

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY**  
**Monday, October 10, 2016**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**1. Welcome & Introductions**

*Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair*

*Jeff Richman, UCORP Vice Chair*

**• UCORP overview, member expectations, committee work & priorities**

Committee members were asked to introduce themselves and describe their committee experience. Committee Chair Isaac Martin provided an overview of UCORP's role within the Academic Senate. UCORP reports to the Assembly of the Academic Senate and is charged with advising on research policy and the systemwide research enterprise. This includes reviewing multicampus research units (MRUs) and related guidelines and procedures, and monitoring a wide variety of research-related issues that affect UC including cybersecurity, UC's relationship with the national labs that it manages, and more. The committee will have the opportunity to opine on "Systemwide Review" items – usually policies or portions of policies that have been revised and are required to go through a formal university-wide review process. UCORP can choose whether or not to submit comments.

UCORP is represented on the Academic Council and Academic Planning Council by Chair Isaac Martin and on ACSCOLI (the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues) by Vice Chair Jeff Richman. UC Berkeley member Kimmen Sjolander volunteered to represent UCORP on the TTAC ([Technology Transfer Advisory Committee](#)).

As a *systemwide* committee, UCORP, is also a forum for communication among the campus Committees on Research (CORs). Meetings will include time for discussing items that members think would be useful, including the ways that other campus' CORs operate.

**Discussion:**

Members brought up topics of interest for further discussion, including:

- Understanding how the campuses provide research funding.
- Issues around hiring, research FTEs, etc.
- Further development of the draft mission statement for UC Research that is currently on the UCORP website.
- Data sets management - policies and procedures.
- Technology licensing.
- Best practices that can be distributed to CORs.
- Information sharing on indirect costs and where they end up.
- How UCORP can be more proactive instead of in a constant state of reacting and responding to outside forces.

- **UCORP goals and priorities for 2016-2017**

Last year UCORP spent a significant amount of time on a 15-year “sunset” review of an MRU. This year the committee will work with a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and a new Office of Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship, led by Senior Vice President Christine Gulbranson in a newly-created position that reports directly to President Napolitano.

The committee may want to engage in helping UC to explain its research enterprise to the state legislature.

UCORP advises the President via the Academic Council, but can communicate and work directly with its UCOP consultants.

## **2. Systemwide Review Items**

Faculty were asked to opine on the following items currently out for systemwide review:

1. Proposed revision of the APM Section 190, Appendix G, Program Description: Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary (Comments due Oct. 20, 2016)
2. New Presidential Policy on International Activities (Comments due November 18, 2016)
3. Proposed revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 (Comments due November 18, 2016)

UCORP will not opine on the technical changes to APM 190. UCORP will also not opine on the changes to APM 015 and 016 and Senate Bylaw 336.

UCORP will opine on the revised International Activities Policy. Some members felt that the revised draft was improved from the last round, including the incorporation of UCORP’s suggestion to explicitly state that the policy does not impose new rules. After some discussion on the definitions, committee members agreed that UCORP will provide feedback on the draft. Committee members appreciated the inclusion of the advice offered by UCORP in the managerial review. Some committee members expressed concern about the meaning of “risk” in the policy, especially in Section 3. i. 4, where one of the criteria for Regental approval is “very high levels of financial or other risk.” A particular concern was expressed about “reputational” risk. Concern was also raised about potential redundancy with other senate review procedures. Committee members suggested that a decision tree might help to clarify the level of approval authority necessary for particular international activities.

## **3. Senate Travel Procedures**

Mona Hsieh, Executive Assistant for the Academic Senate came to remind the committee about Senate travel procedures. Those who are flying to Oakland should make an effort to book tickets at least 21 days in advance to get the “wanna get away” fare on Southwest. If not, then the “anytime” fare is preferred. Travel reimbursement forms, available on the Senate [website](#), should be submitted within 45 days after a meeting. Instructions for submitting are on the form.

#### **4. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair*

*Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair*

Academic Senate Chair Jim Chalfant provided an overview of the latest concerns and current activities of the Senate.

- **Board of Regents**

The Regents have adopted a new set of bylaws that reclassifies all standing orders as either bylaws or policies. The change codifies shared governance with the Academic Senate as a Regents' policy. All changes were reviewed by the Academic Council. The Regents also adopted a new governance structure and new committees. Chair Chalfant noted that the National Labs subcommittee is part of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, which is a placement that shows understanding of UC's education-based involvement with the labs. In July, the Regents approved the Merced 2020 capital plan and the central budget.

At the past few Regents meetings there have been presentations by individual campuses that highlight elements of that campus.

A new [Health Services Committee](#) that deals with the clinical enterprise met for the first time in September. Although the focus is clinical, it has implications for teaching and research. The Senate is represented on the committee by Joel Dimsdale, Emeritus Professor of Psychology at UCSD.

The Regents and State legislature are interested in strengthening UC's relationship with community colleges. Regent Eloy Ortiz Oakley has been appointed as Chancellor of the community college system and will remain as a member of the Board of Regents. Some UC campuses with extremely compacted majors are encouraging their students to take classes at community colleges or use summer sessions to help alleviate the overcrowding. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates ([ICAS](#)) is working to establish solid transfer pathways; a major accomplishment from last year was the establishment of 21 [transfer pathways](#) to ease the transition from community colleges to UC.

- **State news**

Senate leadership learned at a recent ICAS meeting about the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 158, which encourages the streamlining of general education credits so that they can transfer more easily between the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges educational systems.

This year the state provided \$2 million in one-time funding to enhance faculty diversity. A call for proposals was sent out and the money will go to pilot projects on three campuses. The advisory group for the pilot includes the UCAP and UCAADE chairs. The state also provided \$22 million in one-time funding for "activities to expand or accelerate economic development in the state in ways that are aligned with other efforts to support innovation and entrepreneurship." \$2.2 million will go to each of the 10 campuses.

Chalfant briefly mentioned the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR), which is part of UC. A new Senate task force has been formed under the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) that will focus on ANR and its budget. UCORP may want to designate a member or two for the new task force.

The state auditor is currently conducting an audit of UCOP.

- **Other pending decisions**

The Regents will likely adopt a policy on non-resident admissions this year. The budgetary consequences of non-resident students differ by campus, but may be a large amount of money.

Two Academic Senate committees, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) are looking at a part of a pilot admissions project at UC Berkeley that requests letters of recommendation from a specifically identified group of applicants. Impacts to diversity, workload, and more will be examined.

Chancellor searches at the Berkeley and Davis campuses are underway.

## **5. Consultation with the Office of the President**

Five members of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) joined the meeting to discuss the latest news from that office: Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; Debbie Shen, Interim Deputy to the Vice President; Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office; Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives; and Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy & Coordination.

In addition, Paul Corson, Chief of Staff from the Office of Research Innovation & Entrepreneurship joined the meeting to talk about the goals for the newly-created department.

### **Paul Corson, Chief of Staff, Office of Research Innovation & Entrepreneurship**

Corson introduced himself and explained that the new Senior Vice President, Christine Gulbranson, started at UCOP six months ago to lead a UC-wide effort in support of technology development and commercialization. Corson believes that the UC system has numerous examples of economic development and entrepreneurship, many of which are not being recognized. Corson's office is currently focusing on a branding effort, communication, establishing partnerships, and looking at ways to update licensing technology.

At this time, UC does not know how many companies have been started or how many inventions created by UC graduates, only the number of licensed technologies.

### Discussion:

Discussion focused on the emphasis on innovation in technology and science; members asked about UC support for other types of innovation, such as in design or pedagogy. The \$2.2 million provided from the state for each campus for innovation and entrepreneurship requires proof of engagement of the social sciences.

Practical hurdles such as lack of funding and administrative regulations that impede innovation may need to be addressed. There was a discussion of whether UC's intellectual property policies need revision, or whether barriers arise from campus implementation.

### **Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies**

Vice President Art Ellis spoke about making the research enterprise of the university greater than the sum of its parts. ORGS works closely with UCORP and the Vice Chancellors of Research, and has key relationships with UC's Federal Government Relations and State Government Relations. Current concerns that may involve UCORP include evaluating MRUs, monitoring the UC observatories, and relationships with other types of systemwide research programs. ORGS welcomes advice on determining the correct level of involvement and adequate review for these entities.

#### *Undergraduate research*

One initiative on which ORGS could use the advice of UCORP is the involvement of undergraduate students in the research enterprise. The office is drafting a one-page guide for undergraduate and graduate students about intellectual property rights at UC. Engaging undergraduates raises the visibility of UC's scholarly work and builds a larger and more diverse and prepared pool of potential graduate students. VP Ellis referred to [Accountability Report figure 3.3.2](#) for some statistics on undergraduate research.

#### *Tools for assessment*

The office is investigating how to better use ORCID unique identifiers (<http://orcid.org/>) and make more people aware of them. There are now 13,000 users, including many affiliated with UC, and ORCID has great potential for helping UC gather data on its scholarly outputs.

The office is exploring tools for expanding knowledge and collaboration such as Elsevier's SciVal citation measurement product that can demonstrate impact. With tools like this, ORGS can share data-based evidence with Vice Chancellors for Research and others on trends and performance. These types of "knowledge maps" may be helpful for looking at contracts and grants and useful in developing collaborations.

#### *National initiatives*

ORGS would like to help UC be more of a leader on some of the current national initiatives and promote scholarship in those areas. The Human Microbiome Project is one such pilot in which UC is deeply engaged. UCORP could help identify areas where UC could be focusing more. One example is immersive visualization to help cultivate empathy. It is not a national initiative, but something that is important in the current environment and UC could be in a leadership position.

#### *International collaborations*

Other areas of interest for ORGS include expanding international collaborations for peer reviews, joint degrees, and more. The Senate would play key role in any initiative in this area.

### *Educational analytics*

ORGS is working with the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning to make better use of educational analytics to inform decision-making. Data includes student experiences and outcomes.

### Discussion:

UCORP members voiced concern about obstacles for getting students into research such as lack of staff and faculty time. Members argued that graduate students need more funding and more opportunities. Some committee members see them as too often left out of public discussion of the UC's contribution to the state.

Some questioned the need for \$22 million for innovation funding and the perception of difficulty in getting the people with ideas together with the funders. Graduate student support is seen by many on the committee as a bigger issue. There are opportunities such as the annual "[Grad Slam](#)" contest and a "[Grad Day](#)" in Sacramento for graduate student advocacy that promote the work of and need for graduate students.

Members stressed that UC's research enterprise is broad and comprises much more than scientific discovery and information technology. Members are willing to help make the case to the state legislature that research is beneficial even if it doesn't bring in a lot of money or lead to business innovation or entrepreneurship.

### **Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives**

Director Erwin began by describing the two funding opportunities offered by the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives ([MRPI](#)), which by design incorporate support for graduate student research. Funding is now around \$8 million per year, half as much as was provided in 2009.

The MRPI competition, which is funded by campus tax, has received proposals for the 2017 grants. The proposals undergo a two-tier review. UCORP Chair Isaac Martin and Academic Senate Chair Jim Chalfant are on the portfolio panel. Each proposal must have a minimum of three collaborators, each from a different UC campus, and include graduate student support and training. There is also a requirement to identify specific contributions to undergraduate education through the research endeavor, such as via internship or participation in research, and a community engagement requirement as well.

The Laboratory Fees Research Program ([LFRP](#)) is a separate program administered by UC Research Initiatives that provides grants from the fee money received from UC's oversight and management of Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Labs. The competition is currently underway, and UCORP will hear more about the proposals in the coming months. There are two targeted opportunities: Collaborative Research and Training awards and In-Residence Graduate Fellowships. The collaborative awards must include four campuses and either LANL or LLNL. Thirty-three proposals were received. For the graduate fellowships, the candidate must have advanced to candidacy and have a desire to do on-site research at Los

Alamos or Livermore National Labs for two to three years. Seventeen proposals were received and are currently undergoing review.

### **Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy & Coordination**

Wendy Streitz talked about the policies of highest concern in her department that are also relevant to UCORP. There is a new export control policy to demonstrate compliance with law. It will come to the Academic Senate for formal review within the next few months. Conflict of interest disclosures and changes to UC's policy on Native American graves and repatriation are issues that will come up this year.

A new policy on access to and management of research data policy is being developed to fill a policy gap. Spurred by a couple of high-profile incidents that may have been helped by such a policy, the university is interested in defining what happens to original data when someone leaves the university.

The committee spent some time discussing the forthcoming proposal for a policy on "Openness in Research." The current rough draft pulls together existing policy statements concerning publication and citizenship restrictions on research, and discusses a process for exceptions to existing policy. Many peer institutions have similar policies to the one proposed. Stanford's was used as a starting point. Streitz talked the committee through some slides that were presented to Academic Council last year to introduce the "pro" and "con" of such a policy. UCFW (faculty welfare) is also discussing the policy because of academic freedom implications. While funding that comes with restrictions is most common in defense contracts, other funding such as for disease research may also come with restrictions. Arguments for a less restrictive policy say that it would bring new funding opportunities and that restrictions impede the progress of certain types of research. Arguments against a less restrictive policy say that it limits the free flow of information, restricts the composition of the research team, and could have a negative impact on students. Streitz noted that such a policy might also increase UC's "compliance exposure" and might limit UC's ability to rely on fundamental research or other exclusions from certain regulations. Work done at the national labs (LANL and LLNL) is not subject to the funding restrictions in UC's policy.

UCORP will have a more substantive discussion once a draft policy comes to the committee for review.

## **6. Campus Reports – Discussion about Campus CORs**

### *ORU process*

UCORP members were asked about the processes on their campuses for the establishment and review of Organized Research Units (ORUs). The group came up with some "homework" questions that will be compiled and distributed after the meeting, and committee members were asked to come back to the next meeting ready to discuss. Questions came up about "campus centers" as well. The intent is to examine the various ways campuses deal with ORUs and similar entities.

### *COR grants process*

UCORP members were asked about the faculty senate research grants on their campuses. UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman provided the group with sample questions about UCSB's

faculty grants process, including the average grant amount, number of applications, percentage of awards funded, and more. Members added more suggestions for data collection, including where the money comes from and whether there was funding available for travel and/or publication. This topic for discussion came out of a UCORP discussion last year about the different ways that campuses do research grants funding. UCORP will continue to discuss the COR grants process at future meetings.

## **7. Next Steps**

Items that came up in the course of today's meeting have been added to a list of potential future agenda topics. Members may send suggestions for agenda topics to Chair Isaac Martin ([iwmartin@ucsd.edu](mailto:iwmartin@ucsd.edu)), with a copy to committee analyst Joanne Miller ([joanne.miller@ucop.edu](mailto:joanne.miller@ucop.edu)).

*Meeting adjourned at 4:08*

*Minutes by prepared by: Joanne Miller, committee analyst*

*Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair*