

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, February 13, 2017

Meeting Minutes**1. Welcome, announcements and agenda review**

Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair

Committee members brought up topics of interest to be discussed at a later time, including:

- Increase in the Indirect Cost Rate for State grants.
- Handling of export control.
- Security of research data at borders.
- A new state bill (AB1887) that prohibits state-funded travel to states that have enacted discriminatory laws (the four states are: Kansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee)

The meeting minutes from December were approved.

2. Potential White Paper on UC's Relationship with the National Labs

Jeff Richman, UCORP Vice Chair

Committee members agreed that a white paper was a good idea and discussed the content. While the primary audience of the paper would be the systemwide Academic Senate committees that interact with the administration on matters of laboratory management, including ACSCOLI and UCORP, it could also be used to inform the faculty about UC's relationship with the national labs in advance of a campus visit from UC's Vice President for the National Laboratories Kim Budil. If the paper is to be relatively brief – which all agreed that it should be – then a set of appendixes or other background material may be needed in order to provide enough background. Faculty may want to know the portion of work devoted to maintaining the nuclear stockpile, weapons development, and classified research.

UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman's proposal for the paper, which was reviewed by committee members, included a list of questions for VP Budil to address in the paper. Committee members continued to express concern that the paper might be too one-sided and risks being seen as an argument in support of a UC bid for the Los Alamos National Labs contract. Members felt it was important that the risks and costs of UC's relationship with the national laboratories get due consideration. Conversation included how to break down the risks into areas such as financial, reputational, and safety.

Members noted that there is a potential conflict between the work of the labs and the principles of the university. Some lab research is classified, which means that some groups are excluded and the results of some lab research may have publication restrictions. VP Budil joined an Academic Council meeting in the fall in order to introduce the subject of the LANL re-bid and offer division chairs the opportunity to invite her to campuses to speak to faculty. UCORP members wondered about their role in a potential visit, and considered drafting questions that faculty might want to ask.

UCORP (or the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues) could post information on the Resources section of its website.

Committee members expressed concerns about UC management of the laboratories, given the potential for political interference that conflicts with the integrity of the science done at the labs. Faculty want assurance that UC would protect scientific integrity. The ability to select the lab director is critical in defining the work and environment of the lab, and UC has had full control over this. The funding for the work of the labs is determined by Congress, not the DOE.

Action: UCORP Vice Chair Jeff Richman will incorporate the committee's suggestions into the white paper proposal and circulate to committee members before sending it to VP Budil.

Action: Chair Martin will initiate further discussion about framing options for the white paper via email. Committee members should respond with their comments.

3. A. Systemwide Review Items

1. [Presidential Policy Business and Financial Bulletin G-28 Travel Regulations](#) [PDF] (Comments due February 15, 2017)

After brief discussion, UCORP members agreed that the committee had no comments on the travel regulations.

2. [Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D](#) [PDF] (Comments due March 15, 2017)

UCORP had no feedback on the revisions.

B. Management (Limited) Review

Proposed revisions to Presidential BUS-50 Controlled Substances Policy for Management Consultation (Due March 22)

UCORP members expressed concern with the lack of clarity about background check requirements. Although there seems to be an exception for faculty, it's not entirely clear. In the fall, some UC Davis faculty received an email message informing them that they were not in compliance with federal regulations and that the required background check information was being submitted to the DEA for them by the university.

Committee members requested clarification about whether faculty were meant to be included in "staff" and "all personnel." They also wanted it to be clear that under no circumstances should information be released about faculty, students, or staff without approval; notice is not sufficient. Committee members were also concerned about the potential that undocumented students working in labs could become objects of scrutiny. Members suggested that an executive summary of main points and changes would be helpful for the systemwide review.

Action: Chair Martin will draft a UCORP response for the committee to review before sending to the Academic Council Chair.

C. Inquiry about Review

Proposed Policy Revisions to Sustainable Building Operations Section of the Sustainable Practices Policy

Committee members agreed that the policy revisions need to be reviewed by the Academic Senate.

Action: Committee Analyst Joanne Miller will alert the appropriate administrators and the Academic Council Chair.

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

Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Chris Spitzer, Program Officer

Nick Anthis, Program Officer

- ***Lab Fees Research Program RFP***

Staff from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies updated committee members on the 2018 Laboratory Fees Research Program grant opportunities. The targeted fields are different from last year, which opens the competition to new applicants. As before, the research areas were chosen to align with the mission of the laboratories and where UC can bring its own strengths. Workshops to help broker connections will be held in the spring. The RFPs will be released on March 23rd, with letters of intent due on June 1st and full proposals due at the end of July.

ORGS staff noted that graduate student applicants were not evenly distributed by campus, and wondered what could be done to increase the breadth of the applicant pool. Committee members noted that it might be difficult for faculty mentors to send away graduate students for two years after having spent years working with them. The evaluation panels from the last competitions had a similar impression. UCORP members suggested that some sort of incentive for faculty mentors might help.

UCORP members expressed appreciation for the program and the RFPs. Any specific feedback for the Research Grants Program Office should be sent to UCORP chair Isaac Martin (iwmartin@ucsd.edu) and Committee Analyst Joanne Miller (joanne.miller@ucop.edu) by February 21.

- ***MRU Review consultation***

ORGS staff invited legacy MRU directors to participate in a conference call in January to ask whether their units wanted to continue as official MRUs. Of the fifteen “Category 2” MRUs that do not receive ongoing systemwide funding, four have requested continuation of MRU status, eight have selected to disestablish or convert to a different entity, and three are still pending. There are four “Category 1” MRUs that receive ongoing central funding from UCOP.

ORGS staff suggested that the official reviews for the four Category 2 MRUs that would like to continue as MRUs be delegated to the host campus, per the option outlined in the [Compendium](#), but committee members disagreed. Because UC is not annually funding these organizations and the Vice President has not maintained oversight, there is no clear locus of responsibility. Some committee members noted that entities that call themselves MRUs and behave like MRUs should have to be reviewed like MRUs. There was some question about whether the extensive MRPI

funding award application process takes the place of the MRU review for multi-campus research units that are in Category 2 that receive these awards.

Committee members suggested that there be documented principles that define the conditions under which systemwide entities must have a formal review. The [Compendium](#) attempts to do that (see pages 30-37). UCORP, as directed by the Academic Council, may want to undertake its own reviews of the MRUs in Category 2, or officially request that the UCOP administration conduct the reviews. Members suggested easing the administrative burden by asking the applicable MRUs to produce a “self-study” or lightweight report that describes the multi-campus nature of the unit instead of a comprehensive financial review. The intensity of the scrutiny should be calibrated to the degree of support provided centrally by UC. Presumably the multi-campus units are submitting annual reports to some authority or funding agency, so reporting to UCORP should not be too onerous. However, UCORP should come up with its own questions for the review.

Chair Martin thanked the ORGS staff for moving ahead on the call with MRU directors and continuing to direct the MRU process.

Next steps:

1. Category 1 MRUs need to get on a review cycle. If ORGS staff do not bring a proposal, then UCORP will draft one.
2. Chair Martin will initiate a conversation with ORGS staff about the notion of asking Category 2 MRUs to submit self-studies on a case-by-case basis going forward.

• ***Potential UC-NIH initiative***

The NIH has approached UC about its interest in developing a program for diversifying the pool of postdocs and faculty in biomedical sciences.

• ***Follow up on Collective Excellence document***

The Collective Excellence document has been reviewed by COC, COVC, UCAADE, UCAP, and the Chancellors. The next step is to send it out to the divisional CAPs. Although the document’s primary intent is to raise awareness within the university, if there is implementation as a result of the document it would lie with the CAPs and academic unit review committees.

UCORP supports and encourages collaborative research and believes CAPs should take into account the guidance offered by the document.

5. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

The Academic Senate leadership update was cut short due to other discussion, but Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant let the committee know that a UC policy on non-resident policy will be forthcoming. He also noted that there was concern within the Academic Senate about the increase in State indirect cost rates.

6. Other topics

The committee briefly discussed the new State of California restrictions on using state funds to travel to specified states. FAQs on how the university is interpreting the law are posted on campus

websites (see, for example: <http://www.accounting.uci.edu/travel/resources/ab1887.html>). There are several exceptions that would apply to faculty and researchers.

Information about the increase in indirect costs for State grants was provided to UCORP by Wendy Streitz in April, 2016. See the [meeting minutes](#), page 6.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00

Meeting minutes drafted by Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair