

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Monday, January 13, 2020

## Videoconference

**Meeting Minutes****I. Chair's Announcements***Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair*

Chair Baird noted the letter sent from the Academic Council to President Napolitano conveying UCORP's recommendations for climate change principles and actions, and the President's supportive response. UCORP will follow up on these recommendations with a discussion at the March meeting. An inventory of current work in the area would be helpful. Baird would like to explore how systemwide funding used for MRPI/MRUs could be used to encourage work related to climate change. Better would be if new money could be obtained by leveraging current efforts and presenting a unified, coordinated effort.

**II. UCORP Survey on Campus CORs**

The committee talked about the information gathered via the new UCORP survey on campus Committees on Research and remarked on the diversity of activities of the CORs. The information was compiled to facilitate information sharing on budgets and funding opportunities that are present on each campus. Sharing results might empower those who would like to see more support at their campus. They show that some campuses' CORs are more policy-focused and some end up being more reactive than proactive. Members noted that the Chair of the local committee really makes a difference in the work that gets done. This underscores the importance of the local CoC to get the right mix on the local committee. It was also noted that the Vice Chancellor for Research – and the extent of his or her involvement with the committee – can also have a big impact.

**Action:** Not all survey respondents included the total budget available for grants so members are asked to send totals to be added to the survey compilation.

UCORP members expressed interest in finding out how much of a campus' indirect costs are used for faculty research grants and what the formula might be. Experience from several members has shown that this data is difficult to get. It will also vary from campus to campus (and possibly among schools/departments) and from year to year. Some members also wanted to know the number of faculty who have access to the COR funds.

Some campuses continue to have issues around computer hardware support for faculty, particularly computer replacement. Other Senate committees may be exploring this as well. It is an example of an infrastructure issue that would benefit from a systemwide discussion of best practices.

**III. Academic Senate Leadership Update**

The Senate leadership updated was cancelled.

**IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Innovation***Janna Tom, Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination**Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination*

- *Update on UC Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation Policy*

UC's new Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation Policy was approved in November but will be delayed due a request for additional review by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). In addition to additional consultation with Native American tribes, the Commission is requesting that a list of California's tribes be incorporated into the policy and that implementation guidance be more specific, including charts for campuses that illustrate the paths to repatriation. The university anticipates a legislative extension of the January 1 deadline for the new policy. President Napolitano's letter to the NAHC was included as background in the UCORP agenda. The secondary review will allow for public comment as well as an additional Senate review period in the spring. The policy is expected to be issued by July 1, 2020.

- ***Higher Education Act Section 117 reporting***

The Higher Education Act requires universities to report all funding of over \$250,000 from single foreign source. This includes all awards and gifts. In the past, this requirement was interpreted as research awards only, but applies more broadly to any type of contract with a foreign source. This is resulting in more coordination on the campuses because gifts and awards may be accounted for in different offices. There are concerns around license agreements, confidentiality, and public reporting. New guidance was distributed to campuses today.

- ***DOE Order 142.3A, Approval of Foreign Nationals***

The DOE order to report all foreign nationals is meant primarily for personnel access to laboratory facilities and not all work that is done on DOE-funded projects. For the past few years there has been a fundamental research exception for universities, but that has been removed. There is still concern about racism and targeting of Chinese researchers in particular. Some Chancellors have issued statements about inclusiveness.

## **V. Consultation with the UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources**

*Wendy Powers-Schilling, Associate Vice President, ANR*

ANR Associate Vice President Wendy Powers-Schilling provided information on her background at Michigan State and Iowa State and on the structure of UC's Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. ANR consists of Cooperative Extension Specialists on the campuses and Cooperative Extension Advisors in counties around the state.

The ANR Governing Council was convened in April based on recommendations stemming from the UCOP Huron Report – an audit of UCOP in 2018 – that evaluated potential changes to programs based at UCOP. Chaired by UC Riverside Chancellor Kim Wilcox, the Governing Council includes representatives from every campus but UCSF and is charged to advise the UC President on the work of ANR.

After AVP Powers-Schilling's presentation, the committee discussed various topics including the academic status of cooperative extension specialists. In other states, cooperative extension specialists are considered regular faculty members, but in the UC system, specialists function like research/extension faculty do in other states and typically do not have teaching responsibilities unless they have a joint appointment as faculty/instructor. Within the Specialist and CE Advisor designations there are Assistant, Associate, and Full titles.

These researchers may not be very visible on campuses, with the possible exception of Davis, since there are few of them compared to the total number of faculty and researchers.

As in previous discussions, UCORP asked about the processes for spreading the word about research opportunities and how the committee could help ANR staff to reach out and make connections. Climate change research was specifically brought up as an area of intersecting interest where the Senate is looking to stimulate active engagement by faculty.

ANR Task Force member Brent Haddad joined the meeting and talked briefly about how that group was formed as a subcommittee of the UC Committee on Planning and Budget about two years ago and that they were also looking at ways that ANR could be further integrated with all UC campuses. He noted that UCPB has been engaged with ANR over the years but discussions have been more focused on existing funding. He expressed approval that UCORP was looking at ways to leverage complementary skills for new funding opportunities that might be overlooked. TFANR is currently gathering information from ANR researchers and trying to determine how to connect the research goals of ANR and the wider university.

Baird reiterated the call for any UCORP member to represent UCORP on the ANR Task Force, which generally meets via videoconference.

## **VI. MRU Reviews**

UCORP members discussed the Five-Year Review reports and data that were submitted by the UC Observatories and Bioengineering Institute of California and started to develop questions for the MRUs' Directors. The questions for the Directors will be compiled and sent before the February meeting, where leadership from both MRUs will participate – UCO in the morning and BIC in the afternoon.

Review committee members discussed whether the MRUs are accomplishing their mission, their service to the state, added value, inclusion of students, ability to leverage outside funding, governance and administrative structure, and budget details. The two MRUs are very different in purpose, structure, and especially budget. Members were concerned that some of the content of the reviews was out of date.

**Action:** Chair Baird and Vice Chair Desjardins will compile a draft list of questions to circulate to the respective Review Committees before the questions are forwarded to UCRI Director Kathleen Erwin to send to the MRU Directors.

## **VII. Planning for future meetings**

Agenda items for upcoming meetings will include an Elsevier update and follow-up on UCORP's proposed changes for the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee.

-----  
Meeting adjourned: 1:00

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

Attest: Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair