UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Minutes of Meeting
October 12, 2015

I. Welcome & Introductions
UCORP Overview & Agenda Review, *Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair*
There is an addition to the agenda; at 11:00am, Provost Dorr will provide an update on the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies search. Regarding *Agenda Item V. Systemwide Review Items*, UCORP does not always have to opine. UCORP should look at policy reviews and question how does this impact research and how does this impact the conduct research on campus?

The topics for the 2015-16 year include the following below.
- Review of UC MEXUS, which is an MRU (multi-campus research unit). UC MEXUS provides encouragement of research related to Mexico, Mexican studies, and research with scholars from Mexico. This MRU also provides faculty grants, dissertation grants, and visiting fellowships for Mexican scholars. For MRUs, there is a review every 5 years, and a sunset review at the 15th year. These reviews help justify their continuation. UC MEXUS hasn't been reviewed in 12 years. UCORP is the lead committee on this review. Discussion followed:
    - o UCORP is the lead review committee, with collaboration from Planning and Budget (UCPB) and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Studies (CCGA).
    - o This review is only based on documentation. There will be an opportunity to meet with the director and maybe other members of the other committees, and can ask for additional information.
    - o Need someone from UCORP on the sub-committee, who would help put packet together and move this forward. This sub-committee will have one-hour phone meetings.
    - o May schedule a January 11, 2016, 2-3 hour phone meeting for this review.
- The PRG (Portfolio Review Group) was assembled by previous Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steve Beckwith. This was to examine centrally-funded groups by the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS). Two reports have been submitted, and the recommendations were taken seriously by Vice President Beckwith and Provost Dorr. ORGS responded to those reports and are planning for the next round. This process includes a three-year cycle. The following questions were asked:
    - o What should be the composition of a PRG committee?
    - o What is the total amount of funding?
    - o What is UCORP's role?
    - o How well did they respond?
- Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies search.
- UC Innovation Council, which includes the sub-committees of entrepreneurship and rewards. UCORP should be briefed on regularly.
- Discussion followed on research, teaching and research, part of teaching is research and vice versa; how to explain this story better – the synergy of research and teaching better. For example, during recruitment for undergraduate students, it should be said, "we do research." How can my kid get research experience?

II. Travel, *Mona Hsieh, Executive Assistant – Academic Senate*

Mona Hsieh asked UCORP members to keep their email messages with the total amount. She showed the interactive Travel Reimbursement Form (http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/documents/Travelreimbursementform.pdf). Assistant Director and Committee Analyst Jocelyn Banaria will email the form to UCORP; this document needs to be submitted within 45 days from travel. If driving is involved, please include the "to" and "from" addresses and a map. There is a new airline that opened in Merced called *Boutique Airlines*, and there is a special to fly from Merced to Oakland for $18.99. If expenses are under $75, receipts are not required.

Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies vacancy, *Provost Dorr*
President Napolitano would like a permanent Senior Vice President for Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship. This position would focus on the outside, be a "science advisor" to the President, and have a small unit. The search will start soon for the position to start in early 2016. This position will have an incubator perspective rather than an education one, and will work with legislators and venture Capitalists. The Innovation Alliance & Services (IAS) department of UCOP Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) would move to this Senior VP, and the expectation would be that this Senior VP would call on ORGS, Public Affairs, Government Relations, and Health Science & Services to carry out the work. There will be minimal funding to award, and will need to get the money for great ideas. This unit will not be a place for long-term investments, nor a place for on-going research.

This person has to have the right connections, well-spoken, and interested in talking to Legislators and individuals from the federal government. A person who appreciates research and what it can do for the world would be a great candidate for this position, but not necessarily an academic. The job description is currently being drafted and the chair of the search committee is Dean Rich Lyons from UC Berkeley's Haas School of Business.

The Vice President/Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies vacancy will also be filled, and this position will not be affected by the Senior VP position, except that IAS will move out of ORGS and into the Senior VP's unit. ORGS will be renamed.

Discussion followed:
- The relationship with the two positions will not overlap.
- The Senior VP will add to UC's portfolio which UC systemwide doesn't have on a permanent basis, and will report to the directly to the President.
- Lawrence Berkeley Lab does lots of innovation, and perhaps UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR).
- Policy efforts will be part of the "safeguards" that will help non-entrepreneurial research not be "slighted"; and they will make it easier for entrepreneurship and a system of evaluating faculty.
- The entrepreneurship area is motivated by more by public good than getting rich.
- On the campuses, the Office of Intellectual Property presents some barriers. The President is interested in removing barriers. UCORP should consult with both positions; will need to make request directly to the President for new position to consult with UCORP. Senate leadership can help facilitate that process.
- The Senior VP would raise the profile of UC.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership, *Dan Hare, Academic Council Chair and Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair*

A. Regents
  a. July 2015: The <u>total remuneration study</u>, which was Item C10. It is no longer true that "benefits make up for low salaries."
  b. September 2015:
   i. <u>Moving governance of health centers to a delegated board proposal</u> with non- Regent voting members. Two committees and six divisions provided input. At most, the Academic Senate advises, and the Senate rarely opines on Regents processes. The letter from Chair Hare to President Napolitano was submitted last week, and the Regents received it. <u>AD Banaria will provide the website to the UCORP members</u>. Chair Hare invited Council's input for the November 2015 Regents Meeting.
   ii. <u>Statement of intolerance</u>. The Regents chose not to adopt the statement, and developed a working group. On October 26, 2015, there will be a public forum at UCLA.
   iii. <u>UC Budget discussion</u>.
  c. <u>Budget Framework Implementation (BFI)</u>. This includes:
   i. reducing upper division major requirements to 45 credits,
   ii. adopting the Common Identification Number System (C-ID) that is currently used by the California Community Colleges (CCC) and CSU as a supplement to existing course number systems,
   iii. offering alternative credit, such as credit by examination,
   What is happening at UC is also happening throughout the nation. AD Banaria will send the BFI summary to the UCORP members.

B. UC Budget. There is some Council input to the UC budget until November. In April 2015, SB-15 was completely erased in the May revision. The May Revision takes 2 weeks, and the Governor controls the process. Enrollment funding is a process under Legislature control. The final budget bills are due by June 14; therefore, there is at most, one month between the May revisions and the final budget.

C. Retirement Options Task Force. The progress is slow, and it continues to meet. There have been few decisions made, and there is still much work.

D. Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy. The latest version has improved, and not all of the Senate's concerns were addressed. Responses due October 26th, and Council has to submit by October 31, 2015. If reviewing, consider "How important are Senate issues that have not been addressed in this revision?"

E. Expedited reviews – can't change the timelines; can only adapt to them.

F. Auditors – looking at rebenching executive compensation.

<u>Discussion followed</u>:
- Why move governance structure away for health centers?
- When the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies is hired, UCORP can bring forward policy and tech transfer impediments.
- The Senior VP should be a consultant to UCORP.

- Reinvesting in quality – how can the message be packaged? Perhaps presentations by graduate students.
- UCORP mandate covers all research, not just technology.

V. Systemwide Review Items, *Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair*
Action Requested: Decide if UCORP will opine, and if so, what the comments shall be.

1. **Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Presidential Policy – Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence** (Comments due by October 26, 2015)
   Does the proposed policy provide adequate protections and responses for incidents that may occur in University-sponsored research and educational activities that occur away from campus? Are faculty and Graduate Student Employee responsibilities in such situations clear? Are adequate provisions made for meeting any such responsibilities?
   Discussion followed that UCORP should look at specific clauses and sections. On page 10, section 2.b., the section on off-campus, and doing research is covered well. Chair Habicht Mauche will draft a response that will state, "UCORP examined with respect to UCORP's scope, and find the proposed policy satisfactory."

2. **Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 417 and 621**
   417. Discussion followed on if anything that relaxes the admissions comprises the research mission. UCORP agrees with the proposed revisions.
   621. Discussion followed that there are systemwide Senate committees on Education Policy (UCEP) and on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). Does it have a research policy/research context? Chair Habicht Mauche will draft a response that will include "would like to make sure that there is very careful control to prepare students for the rigor; make sure that students are prepared to compete."

3. **Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140**
   UCORP will not opine.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President –
Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)
Kathleen Erwin, Director – UC Research Initiatives.
Chris Spitzer, Coordinator – UC Research Initiatives
Emily Rader, Project Lead – ORGS
Wendy Streitz, Executive Director – Research Policy & Coordination
Jeff Hall, Director – Research Policy Development, ORGS.

- **Multi-campus Research Units (MRU) - MEXUS Review**, *Erwin and Spitzer*
  Background. Last year, the approach of the reviews was reviewed by UCORP, CCGA and UCPB. This process included reviewing the MRU portions in the updated *Compendium*, and the goal was to come up with a more streamlined review process. The comments were submitted to UCORP, then to the Interim Vice President for Research. MRUs that receive systemwide funding are a higher priority for systemwide review. The results included a new template for review and approved by UCORP, CCGA, and UCPB. There was a sub-committee that included Chair Habicht Mauche, two UCORP members, two UCPB members, one CCGA members, and their chairs.

  During the meeting, Coordinator Spitzer passed out the timeline and the revised templates; he will send AD Banaria electronic copies. The handouts included the completed templates, budget

summary, and the UC member survey (i.e., which measures the impact on their careers). Coordinator Spitzer went over the timeline, and asked UCORP to look at the materials that will be sent to them in mid-November. As they are reviewing the document, he is requesting that they come up with questions.

Discussion followed and included the following topics.
o The 5-6 key criteria for review are in the *Compendium*. Question: criteria for review?
o The leadership of the MRU is evaluated.
o UC MEXUS' budget is $2million.
o Instead of using the original proposals and goals for the review, Director Erwin suggest to focus on the current value and projected goals to see if the MRU is meeting the needs of current scholarship and research.
o Three to four external reviewers are needed. These individuals would have national prominence and are knowledgeable about UC Research about/in Mexico.
o The timeline is very aggressive.

• **Catalyst RFP (Erwin & Spitzer)**, *Erwin and Spitzer*
President's Catalyst Awards totals to about $10million, which included $3million awarded last year and $7 million remaining. 186 letters of intent (LOIs) were received and 29 advanced to the peer-review process. The selection committee includes representatives from the Senate, UCOP, and the campuses. The chair of the committee is Paul Grey, UCB Provost Emeritus. The final decision is based on President's selection in a December announcement.

• **Upcoming Lab Fees Research Program**, *Erwin*
The Lab Fees Research program includes collaborations between UC faculty and the national labs. Last year, there was $0 appropriated, and it is expected to be $14million this year. This program works with lab directors and the campuses Vice Chancellors for Research (VCRs). The call should be issued in April 2016, and UCORP should review to ensure the mission of UC and the Labs is included. There is also a graduate program that is being piloted. Discussion followed on that Berkeley National Labs will be treated separately and that UCORP should provide comments.

• **Multi-campus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) reviews**, *Erwin*
This occurs every other year, and this year, the MRPIs are restored at $8million. With MRPIs, there should be a minimum of 3 campuses. Last time, there were 2-3 year awards, and last year, 4-year proposals were more popular with peer reviews. Director Erwin would like UCORP to be involved in the scope of reviews of what systemwide Senate would like to see with MRPIs.

• **Portfolio Review Group (PRG) review**, *Radar*
Project Lead Radar showed slides. The strategic plans received are the following: California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology 2 (calit2), Center for Information Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI), UC Natural Reserve System (NRS), and the UCSD Supercomputer Center.

Radar is requesting feedback and comment from UCORP on the strategic plans in a written statement, and should evaluate them against Principles 1-2 (were in packet). The deadline is December 14, 2015. The next steps are that ORGS will work with the programs to develop 2-page briefing documents every six months, which would highlight 1-2 major recent accomplishments.

Discussion followed on the total amount is about $85million from ORGS, AD Banaria will send the PRG link, and one of the goals for the PRG is to line up the programs next to each other aligned with the principles. This is a holistic look of the research portfolio as a whole.

- **Openness in Research Policy**, *Streitz*
  Executive Director Streitz showed slides. This policy involves not accepting publications and citizenship restrictions. Currently, UC does not accept restrictions on publications. AD Banaria will send the slides to UCORP members so that they can be shared with divisional Committees on Research (CORs). Questions that UCORP members should ask their COR members include:
  a. Are there faculty members who can't pursue their research agenda?
  b. What is your CORs opinion?

  Discussion followed on the timeline/process; the consulting on drafting of the draft policy; any research that results in a publication; poorly defined since it includes non-classified; and need more examples of what may be problematic.

  The timeline/process includes the following: (1) draft policy to UCORP before November 9, 2015; (2) want UCORP feedback, thoughts and concerns; (3) take it to the divisions; (4) "take the temperature" that includes the pros/cons and who would benefit?, and (5) discuss again at the November 9th UCORP meeting.

- **Principle Guidelines/Summary of Sponsor Rights**, *Streitz*
  The Principles Guidelines includes 8 principles. Executive Director Streitz will send AD Banaria a packet to distribute to the UCORP members and a brief.

- **Update on Recent Fetal Tissue Activities**, *Hall*
  This is part of the results of Congressional Hearings on Planned Parenthood. There's a work group at UCOP that includes media relations, governmental relations, and ORGS. Discussion followed on that they would like to see UCORP take a stand (UCLA COR will) and bring the topic to the campuses.

- **Proposed changes to the Common Rule**, *Hall*
  With the Human Research Subject Rule, which is an overhall of the Common Rule, there is a sense that it needed to be more streamlined. The deadline to offer comments is December 7, 2015. Part of the goals is to improve the consent process (i.e., the template, able to attach appendices, obtain required informed consent, broad consent, single IRB for multi-site studies, etc.). Director Hall, will send the materials that were sent and will send "townhall" site. Discussion followed on that the IRB doesn't answer to the University. If UCORP members have any input from campuses, they should bring it to the November 9th meeting.

- **Issues regarding use of drones (Hall)**
  This is a new tool for research and they are strongly regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). There is a broad-use license that will permit the use of drones for teaching and research, and this license goes beyond research. There is a search for an administrative office to oversee this, and it is not the VCRs; the Office of Risk Management obtained insurance for our "drone wrecks." Discussion followed on that ORGS will send materials to comment on and to include it in UCORP's agenda, and highlight which areas UCORP should focus.

- **ORGS Hot Topics** – Executive Director Streitz will send this list.

VII. Further Discussion
   For November 2015 meeting
   - Provide the 2 PRG reports
   - Provost to share and discuss the job description of VP of ORGS
   - Access to and management of research data
   - Openness in Research Policy