

Minutes of Meeting
March 11, 2013

Session One: Joint Meeting with Legislative Aides

I. Welcome and Introductions

Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council

Mike Kleeman, Chair, UCORP

Welcome: Council Chair Powell and UCORP Chair Kleeman welcomed the guests, led introductions, and gave an overview of the goals of the day's meeting: To make explicit the importance and foundational nature of research at the University of California and for the continued well-being of the State of California.

II. Joint Session

Discussion: Chair Kleeman began the discussion by noting that UC faculty are expected not just to be good teachers, but also to be excellent researchers. UC was founded on the central theme of new discovery, and the California Education Code states the UC shall be the primary state supported academic agency for research. The Academic Senate reaffirmed its commitment to research during the recent financial crisis by endorsing a Research Mission Statement. UC's research accomplishments over the past decades are too numerous to describe. Some typical examples include year-round citrus growing cycles, AIDS diagnoses, treatments and now prevention, and stem cell research. UC has Nobel laureates in multiple fields.

The legislative aides asked about the balance between teaching and research, especially in the undergraduate experience. Members began by noting the difference between applied and basic research: basic research can be slow, even generational, but forms the basis for applied research, which can develop amazingly fast when all the basic research parts are in place. Both aspects are important to undergraduates: basic research teaches that knowledge is cumulative and non-linear, and applied research teaches that knowledge can be used differently. Chair Kleeman noted that over half of UC undergraduate seniors have had some research or creative experience, and Vice Chair Clare added that research is another form of teaching and learning: lectern teaching conveys known knowledge, while lab or experiential teaching, read: research, conveys a sense of the unknown and how to find answers. Taken together, the critical thinking skills developed through research, as well as the discipline-specific knowledge learned, constitute workforce training by another name.

The legislative aides then asked how the benefits of research were reflected in undergraduate transcripts and other records. Members noted that students assist in grant preparation and lab work, as well as in literature review development. Credit is given for specific topics and practica, and some departments require lab courses that do not have an accompanying lecture component. Grades associated with research or creative endeavors are often based on engagement, rather than results, since it is the process that is important.

The legislative aides also inquired after the level of interaction with ladder-rank faculty, as opposed to teaching or research assistants, and how the various roles of student researchers were differentiated. Members noted that TAs and RAs might usefully be conceived of as part-time apprentices. TAs and RAs are usually upper division students because of academic prerequisites and laboratory experience. The appeal to upper division students of being a TA or RA lies in building an academic portfolio and networking with industry leaders.

Ladder-rank faculty members teach and interact with all levels of undergraduate students, both in the lecture hall and in the laboratory. Members noted that prize-winning faculty are significant attractors – both among students to individual classes, and among peers to the University. In the classroom, prize-winning faculty members attract students by providing inspiration and motivation through individual, interpersonal interaction and by making academic subjects come to life and illustrating their inherent dynamism. In the higher education market, prize-winning faculty attract elite peers by creating the most reputable and competitive academic environment. As a result, education and research balance and renew each other: research grants support courses that otherwise would not exist, and the knowledge taught leads to new research questions.

The legislative aides then asked about faculty workloads and teaching-research balance, wondering if there was a one-to-one correlation between classroom and research hours. Chair Kleeman noted that fulfilling the tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service required 150% of an individual's time. Vice Chair Clare added that research was an expectation, and should not be framed as being “in opposition to” or “instead of” teaching. Council Chair Powell suggested that faculty workloads should be thought of multi-dimensionally, as teaching occurs in many settings – from the classroom, to the lab, to office hours, as well as mentoring and sponsoring upper level and graduate students. Members went on to add that most all faculty members are oversubscribed and that the excitement and commitment of UCORP members to the University mission and the philosophy of public higher education is standard.

The legislative aides next asked UCORP members what the ideal role of the state in research should be, given the recent cuts in state funding. Vice Chair Clare noted that the state, with few exceptions, does not provide direct research funding; instead, the state funds the framework that enables faculty expertise to be leveraged through extramural grants. Members added that the return on investment for UC research is between 200-700%, depending on the field. That is, for every \$1 the state invests in the research framework at UC, between \$2-7 of federal funds are returned to California's economy. Moreover, the research process empowers the next generation of researchers to build upon the successes of the current generation. The workforce training implicit in research is made manifest in the fact that half of all graduate students stay in California for their careers.

The legislative aides' final questions focused on public service and what faculty service looks like. Council Chair Powell observed UC's on-going management role in the Department of Energy national laboratories and UC's role in maintaining the nuclear stockpile's safety and readiness. Members added that state parks, natural reserves, and agriculture and natural resources all benefit from UC research and stewardship. Members also noted that the research conducted leads to public service improvements, such as investigations into childhood pedagogy and medical delivery systems.

Finally, members asked the legislative aides how they could be of further assistance. The aides suggested repeating this type of meeting between the Legislature and the Academic Senate would be helpful given the high turnover rates in state officeholders. The aides also suggested joining UC days and providing additional examples of how research impacts the educational experience of all students.

Session Two: UCORP Regular Meeting

I. Debrief

Discussion: Chair Kleeman identified two themes to the aides' questions: resource allocation and reiteration. Members asked Council Chair Powell if faculty voices are able to convey different information or the same information more effectively than the professional governmental relations staff, and Chair Powell indicated yes, the faculty are able to communicate unique aspects of the research mission; the director of state governmental relations agrees. One important point to stress is that UC should not let itself be placed in contrast or competition with other entities and priorities: UC is the solution, not the problem; discussions should include UC *and* X, not UC *versus* X. Knowledge is not zero-sum, and neither are finances, if the long view is taken.

II. Chair's Announcements

Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair

Update: Chair Kleeman updated the committee on several items of interest:

1. Presidential Search: Council Chair Powell reported that the various advisory committees will meet tomorrow with the Regents' Special Committee to provide feedback on the selection criteria for the next president. The first vetting of candidates is scheduled for April 19, and it is hoped that the next president will be announced at the July Regents meeting.
2. Online Education: An RFP for the \$10M state allocation is being developed. There are many obstacles to overcome before any effort can be successful: delivery mechanism, intercampus articulation, administration, evaluation, pedagogy, and local and wide politics. Two summits to discuss the obstacles are scheduled for April; one at UCOP and one at a southern location TBD.
3. Compendium: Additional suggested edits were circulated for evaluation (see also Item IV.2 below).
4. UC Budget: The Council approved and forwarded a request to have Senate participation on the Executive Budget Committee, a newly reconstituted group tasked to make systemwide budget allocations and set internal spending priorities.
5. Self-Supporting Programs: The Academic Planning Council is exploring guidelines for conversion to a self-supporting program, as opposed the extant guidance for establishing one from scratch, and whether a one-size-fits-all approach is workable.

III. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Revisions to APM 700 (Presumptive Resignation):

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo reiterating previous concerns which have not been adequately addressed.

2. Proposed New APM 430 (Visiting Scholars):
Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo reiterating previous concerns which have not been adequately addressed.
3. California Institutes for Science and Innovation Academic Reviews:
 - a. California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI):
Action: Vice Chair Clare and Santa Cruz Representative Oliver will serve as lead reviewers.
 - b. California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2):
Action: Davis Representative McKee and San Diego Representative Dubnov will serve as lead reviewers.
4. Merit Review Group:
Issue: How to evaluate and include Open Access publishing in Academic Personnel reviews is the focus of a new working group.
Action: Davis Representative McKee and San Diego Representative Dubnov will be forwarded as UCORP nominees to this group.

IV. Continuing UCORP Business

1. Open Access:
Issue: A newly proposed bill in the California statehouse would require all state agencies that receive state money for research to publish their results in an open access repository; the proposal is thought to be modeled after similar federal regulations now in place at the National Institutes of Health (NIH).
Discussion: Members noted that the California proposal is more aggressive than the federal model as it imposes a six-month deadline, rather than a one-year deadline. Members also wondered how a “state agency” was being defined. Members wondered whether the same research would have to be deposited in multiple repositories, and who would cover the cost of deposition and preparation for deposition. Members also noted that the proposal does not make reference to any best practices or data.
Action: Associate Director Giedt will draft the Senate’s response.
2. Compendium:
Issue: The APC made minor revisions to the Compendium section on MRU director appointments.
Action: Chair Kleeman will convey UCORP’s support of the proposed changes to the APC, and then to the Academic Council.
3. UC Observatories:
Update: Consultation with the new director will occur in May. Members should be prepared to discuss split appointments, graduate student and post-doctoral scholar participation and outcomes, and fee-for-use programs.

V. Campus Updates

- Berkeley: 1) Baseline support services for faculty have been pared back due to budget. 2) The future of bridge grants, and what specifically they are designed to bridge, is under discussion.
- Davis: The call for campus COR grants is open.

Irvine: 1) Awarding campus grants took most of the February meeting. 2) Investigations into a campus abroad, distinct from EAP, seem to have stalled, but no reason has been given. 3) Conversion of the Anza-Borrego State Park into a Natural Reserve System facility is expected to bring new research opportunities, but there was not widespread consultation before the decision was made.

Los Angeles: (absent)

Merced: No report.

Riverside: 1) Local COR grants were awarded at the last meeting, but per faculty COR allocations have deteriorated significantly recently.

Action: Analyst Feer will send the COR profile survey for updating.
2) Similarly, baseline support for faculty, ranging from provision of office supplies and furniture to custodial services, have also deteriorated recently.

San Diego: (absent for this portion of the meeting)

San Francisco: 1) UCSF is in good stead regarding lab safety; the only real change is greater documentation. 2) Concerns about open work spaces continue, especially as administration now plans to construct all new buildings with open work spaces. 3) The proposed changes to the HIPAA guidelines are under further review; the local COR is in direct contact with the systemwide Office of Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services. Of specific concern are the stricter standards regarding zip codes.

Santa Barbara: (absent)

Santa Cruz: 1) A new VCR is being recruited. 2) Until that process is finished, the Provost put on hold a scheduled review of the Office of Research.

Action: Chair Kleeman will share the review materials from the Davis Office of Research review.

VI. New Business

1. Lab Safety:

Issue: Members wonder how widely the negotiated settlement's enhanced inspections will spread from biology laboratories to general laboratories, and how likely it is to target the scope of emerging guidelines to only the laboratories that would actually derive some benefit.

Action: EH&S will be invited to the next UCORP meeting for follow-up.

Adjournment at 3:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Mike Kleeman, UCORP Chair