

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, October 16, 2017

Minutes of Meeting

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Committee Overview

After introductions, Chair Jeff Richman reviewed UCORP's charge, committee functions, and the consultative process with Academic Council and UC administration. [UCORP members can view Chair Richman's [slides on SharePoint](#).] The committee's current membership is heavily weighted toward scientific disciplines, and members should keep in mind that other fields may be relevant to UCORP's work.

One of UCORP's accomplishments last year was getting back into alignment with the Compendium (the manual for "Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units") and scheduling MRUs for regular reviews. Anticipated work for the coming year includes an MRU review and development of a white paper on UC's relationship with the national labs. The committee might devote time to determining how to best advocate for UC's research enterprise in the state of California and how to inform legislators about the crucial role of research in higher education.

2. Reproducibility and authentication issues in the biological sciences

UCORP Vice Chair Andrew Baird led the discussion on reproducibility and authentication in the biological sciences. One approach is the use of research resource identifiers (RRIDs), which the committee will discuss in a future meeting.

A question is whether UC should take a leadership role in this area, and what that would look like. The university has a vested interest in ensuring that the work of its scientists and researchers is reproducible. As the recipient of one-eighth of NIH funding, UC will be impacted by any NIH requirement.

Not all committee members are convinced that RRIDs are a good idea. A UCORP member with experience in the biological sciences does not think that identifiers will solve reproducibility problems, and the implementation of such a requirement would be a burden to researchers who are already overwhelmed with complying with existing requirements. Each project could have hundreds of unique resources.

Action: Andrew Baird, Leif Havton and Irina Conboy will form a subgroup to follow up on the issue of authentication for biological sciences. Before the November meeting, the group will prepare a list of questions to frame the discussion with Dr. Anita Bandrowski from UCSD, who is the founder and CEO of SciCrunch.

3. Travel Information

Academic Senate Executive Assistant Mona Hsieh briefly joined the meeting to be sure that committee members knew about UCOP's travel guidelines, which are available on the Academic Senate's Resources page: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/resources/>. Members should

submit their travel reimbursement requests to the email address on the reimbursement form no later than 45 days after the meeting.

4. The National Labs and UC's Bid for Management of Los Alamos National Laboratory

Chair Richman provided background information about the labs and the distinction between the NNSA (National Nuclear Security Administration) labs and Berkeley Lab, which is overseen by the DOE's Office of Science.

Vice President for the National Laboratories Kim Budil joined the meeting and distributed an organization chart for her office and two-page handouts about each of the three labs. VP Budil talked about the history and background of UC and the national labs. The first was Berkeley Lab, founded in 1931, which is managed solely by UC for the Office of Science. UC's relationship with Los Alamos National Lab started in the 1940s during the Manhattan Project. Lawrence Livermore was founded in 1952. UC held the three management contracts for many years, with a focus on assuring proper oversight and bridges between the labs and the university. Since 2006, the two NNSA labs, Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore, have been managed by a partnership of UC and private sector contractors and are no longer part of UC, although UC controls fifty percent of the Board of Governors Executive Committee and is responsible for selecting the lab directors.

The RFP for the new Los Alamos National Lab management contract was released on October 25. VP Budil has spent a good amount of time in the past year interviewing potential partners and organizing UC's approach. In her communications with the UC community, VP Budil is trying to balance transparency with protecting UC's competitive advantage. One of the criteria for the new contract will be past performance. The LLC-managed labs have performed well in following their mission and scientific advancement, but some of the operational components at the lab have had some trouble.

When the LANL management RFP is released, applicants will have sixty days to respond. While the new streamlined procurement process is weighted towards past performance, it also includes organizational structure, key personnel, and small business strategy. Orals have been added back after being removed in the first iteration. The contract duration is five years plus five additional award years possible. A portion of UC's fee for managing the lab goes back into the labs and to support the work of the UC Office of the National Laboratories. The rest goes toward developing the UC-lab relationship.

VP Budil had a couple of suggestions for how UCORP could help her in her role and in the bid. Faculty can help assure that the mission of the labs is consistent with UC's mission. Those who are in a position to do so can continue to develop ties with the labs. Budil noted that 30% of LLNL papers are co-authored with UC faculty. Strategies for streamlining communication and codifying adjunct appointments are things that the committee could assist with.

Recently there has been an increase in staff turnover due to retirements, and VP Budil felt that it would be worthwhile to inform faculty about the vacancies at the labs. There is a larger effort to strengthen the lines of communication and bring groups of people together around issues and opportunities, including a nascent "speakers bureau" idea that VP Budil's office is working on to bring the communities together and get more exposure.

5. Academic Senate Leadership Update

Academic Council Chair Shane White and Vice Chair Robert May joined the meeting to provide an overview of current activities of the Senate.

- ***Sacramento and the legislature.*** Recent legislation, including the Budget Act of 2017 (AB97) included elements detrimental to UC. Funds are being withheld pending UC meeting certain criteria for admission of transfers and funding for undergraduates. Some of UC's ongoing programs were originally founded with state funds or by state mandate, and now the state wants to see better accounting and rationale for these programs. The Academic Council sent principles for evaluating cuts to academic programs to the President on October 1st.

Governor Brown recently signed a bill that allows for unionization of graduate student research assistants.

- ***Retiree health.*** Some in the UC administration would like to remove the “floor” for employer contributions to retiree health care, which is currently set at 70% of the cost of premiums. Retiree health is not a guaranteed benefit. UCOP is convening a task force with all stakeholders to look at the benefit for 2019 and beyond. An informational item will go to the Board of Regents in November.
- ***Campus Funding Model.*** One of Academic Council Chair White's priorities for this year is to find a way to equalize student funding across all campuses. After the “rebenching” process a few years ago, all new money was re-apportioned to level per-student spending on each campus. But the recent recession prompted campuses to raise funds in any ways that they could to help increase revenues. Because the larger campuses have more resources and leverage to raise money, the inequalities remain. Chair White said that all campuses could aspire to rise to equal level of greatness, but a recent vote by the Regents to differentially limit nonresident undergraduates is having the effect of explicitly “tiering” the campuses.
- ***Faculty Salary Gap.*** Chair White's other priority for the year is to start to address the faculty salary gap. Studies have shown that UC faculty earn around ten percent less than their peers in the “Comp 8.” The gap grew steadily for past 20 years, although it seems to have plateaued recently.
- Other issues of concern to the Academic Senate include: Freedom of speech, DACA, and a proposed revision of the LSOE series in the APM.

UCORP members were encouraged to check out the latest [Accountability Report](#) for facts and detailed information about the university.

6. Consultation with the UCOP Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

Collective Excellence - Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Art Ellis thanked UCORP for the important input the committee provided last year, including reviewing the recent “Collective Excellence” document that is now posted on the UCOP website. The document identifies nontraditional aspects of the research enterprise that might otherwise be overlooked.

Action: UCORP members may take the document to their CORs to ask whether the issues in the document resonate and if there are more examples that might be given attention. Any feedback from UCORP members will go to VP Ellis, who will revise the document periodically.

UC's 150th anniversary - UC is planning an undergraduate research day in Sacramento in conjunction with UC's sesquicentennial next year. The event will highlight undergraduates, but graduate students will be included as well. UCOP is looking for articulate, enthusiastic students and faculty who have good stories about their research experiences. The Vice Chancellors for Research are the campus contacts. UCORP's undergraduate student suggested that UC should find ways to quickly integrate transfer students, who may arrive with experience and are only at UC for a couple years.

Enhancing diversity in biomedical fields - UC is working with NIH on a nationwide initiative to increase diversity in biomedical fields that includes various ways to make hiring more inclusive, shortening the time to scholarly independence, and changing departmental culture. Underrepresented minorities now comprise ten percent of graduate students in biomedical fields.

Humanities Endowment - The Mellon Foundation is interested in establishing an endowment for humanities research at UC. The Foundation will contribute \$10 million into what will be a \$30 million fund. Fundraising is underway now.

Cannabis Research - The California law that legalized marijuana for nonmedical adult use included allocation of \$120 million over the next ten years for research. Because cannabis is a federally controlled substance, UC researchers who are interested in marijuana-related research will need to follow special requirements. UCOP has a [Guidance Memo](#) with information for UC researchers and research administrators regarding the new law and the effect of marijuana research conducted at UC. Campus resources include Research and Grants offices, Offices of Research, and campus counsel.

Action: UCORP members were asked to take the Guidance Memo and information from the meeting to local CORs to make sure the committees know that guidance exists. Members should try to find out if there are any problems, issues, concerns on the campuses and report back to UCORP.

Export control policy - Development of an export control policy was one of the outcomes required by US State Department after there were some UC violations of federal export control. There is nothing new in the policy; it is meant to inform the UC community about existing law. The draft policy, which was reviewed by UCORP and the rest of the Academic Senate in the spring, provided basic guidance with advice for whom to contact on a campus. No new action was required by the campuses, each of which has an export control contact person. The responses from the systemwide review included suggestions to provide context and to develop some type of awareness/education/training. The Research Policy Analysis and Coordination unit at UCOP will host a "living FAQ" for information and pointers to campus sites. Faculty wanted a mechanism for appeal, and the next iteration will suggest that campuses can implement that.

Examples of “exports” under the policy include traveling overseas with a laptop that holds certain kinds of data, shipping a medical sample, and even conveying information to non-US citizens. Fundamental research is excluded, which is often what UC relies upon. UC does not accept research restrictions, which means that UC does not accept certain restricted funding. The draft policy will be revised and sent to Academic Council.

A related policy on “Openness in Research” is currently on hold.

State funding model - The university will remain at a 25 percent cost recovery rate for another year before starting to annually increase the rate by 5 percent per year over the next four years.

MRUs – There is a new webpage for MRUs that includes information for directors. Last year, UCORP helped to develop a schedule for five-year reviews of all MRUs. This Institute for Transportation Studies will be reviewed this year. The materials will be sent to UCORP in time for the December meeting, with a goal of completing the review by the end of the academic year.

Comprising a committee of UC faculty members, the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) was on the MRU review schedule for this year, but when the Executive Secretary retired last year the committee took the opportunity to begin a reassessment of its structure and whether to continue as a designated MRU. The CRCC provides competitive research awards to UC faculty and researchers. Its funding comes from endowments and from taxpayers via the California Cancer Research Fund.

Laboratory Fee Research Program – The Laboratory Fee Research Program (LFRP) is responsible for disbursing the net fee received from UC’s management of the DOE labs. The grants are used for promoting collaboration, undergraduate research opportunities, and promoting science and research at the labs. More recently, the awards have focused on targeted research opportunities in areas that align with the priorities of the lab. Last year there were four proposals that received a total of \$13 million. LFRP also launched an in-residence graduate student fellowship that provided funding for two fellows at Los Alamos and two at Lawrence Livermore last year. At the end of September a symposium was held in Oakland to highlight the accomplishments of the award recipients and to help spread the word about the opportunities.

7. Revised Presidential Policy on Information Security

UC Chief Information Officer Tom Andriola joined the meeting to update the committee on the Revised Presidential Policy on Information Security (IS-3). The revision is part of larger effort to improve cybersecurity at UC. Rather than being prescriptive, the new policy uses a standards-based approach based on risk analysis, which inevitably results in some vagueness and uncertainty. Based on the systemwide review and comments from the Academic Senate, the CIO’s office has produced additional accompanying documents to help faculty understand the policy and any implications for their work.

The new policy does not dictate to campuses. It is intended to set direction and provide an outline while building consciousness about risk. Campuses can decide how to proceed on a campus, school, or department level, including defining the “unit head” (as used in the policy). This might mean more of a burden, but also provides for autonomy and rational thinking. The

systemwide group for cybersecurity oversight is the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC), which is comprised of the primary responsible person from each UC location.

The primary risks surrounding the research enterprise include data integrity and ransomware. In discussion, members expressed concern about increasing layers of security and wondered if there were plans for a clearinghouse of information about best practices. UCOP's [Systemwide Information Security](#) website provides some of that information.

Action: UCORP members should discuss the latest draft of the Electronic Information Security Policy with their local CORs. Background is: the Policy, Glossary, FAQ, Guide for Faculty, and Academic Senate Brief (note that all five documents are drafts).

8. Systemwide Review Items

After discussion, the committee decided that it would not submit comments on the Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (area "d") Requirement.

In order to provide comments on the Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program, two committee members, Irina Conboy (UCB) and Nasrin Rahimieh (UCR), will review the report to provide a brief explanation to the rest of the committee and recommend whether UCORP should respond to the systemwide review, and if so, what to say.

Meeting Participants

Members: Jeffrey Richman (Chair, UCSB), Andrew Baird (Vice Chair, UCSD), Irina Conboy (Berkeley), Dietmar Kueltz (Davis), Nasrin Rahimieh (Irvine), Leif Havton (UCLA), David Noelle (Merced), K.K. Ramakrishnan,(Riverside, via video), Brian Eliceiri (UCSD), Janet Myers (UCSF), Harry Nelson (UCSB), James Doucet-Battle (UCSC alternate), Shane White (Academic Council Chair), Robert May (Academic Council Vice Chair), Kian Maalizadeh (Undergraduate Student Representative – UCSB, via video)

Consultants and Guests: Tom Andriola, UC Chief Information Officer; Kim Budil, Vice President for the National Laboratories; 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 and Coordination; Ellen Auriti, Senior Counsel, Office of General Counsel

Academic Senate staff: Joanne Miller, UCORP analyst, Mona Hseih, Executive Assistant

Meeting adjourned: 4:00pm

Minutes prepared by: Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

Attest: Jeffrey Richman, UCORP Chair