

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, March 13, 2017

Meeting Minutes**1. Welcome & Chair's Announcements**

Committee members welcomed UCORP's new graduate student representative, who attended the meeting for the first time.

The minutes from February 13, 2017, were approved.

Chair Isaac Martin provided some updates on topics of interest to UCORP:

- UC has announced an increase in indirect cost recovery rates from State grants. Waivers are available on an individual basis. At least some campuses are working on processes to streamline the waiver process. Faculty are concerned that the higher rates will drive away State agencies that currently provide grants.
- A new Export Control Policy was sent out for a 90-day systemwide review late on Friday. UCORP will discuss the new policy in April.
- UCORP members were sent a revised template for multicampus research unit (MRU) reviews and are encouraged to offer suggestions for further revisions.
- At the Academic Planning Council (a joint administration/Senate committee) that Chair Martin attended earlier in the week, there was a proposal to revise the Compendium. At this point, UCORP's plan is to encourage compliance with the existing Compendium, rather than revising the document.

2. Update on White Paper Request - UC's Relationship with the National Labs

UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman revived the white paper proposal with suggestions from committee members. It was sent to ACSOLI Chair Jim Chalfant, who circulated it to ACSCOLI. Richman has talked to many people in the UC system with a wide spectrum of attitudes about UC's relationship with the national labs and found that there was universal support for the idea of a white paper. In addition to education for faculty and others in the UC community, the goal of the paper is to help inform the process for UC's ongoing relationship with the labs.

3. MRU Reviews

The committee members agreed that it was necessary to get back into a regular review schedule for all multicampus research units and discussed a possible "lighter touch" for reviewing the MRUs that do not receive ongoing systemwide funding. Before setting a review schedule, members suggested that the MRUs submit annual reports, as specified in the Compendium, so that the committee can make a better informed judgment about review priorities. The committee will find out whether annual reports can be submitted before its June meeting so that they can be

reviewed and inform UCORP's plan for the next two to three years of MRU reviews. UCORP will then propose a schedule to the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. For 2017-18, the committee will start with Category 1 MRU reviews.

The committee discussed the possible reasons that MRUs not receiving ongoing systemwide funding would request continuation of MRU status, and considered that it might put them in a better position for a competitive systemwide grant or outside grants. Committee members were interested in the nature of the central funding that some of the units receive on a competitive basis as well as their other funding.

The committee discussed the review template, and whether it was sufficient for the 15-year "sunset" review of Category 1 MRUs. There were suggestions to shorten, edit, and remove the forward-looking emphasis of the template so that it would be suitable for an annual report, for those MRUs that are not undergoing a 15-year sunset review.

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

Nick Anthis, Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives

Wendy Streitz, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

- **Export Control policy**

Executive Director Wendy Streitz provided some background on the new UC Export Control Policy, which was distributed for systemwide review on Friday. The systemwide policy is intended to state for the record that UC follows with export control laws and that campuses need to show compliance by setting up a compliance program. The policy became necessary after UC disclosed violations to export control laws.

UCORP members related that campuses vary in their compliance requirements and procedures, which raises the possibility that colleagues at UC campuses might have differing compliance requirements. Administrative compliance personnel meet together regularly and should be addressing this.

Export control laws are complex. They cover physical entities that leave the country, such as biological compounds or equipment carried by researchers, as well as "deemed export," which consists of providing certain technological information to a foreign national (with exceptions). There is a fundamental research exception, which applies to almost all UC activity.

If UC researchers have questions about what is covered under the law, they should first contact their campus export control expert.¹ Streitz said that she would inquire with the systemwide Export Control Officer (at UCOP) about creating a website that points to resources such as the

¹ Export Control Officers: <http://www.ucop.edu/ethics-compliance-audit-services/compliance/international-compliance/campus-contacts.html>

actual export law. Meanwhile, resources can be found on UCOP's International Compliance website.²

- **Indirect Cost Recovery**

Director Streit last updated UCORP on the increase in State agency indirect cost recovery rates in April, 2016. UC negotiated a new model agreement with the State that went into effect in January, 2016. Although the model agreement did not affect indirect costs, it brought attention to the need to increase the rate to cover actual campus costs. Until now, agencies have been paying an average of 18%, which means that UC has to cover the gap. The plan to obtain a 40% cost recovery phased over the next four years, from 25% this year and increasing by 5% each year. Chancellors and Vice Chancellors for Research are supportive, but also agree that specific cases may need exceptions. Director Streit would like to be informed if committee members are aware of agency grants that are in jeopardy due to the increased rate.

UCORP members noted that the State Fish & Wildlife agency didn't seem to know about the increased rate. Scripps and UCSD have already expressed concerns. There is also an issue with Riverside and the CA energy commission.

Streit confirmed that the model agreement includes service agreements, but it is unclear whether the indirect cost rate applies in all instances. There is an effort to work on messaging and spreading the word to campuses and to the state agencies. Streit reported that there was a glitch in the ticketing system for requesting waivers for agencies *other* than State agencies, which caused a backup in the processing of waiver requests that is now being addressed.

- **MRU review consultation**

UCORP Chair Isaac Martin described UCORP's goal to get back on track and into compliance with the Compendium. UCORP would like to proceed with Category 1 MRUs by initiating 15-year reviews for the Institute for Transportation Studies and the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee. UC MEXUS was reviewed last year, and the UC Observatories has had special oversight for the past few years and will undergo a review in 2019.

For Category 2 MRUs that are requesting continuation, UCORP agreed to ask for annual reports for the committee to review in time for the June meeting. This would allow UCORP the opportunity to plan how to proceed with ongoing reviews for these units.

UCORP members will take a few days to further revise the MRU review template sent from Director Kathleen Erwin so that it can be used as a template for annual reports. The existing (revised) template should be sufficient for the Category 1 MRU reviews for the 2017-18 academic year.

Discussion clarified that there is no intent to make a "continuation/no continuation" decision based on the annual reports. Members discussed whether the same amount of review rigor would be used for all MRUs. Committee members felt that some reviews would be simpler and some

² International Compliance: <http://www.ucop.edu/ethics-compliance-audit-services/compliance/international-compliance/>

more complex based on the size and complexity of the work of the MRU, but that the degree of scrutiny would not necessarily correspond to the distinction between Category 1 and Category 2 MRUs.

VP Ellis and Director Erwin had some suggestions for streamlining the reviews and lightening the administrative burden. Ellis' department has licensed the SciVal tool from Elsevier, which aggregates metrics about publications and data to allow comparisons of output among institutions. Committee members wanted more information about what information SciVal could produce at the level of MRU. Some committee members argued that the tool would not substitute effectively for letters or other qualitative methods of review.

Erwin noted that MRUs are not necessarily comparable to other entities, like departments or faculty, which is challenging when conducting a traditional review. She suggested that the committee determine how to best get information about the quality of work done within an MRU and exactly what is being evaluated from the start to help with the review process and eliminate the need to request additional information in the course of the review. UCORP members felt that using the MRU's original proposal for establishment would be a useful baseline for the review. Of course, an Academic Senate review would focus on academic quality.

Although it takes a lot of work, committee members felt that a stakeholder input survey remains a necessary part of the review. External reviewers are also worthwhile, although it might be difficult to find the right mix of people.

Director Erwin pointed out the potential conflict of interest with the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee. The CRCC is run by a committee of Academic Senate members and Mary Croughan, Executive Director of the Research Grants Program Office (and Director Erwin's supervisor) is the Executive Secretary.

Next steps:

1. UCORP members will finish revising the MRU review template so that it can serve as an annual report template that the ORGS VP can send to MRU directors. It will ask that units include information for the 2015-16 fiscal year and to-date for the current fiscal year.
2. UCORP Chair Isaac Martin will draft a cover letter to accompany the template that describes the need for MRUs to submit annual reports in addition to undergoing periodic review to maintain MRU status.
3. The deadline for the MRU annual reports to be submitted to UCORP will be **June 1st** so that the committee may have them in time for its June meeting. UCORP will use these reports to determine priorities for future reviews.
4. The Office of Research and Graduate Studies staff will initiate the 15-year reviews for the Institute for Transportation Studies and the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee by contacting the directors in May to introduce the process. The review template will be sent to the directors in June with a September deadline. ORGS staff and the UCORP committee analyst will prepare materials so that UCORP can review both MRUs in the 2017-18 academic year.

UCORP Action: UCORP Chair Isaac Martin will send a revised review template and draft cover letter to ORGS by March 21.

ORGS Action: ORGS will send the annual review requests to the MRU directors and will initiate 15-year reviews with the directors of the Institute for Transportation Studies and the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee.

5. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant provided a brief update on UC's Public Records Act release of information related to cases of sexual violence and sexual harassment within the university. Several news outlets requested the information and it has been published widely. UC's response attempted to balance the public's right to know with an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy.

The Regents will discuss a new policy on non-residents at their next meeting and are expected to adopt a policy this year.

6. Executive session

No notes were taken during executive session.

Meeting adjourned: 3:45

Minutes drafted by Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair