

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, March 12, 2018

Meeting Minutes**1. Announcements, overview, approval of minutes**

Jeff Richman, UCORP Chair

Meeting minutes from 12/11/17 and 2/12/18 were approved.

2. Research Innovation & Entrepreneurship

Christine Gulbranson, Senior Vice President, Research Innovation & Entrepreneurship

Senior Vice President Christine Gulbranson joined the meeting to talk about the work of the [Office of Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship](#). The Office was created through the Innovation & Entrepreneurship Presidential initiative to leverage and combine the promotional efforts of the campuses and labs. The Office works with campuses on policy-related issues and supports technology transfer operations such as patent tracking, patent prosecution, and accounting. At first, Gulbranson focused her attention on launching the innovation and entrepreneurship activities, but the patent portfolio and related functions will soon be reviewed and updated.

SVP Gulbranson talked about the “I am a UC Entrepreneur” campaign that invited students, faculty, staff and post-docs to submit their stories to be highlighted on a website and via other venues. Nineteen UC entrepreneurs were selected for a chance to meet and pitch ideas to venture capitalists at a lunch hosted by UC President Janet Napolitano and SVP Gulbranson. Traditionally, UC hasn’t promoted its entrepreneurial culture as much as other institutions (e.g., MIT, Stanford). UCORP members noted CAP assessments of productivity seem to value scholarly work over innovation.

Gulbranson was asked about the Office’s focus on product innovation, and whether process-type inventions would also be considered, and whether her Office interacted with governmental and other not-for-profit entities. Members thought that SVP Gulbranson’s office would play well in Sacramento, by helping to show UC’s value to job creation and economic growth. UCORP’s undergraduate representative expressed appreciation on behalf of students who want to be entrepreneurs and start their own companies.

SVP Gulbranson was asked about dealing with the great disparity in output among the campuses. The Office’s goal is to help elevate and illuminate campus innovations as a whole. When Gulbranson speaks at conferences and meets with potential funders, she brings together the various campus outputs to generate excitement. She welcomes feedback and input from the committee, especially on where to find innovators. UCORP members suggested that more communication between the new offices and the Senate would be mutually beneficial.

3. ITS Review- Discussion

[Note: The ITS Review was discussed throughout the day, but comments are consolidated in this section of the meeting minutes.]

Most of the discussion about ITS centered on funding and the extent of collaboration between the branches. UCORP members agreed that the review should focus on the work of the past five years, discussed what to include in the report, including recommendations for increased collaboration. Suggestions included having common bylaws, a combined strategic plan with objectives and goals, and an advisory board to oversee more than just the SB1 funding. MRU status was beneficial in securing the \$50 million in SB1 funding from the State, but there may be other benefits. UCORP members thought it would be helpful if the Directors were able to succinctly demonstrate results and successes from all funding.

In a call with ORGS personnel earlier in the week, Chair Richman learned more about the extent to which UCOP was involved in getting the campus ITS branches together to form a more unified team and securing SB1 funding from the State Department of Transportation. He also informed the group that, until recently, UC Berkeley ran a National Transportation Center with federal funding. In the last round of competition to host the Center, the three other ITS branches joined with USC to be part of the National Center based at USC. UCORP members were concerned that only 5% of funding is earmarked for the rest of the system.

UCORP members discussed whether to go back to ITS Directors for more information prior to revising the report. Questions remain about how new funding will be distributed to other campuses, the nature of UCOP's involvement in distributing or verifying funding, ITS FTEs, and the job description for the statewide coordinator position.

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

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

Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis & Coordination

Lourdes DeMattos, Research Policy Manager

- ***Export Control Policy update***

As a result of a self-disclosure to the Department of State, UC had to meet a number of requirements, one of which is to have a policy. The Export Control Policy is meant to say: Comply with US law, and have a method for doing so. Every campus has a designated Export Control Officer.

In the systemwide review, the most robust comments came from the Senate, and primarily from researchers who are leery of being told what to do by an Export Control Officer. Research Policy Manager Lourdes DeMattos clarified that the ECOs are supposed to work with the individual needs of a department or faculty member. In such a distributed environment it's very hard to inform faculty, but that's what the Export Control Offices are for, so that faculty don't have to make the sole determination. As stated in the FAQ, each campus creates its own Export Control program. Currently, two campuses have strong programs that will ideally be replicated on other campuses.

Examples of where the Export Control Policy might affect a researcher include acquiring new technologies (infrared cameras were one example – one type of camera included a technology that was subject to export control regulations), certain chemical compounds, and some defense funding. The word “export” can be confusing; sharing restricted information with a foreign national is a “deemed export.” There is an exception in the law for “fundamental research.”

Executive Director Streitzi emphasized that much of what is in the Policy is not university policy, it's the actual law of the United States with information on how UC complies. Streitzi also reminded the committee that UC's policies do not allow funding that includes publication or citizenship restrictions. The policy (and FAQ) purposefully does not include a checklist. Because each situation is different, ECOs are supposed to answer questions, provide guidance, and assist with a "technology control plan." Local faculty members will be part of the compliance program.

Streitzi said that a related policy on "Openness in Research" at UC is still on hold for now.

Action: ORS will update the question in the FAQ on source code vs. object code.

Action: UCORP will respond to ORGS about whether the policy revision has been sufficiently responsive to the Senate's concerns.

- ***Request for Proposals (RFP) for the 2019 UC-National Laboratory In-Residence Graduate Fellowships***, offered by the [UC National Laboratory Fees Research Program](#) (LFRP).

In the third time offering this fellowship, the only difference is an effort to publicize the competition by creating video conversations with first-round winners. The RFP has same requirements as last year. A UCORP member suggested clarifying the 8% indirect cost reimbursement and referring to the three-page mentor bio as something other than a "CV." Members briefly discussed whether the six-month residence requirement was so difficult that it ruled out too many people. This requirement has been thought-through and is meant to immerse the fellow in the life of the lab.

Another comment was that the competition seemed like lot of work for something that benefits only a few people. Otherwise, UCORP had no further comments.

- ***NSF new requirements for grantees***

NSF has proposed new reporting requirements for grantees regarding sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault. It was released on Monday, March 3, in the Federal Register, with comments due May 4.

- ***The UC Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy carve-out for research subject to IRB oversight.***

A new FAQ question has been drafted regarding the mandatory reporting requirement under the UC Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy ([SVSH](#)). Specifically, in the case of research that is subject to IRB oversight, researchers are exempted from the mandatory reporting requirement if a study subject discloses "Prohibited Conduct." The concern was that the integrity of the research could be affected if a subject is reluctant to be candid in light of mandatory reporting.

- ***Cannabis-related research***

Cannabis is still a Schedule 1 substance under federal law, making it illegal to possess, use, and sell. There is a workshop for stakeholders to discuss legal and policy issues on March 13. Director Streitzi is involved with national workgroup that is developing FAQs and guidelines. In general, the UC

administration is looking toward larger organizations like the Council on Governmental Relations (a higher education association) to ask for clarity and push back on the regulations, rather than working alone. UC will also be releasing FAQs for researchers.

- ***ITS MRU Review***

ORGS Portfolio/Strategies Manager Emily Rader participated in the last ITS Advisory Board meeting and reported that the Directors are interested in engaging regularly with stakeholders and dialog with state and regional entities and non-profits. Advisory Board was created less than a year ago and is still figuring out the best model, but there's a lot of enthusiasm.

VP Art Ellis said that UCORP is welcome to evaluate ITS based on fulfillment or progress toward the recommendations from the Portfolio Review Group,¹ which included examining opportunities to increase intercampus collaboration through an external advisory board or independent program review. The creation of the UC ITS Advisory Board was a step in this direction. The issue of funding for other campuses could be raised in the context of whether ITS is adequately drawing on expertise at other campuses. Updates on progress can be made in the annual reports and do not have to wait for five year reviews to report.

UCORP members expressed concern about the statewide coordinator having a direct channel to the legislature without going through proper UC channels. Ellis said that the coordinator will work closely with UC's State Government Relations before communicating with lawmakers in Sacramento. It is understood that SGR is the coordinator.

UCOP's role in ITS funding has been the distribution of the funding through the UCOP systemwide budget office to the ITS branches along with all other State allocations to those campuses. Some of the ITS legacy funding is used primarily for administration, while other funding is earmarked for research and requires a plan how it will be dispersed. ITS submits progress reports on projects to State funders and stakeholders.

UCORP's review will focus on the big picture meaning of an MRU. The UC ITS Board of Advisors is beneficial in bringing stakeholders together and enabling increased communication for organizations with intersecting interests. Whether this structure furthers the research being done is something that ITS should be able to show.

5. Systemwide Review Items, Next Steps, Upcoming Meetings

There was no time for the items under review.

Next steps: Committee members will continue to work on ITS Review Report.

Meeting participants:

UCORP Members: Jeffrey Richman (Chair, UCSB) Andrew Baird (Vice Chair, UCSD), Irina Conboy (UCB), Dietmar Kueltz (UCD), Nasrin Rahimieh (UCI), Richard Desjardins (UCLA), David Noelle (UCM), K.K.Ramakrishnan (UCR), Brian Eliceiri (UCSD), Janet Myers (UCSF), Harry

¹ https://www.ucop.edu/research-graduate-studies/files/research/documents/prg_cycle2_final_report.pdf

Nelson (UCSB, via video), Dejan Milutinovic (UCSC, via video), Kian Maalizadeh (Undergraduate representative, via video)

Guests and Consultants: Onyebuchi Arah (CCGA via video), Eleanor Kaufman (UCPB via video), Christine Gulbranson (UCOP), Arthur Ellis (UCOP), Kathleen Erwin (UCOP), Nicholas Anthis (UCOP), Emily Rader (UCOP), Wendy Streit (UCOP), Lourdes DeMattos (UCOP)

Staff: Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)

Meeting adjourned: 4:00pm

Minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCORP committee analyst

Attest: Jeffrey Richman, UCORP chair