much information is available online. The impacts of "operational excellence" efforts continue to emerge as new practices must be created.

<u>Santa Barbara</u>: (absent)

<u>Santa Cruz</u>: Travel grant applications have gone paperless, and the COR portal has been updated. A dean or vice chancellor is being invited to each COR meeting to discuss methods of rebuilding the budget base and to demonstrate the importance of doing so.

X. New Business

None.

XI. Composite Benefit Rates

Peggy Arrivas, Controller
Dustin Halverson, Huron Consulting

Issue: The Office of the President is proposing to adopt composite benefit rates to simplify grant processing to replace the current practice of finding individual rates for each person being funded by each grant. Controller Arrivas noted that in response to Senate concerns already voiced, more rate options are being developed, such as for employees with health insurance, but no retirement. Options for accommodating summer salaries are also being explored. Mr. Halverson added that the Division of Cost Allocation (DCA), the unit within Health and Human Services that sets indirect cost recovery rates, likes composite benefit rates since it reduces the chances that federal government will be overcharged. From the institution's perspective, the same amount of dollars will flow out. The DCA does not recognize summer salaries, as one person only receives on entry, and so one rate.

Discussion: Members asked who was in discussion with the DCA, Mr. Halverson indicated that Huron

conducts these negotiations on a regular basis. Members then asked what defined a feasible option, and Controller Arrivas said any proposal must be defendable. Members noted that while the institutional spending would remain constant, individual grants could be significantly impacted. Grants do not offer benefits in addition to research funding, so for some, the available research funding could be cut significantly by this process. Members asked how in-progress grants would be handled, and what the timing for implementation is expected to be. Controller Arrivas indicated that each campus would implement the practice when it went live on the UCPath human resources project. Members asked if grandfathering was possible, but Controller Arrivas noted that such would require custom programming of UCPath. Members asked who was programming UCPath, and Controller Arrivas said it was Oracle software, off the shelf. The UCPath project manager can provide further information.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst
Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair