UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, December 9, 2019

Meeting Minutes

I. Chair's Announcements
Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair

- In November, UCORP sent its recommendations for faculty actions around climate change to the Academic Council. UCORP has been learning about UC faculty activities that are related to climate change for the past three years, and since the Academic Senate has been quiet on the issue the letter was intended to offer suggestions for how the Academic Senate could make a statement and be more involved. There are many activities going on around the UC system, and not all in science. The Academic Council is not interested in directing faculty activities, and UCAP does not want to associate promotion and tenure with specific types of work, but UCORP's recommendations were sent by Academic Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani to President Napolitano. Chair Baird said that this will be a continuing issue that also involves students and the administration. He anticipated more recommendations to come as the situation evolves.

- UCORP members discussed a draft letter from UCORP with recommendations for UC's MRU and MRPI programs. In general, MRUs are not systematically funded by UC, although there are exceptions. The current MRUs were established years ago and the remaining organizations have chosen to retain the title and go through the review processes to keep the prestige it offers and whatever leverage that can provide. Several years ago, funding for MRUs was moved to the MRPI competitive research awards for multicampus projects. UCORP's letter says that MRUs should have a minimal amount of support from UC so that they can at least be able to pull together an annual meeting. Committee members considered whether UCORP should recommend that there be infrastructural support for *forming* an MRU – to foster collaboration across campuses. Since the funding is temporary, the MRPI is not a substitute for the establishment of new MRUs. Questions came up about MRUs being time-delineated and what that means, whether the MRU designation offers status or prestige, whether there is interest in forming new MRUs, the possibility of bridge funding from MRPI to MRU status, and how much funding would be enough. Overall, there needs to be balance between the investment and sustainability.

- The results of the new UCORP survey about the responsibilities of each campus committee will be discussed at the January meeting.

- The meeting minutes from November 12, 2019, were approved.

II. Climate Change work at UCSD
Adam Aron, Professor, UCSD

UCSD Professor Adam Aron joined the meeting to talk about the latest activities on the UC San Diego campus. A cognitive neuroscientist, Aron has taught a class on "The Psychology of Climate Crisis" and recently published an article, "The Climate Crisis Needs Attention from Scientists" in Trends in Cognitive Sciences (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.08.001) that describes how to become more activist.

Aron described the current rise in temperature and CO_2 levels, and how fires in California in the past few years are making Californians more personally aware of climate change. He said that the situation is dire, but there is still time to make changes and limit the damage if big changes are made. As an academic and research institution, UC has the ability to make changes. Right now, he feels there are symbolic efforts from the

administration and more serious efforts need to be made in: de-carbonization, research, and teaching. These need to be taken on by UC like a Manhattan Project, with associated accountability.

- **De-carbonization**: De-carbonization of campuses will take investment. UC's plans for carbon neutrality include offsets, which do not do enough. UC should replace co-generation power plants with renewable electricity production.
- **Research**: Research priorities should be reorganized in every discipline. There are solutions all around.
- **Teaching**: Climate change can be covered in two lectures. There are so many areas in addition to the sciences that could incorporate climate education, including social justice, political economy, social movements, and more.

In discussion, the committee talked about offsets for emissions, new buildings and innovations in materials for more environmental building practices, the elimination of fossil fuel subsidies, and what other technological advances may be able to help. Examples included the Venter Institute, a "green building" (https://www.zgf.com/project/jcvi/) and My Green Lab, for improving the sustainability of scientific research (https://www.mygreenlab.org/). In short, grass roots efforts will have political effects and collective actions will make a difference. The biggest challenges are political will and funding to effect change.

Members discussed how to increase accountability at UC for climate change efforts, such as instituting something like a "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI) statement for sustainability or requiring a carbon emissions report for department/school reviews. Many campuses require DEI statements for academic job applicants and in the promotion and tenure process.

III. Academic Senate Leadership Update
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair
Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani thanked UCORP members for their service on the systemwide committee and provided an update of the current activities of the Academic Council.

Presidential search. The Academic Senate has an Academic Advisory Committee chaired by Academic Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani that includes 13 faculty members, one from each campus, with two at large. Open meetings for community input will occur on the campuses in the next few months. More information can be found on the Regents' Presidential Search website: https://presidentialsearch.universityofcalifornia.edu/.

Pension contributions: Discussion of changes to employee pension contributions by the Board of Regents has been postponed. Employer contributions will increase by half percent per year.

Cohort tuition: The introduction of "cohort tuition" will be an item for the January Board of Regents' meeting. Campuses are gearing up for a start in fall 2020.

Working Group on Comprehensive Access: The Working Group continues to discuss recommendations for how UC values should be upheld when its academic health systems enter into agreements with other health systems. Meanwhile, UC Medical Centers have received a letter from ACLU regarding past and current agreements between UC and religiously-affiliated hospitals. There is also a student petition being circulated. Chair Bhavnani expressed appreciation for the petition that gives a voice to those not represented on the Working Group.

Update on the latest Board of Regents' meeting: Provost Michael Brown gave a presentation to the Regents' Academic Affairs Committee on the need to expand financial aid to include basic needs. He also talked about California's need for high-quality K-12 teachers. There is concern that new, alternative pathways for becoming credentialed have led to unprepared teachers. There is also an ongoing need for expanded outreach to high schools in California. Apparently 80% of UC applicants come from 20% of California high schools. The latest UCUES survey showed overall satisfaction of students is declining.

At the Regents' Public Engagement Committee, UC Berkeley Chancellor Carol Christ brought two UC Berkeley students who spoke about their experiences as a foster child and as a formerly incarcerated student. The following day, the Regents decided to request an additional $20 million from the State to support students who had been incarcerated, from foster care system, or were undocumented. They also requested an additional $23 million for school outreach. The additional $43 million is almost 10 percent of the total increase request for the university. The university is asking the State to restore permanent funding to cover enrollment increases at $35 million per year for 5 years.

The Regents' Budget is sent to Governor in the fall. The preliminary Governor's budget comes out in January, then discussions occur and the Governor's final budget, called the "May Revise," comes out in May. Governor Newsom has been generous compared to previous administrations, but his office is using line-items to provide additional funding. Under its constitutional autonomy, UC is supposed to manage its own budget allocations.

A general obligation bond will be on the ballot in the spring. If it passes, it will provide $2 billion for capital expenditures for UC, $2 billion for CSU, and $8-9 billion for K-14.

Faculty salaries: Faculty are asking for 3 percent plus 1.5 percent on-scale in an ongoing attempt to bridge the gap with comparator institutions.

Standardized testing: Issues around the SAT and standardized testing have made the news lately. The Academic Senate's Task Force continues to examine the issue and is expected to produce a report in 2020. The process after the Task Force releases its recommendations is yet to be determined.

Elsevier negotiations: Elsevier has made an agreement with Carnegie Mellon that includes open access. Although details are not available, it provides some hope that UC negotiations will continue. UCORP members had questions about UC's proposal and the notion of payment based on ability to pay. Faculty patience with the lack of Elsevier journal article availability may be wearing thin. UCORP can convey these feelings in a letter to Council.

UCORP members brought up the MRU/MRPI and climate change work of the committee with the Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair. Discussion focused on how the UC system might become more solution-focused.

IV. Cancer Research Coordinating Committee – Follow-up
Last month the committee talked to the current Chair of the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee, Karen Oegema, about the role of that group and the grants that it provides. The CRCC gets its funding from endowments and a voluntary tax contribution fund, and it has traditionally used the funds to provide start-up and seed grants of $75,000 each. 30 awards are distributed each year, for a total of $2 million. To receive a CRCC grant, applicants must have less than $350,000 of other funding. UCSD representative Tannishtha Reya is interested in seeing the CRCC expand to provide at least some larger grants that would facilitate and stimulate cross-campus collaboration, and that would not be limited by external funding. Dr. Reya said that most cancer research labs have more than $350,000.

In conjunction with CRCC Chair Oegema, Dr. Reya brought a draft proposal for UCORP to consider that would set aside one-third of the CRCC funding for cross-campus collaborations. These would be 2-year grants with the maximum threshold removed. Chair Oegema thought that incorporating matching funds, including students, and showing positive benefits of collaboration would be useful in convincing the CRCC members to make a change. As a committee, the current CRCC members need to agree on the change. UCORP will continue to look into this idea and develop next steps.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Innovation
Bart Aoki, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives
Janna Tom, Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
Agnes Balla, Research Policy Manager

1. Draft Data Policy

Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla provided an overview of the draft UC Data Policy. Right now, the sole "policy" around data created by UC faculty and researchers is in the Academic Personnel Manual, in a policy that was last updated in 1958 that states that all "notebooks and other original records of research are the property of the University." UC is committed to the dissemination of knowledge, but has to balance that with its intellectual property needs. Enforcement of the policy would be a campus responsibility.

UCORP members had questions about the cost and responsibility for maintaining data and other "tangible research results." They expressed concerns about public records requests and situations where common practice is different from what is dictated by the policy. For example, in some fields tangible research materials and/or documentation is destroyed.

When asked for suggestions for how the policy could address their concerns, UCORP members suggested the inclusion guidelines to call out high-priority areas or give examples. Another suggestion was to remove "tangible research results" and just focus on data.

In short, the main concerns about the policy were: cost sharing, retention periods, and the definition of data.

2. Draft Revisions to Protection of Human Subjects in Research Policy

The motivation behind the attempt to revise the current policy on Protection of Human Subjects was to bring the 40-year-old, outdated policy up-to-date and in line with current practices, in which campuses have adopted flexible but commensurate processes for non-federally funded programs. In the process of updating the policy, the Research Policy managers decided to also review the purpose of the policy in upholding the ethical foundation of UC's work. The new draft includes revised definitions and an acknowledgement of the multiple offices and shared responsibilities for compliance with human subjects research requirements.

Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla convenes a monthly call of campus IRB administrators. The administrators regularly share best practices and have discussed and approved the proposed changes to the policy. There is also a national call of IRB administrators organized by USC where commensurate protections are shared and discussed.

3. Draft Openness in Research Policy Issues

Currently, UC does not accept research funding that has citizenship or publication restrictions. With pressure to do restricted research – for example for purposes of national security or domestic workforce development – there is some interest within the university to capture centrally the key elements of keeping research open, with no publication restrictions and no citizenship restrictions. Worries are that selective, local exceptions are made, and that UC researchers are turning down funding. A draft will be distributed for wide review, with the understanding that there will be competing pressures for allowing some exceptions, the need for consistency, and abiding by UC's principles. The Research Policy administrators expect no unanimity and have no expectations for a specific result.

RPAC Associate Director Lourdes DeMattos said that on rare occasions the university has been able to convince funders to remove restrictions.

4. MRU reviews for this year (UCO and BIC)

Director Kathleen Erwin reminded committee members that UCORP's February meeting will include interviews with the Directors from both MRUs under review. The UC Observatories discussion will be 10:30 – 12:30, and the BIC will be 1-3.

The review committees should prepare questions by the middle January to send to the Directors. Questions can focus on areas where the committee would like more information or specific questions about the MRU's Five-Year Review report. The Directors can then provide answers in writing or can be discussed at meeting.

The Annual Reports from other MRUs are generally "accepted" if there are no outstanding issues. UCORP members were interesting in asking ITS, which was reviewed two years ago, if, for the next annual report, the Directors could review the recommendations from the Five-Year Review and address those. Alternatively, the directors could be asked to report to UCORP at an upcoming meeting, or other option.

Director Erwin said that the Economic History MRU has decided to disband as an MRU. Administratively, the Vice President for Research would give the final approval with UCORP's input. Erwin will follow up with the Economic History Director and will report to the Provost in the absence of Research VP.

INPAC (the Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology), which was reviewed last year, has not submitted an annual report. The Director has retired and moved to Hawaii, and it seems that there is no one to take over.

5. Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives update ([website](#))
The release of the next RFP for the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) competition will be in March. Letters of intent (LOIs) will be due in late April, with a systemwide review at the end of May. The LOIs will be used to help narrow the field. Full proposals will be due in August for a fall review. The staff hopes for a 20% success rate. The total funding this year is $14 million.

6. Lab Fees Research Program announcement of awards
The Lab Fees Research Program (LFRP) In-Residence Graduate Fellowship program selected six students to receive the awards. The fellowships are for three years, and awardees have a mentor from the lab as well as a dissertation advisor from their home campus. Three students will be at LLNL and three at LANL. For the Collaborative Research and Training Award competition, six proposals were awarded in three targeted topic areas. For each panel there was a 20-22% success rate. More information: https://www.ucop.edu/research-initiatives/programs/lab-fees/2020-lfrp-awards.html.

The next competition will be in 2 years.

VI. UCOLASC and UC Libraries co-sponsored survey on the impact of discontinued Elsevier/ScienceDirect access
Dennis Ventry, UCOLASC Chair
Kristin Antelman, UCSB University Librarian

UCOLASC Chair Dennis Ventry and UCSB University Librarian Kristin Antelman joined the meeting via video to review a potential survey to gather faculty information on the impact of the discontinued Elsevier access. They wanted feedback on the survey and the timeline for distribution, and were seeking the committee's support and endorsement, as well as making themselves available to answer questions.

Although committee members were interested in learning more about the status of Elsevier contract negotiations, the purpose of the agenda item was to review the survey. Ventry said that he and other negotiating team members could come back and talk about negotiations another time. He noted that Elsevier has a new CEO who is a graduate of UC Berkeley and who may be willing to re-start discussions.

The Council of University Librarians (CoUL), together with faculty and staff at the California Digital Library and Office of Scholarly Communication and the Academic Senate's Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) have been working for years on promoting changes to the scholarly communication system (see: https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/). The Academic Senate indicated its support in its endorsement of UCOLASC's [Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication](#) in May, 2019. The draft survey is meant to gather data on how alternative access is working and how it can be improved. Before the Elsevier contract ended, the University Librarians were planning for alternative access to materials. Libraries ramped up resources in personnel, ILL, etc. in the attempt to provide a turnaround time of 24 hours for 80% of material, two days for 95%. The librarians were surprised to see that ILL requests increased by a very small percentage. The questions in the survey try to get at the reasons for this,

and what alternate methods are being used. UCOLASC was also interested in finding out how other research partnerships were being affected, including peer reviewing, editorial work, and other relationships.

UCORP members discussed the purpose of the survey, and whether the results would be valid. Some faculty are feeling burdened by the lack of access and concerned that they are obtaining articles in unethical ways. As time goes by, support for UC's stance may be waning.

The most up-to-date information about UC and Elsevier can be found on the Office of Scholarly Communication website: https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-at-uc/publisher-negotiations/uc-and-elsevier/. Also see: https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-at-uc/publisher-negotiations/alternative-access-to-articles/

VII. Round Robin Campus Update

UCSB – The UCSB local committee is working on its policy for faculty research grants and continuing to look into outcomes of changes to composite benefit rates.

UCLA – The campus is celebrating its centennial. The VC-Research is introducing a public impact research award – it is the first in the nation. The local committee will review the applications and select four winners in different areas. The School of Engineering has a Center for Advanced Technology that is separate from the campus and can take innovations developed in Engineering to use in defense applications. There are issues around UC funding restrictions, export control, etc.

Riverside – UC Riverside has four kinds of Senate grants, and while the categories are clear, it is not always clear how the money can be used. The local committee is reviewing and will propose changes to how grants can be used for summer salary and course buyouts.

Merced – The UC Merced local committee is finalizing its ORU policy revision and trying to align internal research support with academic planning process.

UCSF – The local committee is considering expanding its faculty research lectureships – there are currently three. An interim IRB Director and lack of staffing has meant that there is a slowdown in research reviews. The campus is looking into allowing more flexibility for working remotely and bringing back retired staff who have appropriate training (and who could work remotely). The committee is looking for improvements in bureaucracy for getting clinical trials started.

Irvine (CORCL) – Grant funds increased by 47%, thanks to lobbying done previously, to $1,044,000 (brought back up to previous levels.) The funds are distributed to schools based on Senate faculty FTE. The faculty at the school level decide how it should be distributed.

Davis – Davis also saw a (smaller) increase in its grant funding. The committee is talking about upsetting incidents on campus including theft, vandalism, and assault, which seems to be happening during the day as well as after hours..

The January UCORP meeting will be a videoconference.

Meeting adjourned: 3:50
Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst
Attest: Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair