

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, November 13, 2017
Minutes of Meeting

1. Chair's announcements, agenda review

After a review of the agenda, UCORP Chair Jeff Richman informed the committee that Vice President for the National Laboratories Kim Budil was preparing a statement about UC's bid for the Los Alamos National Lab that would be sent to the Academic Council Chair to be passed on to chairs of divisional Senates. The RFP was released at the end of October.

2. Reproducibility and authentication issues in the biological sciences

Background:

UCSD Professor Maryann Martone and Dr. Anita Bandrowski brought the plan for RRIDs (research resource identifiers) to UCOP Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis, who suggested that they get input from faculty via the Academic Senate. Bandrowski is a scientist from UCSD who founded the data sharing and display platform SciCrunch, which also assigns RRIDs. Reproducibility and resource authentication are issues that pervade many fields, although RRIDs are aimed at the biological sciences. UCORP members Irina Conboy (UCB), Leif Havton (UCLA) and Andrew Baird (UCORP Vice Chair, UCSD) met with Martone and Bandrowski between the October and November UCORP meetings to gather more information to provide to the larger committee.

Issue:

Dr. Anita Bandrowski joined the meeting via video and gave a slide presentation detailing the origin of RRIDs, the problem that RRIDs are intended to solve, the uptake among scholarly journals, and the increasing use in scholarly papers. Dr. Bandrowski noted that RRIDs are part of a larger landscape of identifiers including ORCID and PubMed ID/DOI. SciCrunch works in cooperation with other institutions and has received funding from numerous sources. The open infrastructure and connection with networks of data platforms provide important safeguards.

Dr. Bandrowski mentioned potential future implementation of an automated system that will be able to intercept papers before they're published to apply identification numbers using a scoring algorithm. She will send the RRID "roadmap" to the committee. In answer to what is being requested of UC, Bandrowski said that assistance from UC might include an official announcement by faculty and/or the administration in support of RRIDs. Faculty could also spread the word more informally among colleagues.

Discussion:

Follow-up discussion (without Dr. Bandrowski) included whether the RRIDs address reproducibility, as claimed by its advocates, or resource authentication, and whether these two issues should be kept separate.

Members expressed concern about the claim that the ID numbers improve reproducibility. Some committee members felt that RRIDs are not ready to become a standard and that they are not inevitable. While NIH has guidelines for rigor and reproducibility, there is nothing that dictates the use of IDs, either at the point of award or in the justification. Some biologists feel that there are

already too many identifiers. UCORP members also expressed concern about relying on a for-profit entity to maintain RRIDs.

Although UCORP members acknowledged that RRIDs would likely not solve most problems of resource authentication or reproducibility, there was some agreement that UC could provide some leadership and guidance in this area. UC faculty could initiate discussions and communication with fellow academics. Discussion could incorporate various initiatives to give a broader view of issues in resource authentication, identifiers, and more.

At the end of the conversation, committee members were not prepared to endorse RRIDs, but willing to present the identifiers to colleagues as a potential resource. The committee decided that the best way to move forward would be to write a letter to VP Art Ellis that would: summarize the issue, describe various considerations, report findings, and prepare questions for further consideration. UCORP's main role will be to facilitate the process of expanding the discussion. The letter will also suggest that VP Ellis' office plan a workshop or forum along with campus Vice Chancellors for Research.

Action: Chair Richman will outline a letter to send VP Ellis and circulate it to committee members for comment and refinement.

3. Academic Senate Leadership update

Academic Council Chair Shane White and Vice Chair Robert May provided an update of the current activities and concerns of the Senate.

- As previously reported, UCOP is required by AB-97, the Budget Act of 2017, to redirect \$15 million from the Office of the President to fund undergraduate enrollment. The Academic Senate sent [Principles to Guide Options for Redirecting Funds to Enrollment](#) to President Napolitano in October. The final plan will be reviewed by the Executive Budget Committee that was convened after the State audit.
- UCOP is facing criticism that it interfered in a campus survey portion of the State audit. New audits are expected, including one that will look at settlements in cases of sexual violence/sexual harassment complaints.
- President Napolitano has taken a national lead in opposing Trump on DACA, which she wrote when she was Secretary of Homeland Security. The Academic Senate wants to make sure that all vulnerable students and members of the UC community are protected, and are also thinking even more broadly about degree-completion and how to assist students if needed.
- SB-201 is a new law that allows for the unionization of graduate student researchers. It is important that faculty remain neutral and follow the guidelines prepared by the administration. Any perceived or actual interference could nullify the vote, which is currently happening on campuses. UC administrators have spoken with colleagues at the University of Washington, where graduate student researchers unionized a few years. UW made suggestions to help minimize disruption, should the vote be successful.

The same union that is attempting to organize the GSRs is also now trying to organize other academic researchers.

- It has been brought to the attention of the Academic Council Chair that some Vice Chancellors of Research view Senate MRU reviews as unnecessary and duplicative. The Senate believes that MRU reviews are important.

4. Campus Reports and Discussion

Campus reports were postponed.

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

SB-201, leading to the possibility that UC's GSRs will bargain collectively

Faculty and graduate students have received guidance from campus administration about unionization, the voting process, and appropriate discussion topics for PIs and GSRs. UC remains neutral and wants to ensure that graduate students are able to make an informed decision and that work situations are not disrupted. The UAW is now also trying to unionize academic researchers in a variety of other titles.

MRU Framework and Preparation for ITS Review

Director Kathleen Erwin reviewed the process, goals, and intent of an MRU review. The idea is to evaluate the systemwide (or multi-campus) value of the unit as well as quality of the work. The review looks at operations, governance, organization, inclusion of graduate and undergraduate students, and how the MRU encompasses the mission of UC. In consultation with the Academic Senate committees on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and Graduate Affairs (CCGA), UCORP makes a recommendation that the MRU continue as-is, continue with some changes, or disestablish. The report goes to Academic Council, which sends it to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. The goal is to complete the review by the end of April so that the MRU director may be informed about the result by the end of the academic year.

As part of this year's review of the Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS), the four directors will be invited to the February or March UCORP meeting for more in-depth discussion. The committee should make it clear that the intent is to be supportive and offer constructive input if needed. A subgroup of committee members will prepare questions for the directors in advance of the meeting.

Action: The committee Analyst will poll members for the best date for an extra meeting in January.

Update on CRCC

The Cancer Research Coordinating Committee has requested disestablishment as an MRU. The CRCC uses an endowment of \$1.8-2 million from 23 bequests to award grant funding for cancer research. The board is required by mandate to comprise only UC faculty members.

More information here: <http://ucop.edu/research-initiatives/programs/crcc/>

6. Negotiated Salary Trial Program Response

Irina Conboy and Nasrin Rahimieh prepared background information so that UCORP would be able to better understand the Negotiated Salary Trial Program and implications for continuing and expanding it – while maintaining its trial status – as recommended by the four-year review taskforce. Members were generally in favor of increasing pay when possible, but not at the expense of

increasing inequities. Committee members also want to make sure that in no way should the program be used to replace actual salary from the university.

UCORP endorses the report of the taskforce and will send a letter in support by the November 22 deadline.

Action: Chair Richman will draft a response letter.

7. Next steps and other issues

- December meeting: Determine the best way to conduct the ITS review.
- January: Additional videoconference to discuss questions for the ITS directors.

Potential future topics:

- Can the university can do anything to assist colleagues or students at the University of Puerto Rico.
- Further discussion about research reproducibility.
- Based on increased emphasis from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies on including undergraduates as part of the research environment, UCORP will schedule an agenda item on the topic of undergraduate research.

Meeting Participants

Members: Jeffrey Richman (Chair, UCSB), Andrew Baird (Vice Chair, UCSD, via video), Irina Conboy (Berkeley), Dietmar Kueltz (Davis), Nasrin Rahimieh (Irvine), K.K. Ramakrishnan (Riverside), Brian Eliceiri (UCSD), Farid Chehab (UCSF alternate, via phone), James Doucet-Battle (UCSC alternate), Shane White (Academic Council Chair), Robert May (Academic Council Vice Chair), Kian Maalizadeh (Undergraduate Student Representative – UCSB, via video)

Consultants and Guests: Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives; Nicholas Anthis, Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives; Emily Rader, Portfolio Manager, ORGS

Academic Senate staff: Joanne Miller, UCORP analyst

Meeting adjourned: 3:50pm

Meeting minutes drafted by Joanne Miller, UCORP Analyst

Attest: Jeffrey Richman, UCORP Chair