

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, March 8, 2021

Meeting Minutes**I. Agenda Review, Chair's Announcements and Report from Academic Council, Approval of Meeting Minutes**

UCORP Chair Richard Desjardin noted that the committee received reports from the "Portfolio Review Group" (PRG) process which was convened in 2012, based on a Task Force assessment report. These documents may provide a basis for current thinking about cross-campus research more broadly, including ANR and the national labs.

ACTION: Meeting minutes from February 8, 2021, were approved.

II. Reports from Liaisons to Other Committees & Task Forces**- *Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) Working Group (Michele Guindani)***

A preliminary survey was sent in January to Vice Chancellors of Research in order to identify the people and systems in use. The results are now in, and it appears that the use of commercial RIMS software is not as widespread as anticipated. Some campus responses were more in-depth than other, and a few need additional clarification. The RIMS group is still working on understanding what all of the potential systems are, and how they are used or may be used in future.

UCORP members asked about external funders and the data they might be collecting. Use of UC data by private companies is generally governed by contract. This is good to consider, but outside the scope of the Working Group.

- *ANR Task Force (Karen Bales)*

Some sub-groups of the ANR-Task Force have met recently, and are trying to figure out how to fund and implement a seed-grant program that would promote integration between faculty from AES (Agricultural Experiment Station) sites and non-AES sites.

There is speculation that the ANR Task Force could revise its charge and become a subcommittee of UCORP. While the Task Force was formed to focus on budget, recent discussions have focused more on research collaboration.

UCORP members noted that the Natural Reserve System (NRS) is a separate unit of the university that is governed by UCOP.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Innovation

Theresa Maldonado, Vice President for Research and Innovation

Bart Aoki, Executive Director, Research Grants Programs Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives

Janna Tom, Interim Co-Executive Director, RPAC

Lourdes DeMattos, Interim Co-Executive Director, RPAC

Emily Rader, Research Portfolio Manager

• *Updates from the Vice President for Research & Innovation*

- Three director searches are currently underway:
 - UC Observatories – the UCO director position is not just focused on the Lick Observatory and campuses (9 of the 10 UCs) that use it, but also on the Keck Observatory in Hawaii and planning for the Thirty-Meter Telescope.
 - Natural Reserve System
 - Knowledge Transfer, Innovation & Entrepreneurship (a new, combined unit)

- Regarding the multicampus research entities, the Office of Research and Innovation has been working on a proposal for a Working Group that would develop principles and governance proposals for consideration, and to inform an eventual revision of the Compendium. The Compendium deals primarily with program reviews and ORUs, with the section on MRUs mirroring the ORU process at a system-wide level.

One idea for the principles work group is to focus on the multicampus entities that are not MRUs, but receive support and/or outside funding, and are not governed by Compendium processes. UCORP is interested in focusing on areas where UC and the Academic Senate can make a difference.

UCORP members noted that the documents related to the 2012-14 “Program Review Group” (PRG) already provide a framework and principles for moving forward. Although it requires resources and effort, the multicampus research entities should have ongoing review, as well as prioritization, by the university, including the faculty. There needs to be a sustainable mechanism for doing this that includes transparency, communication, and coordination. Communication is an ongoing challenge, and some suggested that UC use more of its limited discretionary funds on PR. UC is a large, federated system, and one value of OP at the center is in potentially playing a coordinating role. UCOP also has a constrained budget, with strings attached.

The PRG process lasted for three years. It did not include the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

After the pandemic, cancer research will be a big priority for the federal government, and it would advantage UC to connect its cancer research efforts. Much of the restricted funding that comes into UC is cancer-related. There is already collaborative efforts in this area. UC Health is working to strengthen the cancer consortium.

➔ The working group proposal will be shared with UCORP.

VP Maldonado said that regular meetings of the Council of Vice Chancellors of Research are helping to share information, strengthen relationships, and break down silos. Both ANR Vice President Glenda Humiston and UC National Labs VP Craig Leasure have presented at COVC-R.

- ***Additional updates from UC Research Initiatives***
 - The RFP for the Lab Fees Research Program competition will be released in April. As in past year, topical meetings will be held in each of the three areas to facilitate collaborations. UCORP is asked to help spread the word.

In response to a question from UCORP members, Director Erwin noted that the RFP is circulated to ANR, and that it is mentioned in the RFP as an example of a UC systemwide research entity that may be included in the proposal. (Others are: UC Natural Reserve System, any of the five UC medical centers, and the Hastings School of Law.) ANR is often included in LFRP proposals, and has had significant participation.

- A revision to the way that the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC) distributes its funding is in process.
- ***Updates from the Office of Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)***

Three research policies are out for systemwide review: Research Data and Tangible Research Materials, Gifts and Other Sponsored Awards Classification (revision), and a revised NAGPRA policy that has been updated to align with changes in law.

IV. Presidential Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials

Agnes Balla, Research Policy Manager, UCOP Office of Research & Innovation

Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla joined the meeting to discuss the draft policy on Research Data and Tangible Research Materials, which is currently undergoing formal systemwide review. This policy clarifies

what is now known as “Reg. 4” – which claims UC ownership of all “notebooks” and other original research records. The policy also calls upon campus leadership and researchers to work in partnership to manage, retain, preserve, protect, access, and share data. UCORP provided input to the development of this policy last year.

Director Balla said that although it is still weeks before the deadline for comments, she has already received a large amount of feedback on the policy. Most of the comments can be categorized into four areas:

1. Questions around UC ownership
2. Unintended impact on core research facilities that perform services on a recharge basis
3. Overreach of 3rd party data and materials (e.g., relationships with tribal nations)
4. Policy implementation

It is still unclear what will happen once all comments are received. There is a great deal of related work right now at UC, including recently reported recommendations from the President’s Cyberrisk Working Group. As an outcome of cyberattacks and foreseen future threats, this group recommends that UC invest in a scalable data backup solution to protect its assets.

Although the policy is not meant to change how researchers currently manage their information, many see it that way. UCORP members expressed concerns about potential new costs, both for the administration and for faculty, increasing the vulnerability of animal researchers, and privacy issues for cultural researchers. A previous version of the policy had section about retention, but that has been removed and researchers are expected to follow their own research requirements and customary practices of their field. Some UCORP members suggested that the scope of the policy could be narrowed to encompass only those areas it is truly meant to address.

Director Balla said that part of the intention of crafting this policy is to draw attention to Reg. 4, while being more explicit about what it means. She said that it could be further refined, with more clarification provided. Balla will also continue to work with IT Policy Director Robert Smith to align roles of this policy with the revised IT-Recovery policy.

V. Consultation with the UC Office of the National Laboratories

Craig Leasure Vice President for National Labs

June Yu, Associate Vice President for National Labs

• General overview/update on the labs

UC Vice President for National Labs Craig Leasure introduced himself and provided an overview of the three national laboratories for which UC provides oversight.

- Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (“Berkeley Lab”): In its 90th year. Managed by UC. Budget is ~ \$1B
- Los Alamos National Lab (LANL): Managed by Triad, LLC (with UC as a partner). Budget is ~ \$4B.
- Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL): Managed by LLNS, LLC (with UC as a partner). Budget is ~ \$2.8B.

UC’s role in the management of the labs is to protect and promote the research environment, research integrity, and commitment to excellence. UC’s Office of the National Labs is small office of 10 people that is funded by fees earned for the management contract at LANL and LLNL, and from reimbursement from the Department of Energy for management of the Berkeley Lab. The Lab Fees Research Program, which is managed by UCOP’s Office of Research & Innovation, is also funded by these fees.

The work of the UCNL includes facilitating and supporting initiatives and consortia, including a new Southern California hub, Hertz Hall at LLNL, and the ATOM consortium. UCNL provides staff support to the governing boards of the labs, including committees on mission, operations, and science, technology, and engineering. While a part of UC, the UCNL is responsible to the Department of Energy for managing the labs.

• Preliminary discussion on ideas for joint-funding possibilities

UCORP members feel that UC’s research assets may be able to be combined in more ways, and wanted to find out if synergies could be found between the national labs and the UC Division of Agriculture and

Natural Resources. Both entities have tremendous research assets, but not much is known by a majority of the faculty. Topics common to both UCNL and ANR include climate, energy, water, and potentially bio-security. VP Leasure noted that the upcoming Lab Fee Research workshops will give faculty a chance to learn more, meet others who are working in those areas, and start collaborating on a joint proposal.

The SoCal hub (at UC Irvine) and Hertz Hall (at LLNL) are meant to be used for collaborations with campuses. Right now there is a focus on working with UC Davis in the area of high density computing.

There are currently a few joint programs, such as the UC/LANL Entrepreneurial Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, and campus-based partnerships. The LANL Engineering Institute is an educational and research partnership between LANL and the UCSD. UCNL recently received approval from the Board of Regents for a cohort of postdoctoral fellowships in technology policy areas to be located in Washington DC.

Along with the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI) and VP Theresa Maldonado, VP Leasure is working to facilitate joint appointments between the campuses and the labs. The idea is to make it easier for lab employees to work at a campus, and for UC employees to visit the labs. Currently, this is done on a case-by-case basis, but the administration is working with the labs to craft a template agreement that can be modified to fit the individual situation.

UCORP's undergraduate student member asked about connecting UC students with internships at the National Labs. There is one portal that gives students access to internship applications for all DOE labs. While UC could do more to communicate information about opportunities to the campuses and to students, there is not a way to favor UC students. The internships are funded by DOE. But VP Leasure noted all labs have a high interest in UC students. He provided some statistics about the numbers of (combined) undergraduates, graduate students, and postdocs who participate in lab summer programs.

[Summer 2019 students: 1800 at LANL; 1200 at LLNL; 4-500 at LBL.]

Much of the work of UCNL is done with the goal of enhancing collaborations. There are many challenges in dealing with such large organizations, but getting the word out is a constant effort. UCORP's contribution to this is appreciated.

VI. Academic Senate Leadership Update

Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Chair

Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair

Academic Council Chair Mary Gauvain and Vice Chair Robert Horwitz joined the meeting to provide an overview of current activities of the Senate.

- Planning for fall campus reopening is happening now. The committee that had been the Vaccine Distribution Committee is now the Reopening Committee, although it still focusses on health issues. Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz want to represent faculty issues and concerns and would appreciate input from all faculty. There is a great deal of variability in campus plans, as well as in communication with campus Academic Senates. Campus scenarios have consequences for instruction and for research space, and consequences for faculty may not be fully considered.
- The ILTI program review was discussed at the last Academic Council. The review yielded a wide range of responses, but in short, if ILTI remains in place there needs to be consideration for how it can help faculty and move forward pedagogical efforts.
- The Academic Council is concerned about Presidential and Chancellorial authority as it relates to curtailment plans. The Academic Council now has a memo from a subcommittee versed in the topic, which will inform its discussions.
- The second of two President's symposia on campus safety and policing will be held at the end of March.

UCORP members asked if there would be a Covid-19 vaccine mandate. This year UC announced that all UC employees working onsite would need a flu vaccine, but the requirement was not enforced. Because the Covid-19 vaccines are currently only approved for emergency use, there cannot be a mandate. Serious thought will be given to mandating a vaccine for students; it is less likely that there will be one for faculty and staff.

UCORP informed the Council Chair and Vice Chair about the PRG (Program Review Group) materials that the committee received, and described the similar work that is of interest now for developing guidelines and metrics for multicampus entities. The previous attempt was too resource-intensive, which meant there was no follow-up. The idea now is to make it manageable.

Chair Gauvain noted that most of ANR funding is devoted to state programs and to salaries. It does not have a lot of discretionary funds. There was agreement on the notion of better positioning UC entities to bring in external funding.

VII. Animal Research Support Letter

Karen Bales, UCORP Vice Chair

Vice Chair Karen Bales reported that UCAF, which had been considering co-signing UCORP's letter of support for animal researchers, will instead submit a letter of support to accompany UCORP's letter.

UCORP members discussed the updated draft of the letter, which was modified based on suggestions from UCAF Chair Brian Soucek. Bales also reported that there had been another meeting of the UC animal research working group that focused on development of a communication strategy. The idea for UCORP's letter is to elevate the issue to the level of the UC Provost and President. UCORP members offered a suggestion for adding content to the letter about the FDA being unable to approve drugs without testing on animals.

ACTION: The letter will be circulated one more time to UCORP members before being sent to the Academic Council to endorse and send to the Provost.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

- Presidential Policy on UC Research Data and Tangible Research Materials - Comments due March 23, 2021

UCORP heard from Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla earlier in the meeting that a lot of comments had already been submitted on this policy. UCORP members felt that diversity of research is an issue, and that different fields, and different practices, will need different accommodations. UCORP members noted that although many faculty are stunned to see that UC owns their data, this is in fact already the case. Members brought up concerns heard on their campuses about anonymity of social science notebooks. A question arose about whether the policy could be more limited in scope, perhaps to those data that UC really **wants** to own. Another question was about who pays for any costs associated with implementing the policy. Many researchers are already dismayed that funding must be spent on data management.

UCORP will try to find examples of social science research that would be unduly affected.

- Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-43 Purchases of Goods and Services; Supply Chain Management - Comments due March 24, 2021

According to a UCORP member, campus purchasing officers do not support this policy. That constituency will submit its own comments, but UCORP should respond if there is a research burden. This policy could conceivably impact all research labs, and needs to be reviewed by those in the research enterprise.

IX. UC Data Management Update from UC's California Digital Library

John Chodacki, Director, California Curation Services (UC3), California Digital Library

John Chodacki, the Director of the California Curation Services (UC3) at the California Digital Library joined the meeting to discuss the CDL's partnership with the Dryad data repository.

UC's California Digital Library (CDL) provides transformative digital library services to UC locations. The UC Curation Center ("UC3"), a unit of the CDL, focuses on policies and best practices around data. Currently, there is a lack of clarity about how UC faculty are meant to manage their data. Libraries, as experts on stewardship, know a great deal about information management and are positioned to advise faculty at UC. When considering where to publish data, authors are often presented with data repositories recommended by publishers. In general, disciplinary repositories are the first and best choice, with

institutional or general repositories as further options. With limitations, Dryad provides a home for published research data with no disciplinary home.

UC's evolution as a data repository provider started with Dash/DataShare at UCSF. This local creation grew to include all campuses, but remained a challenge to get researchers to use. After several years, UC looked for a broader solution and discovered Dryad, a non-profit organization founded by researchers. UC launched its partnership with Dryad in 2019, with the goal of offering a no cost service that would be embedded in research or publishing workflows and connecting researchers to global communities. UC has a permanent position on Dryad's Board of Governors. It follows the Principles for Open Scholarly Infrastructure, which are best practices for non-profits working in scholarly communication – including whether they can be acquired by commercial entity.

Currently, over 1,200 academic journals incorporate Dryad in their workflows, and many institutions have joined as partners or members. Dryad charges a data publishing charge (DPC), but it is waived for researchers from UC and other member institutions. Dryad also waives fees for researchers coming from developing countries. Dryad has a limited file size and cannot solve all data storage problems, but its relevance and use is increasing as data publishing increases.

UCORP members asked about documentation for the data, which goes back to the question of what data publishing is meant to be. Data publishing is comparable to journal publishing, but is still emerging. CDL wants to influence the field to improve the quality of repositories. Dryad provides a paid curation staff, which is why there is charge for the service. If more information is needed, curators send back the data with questions.

Director Chodacki noted again that Dryad is not the solution for all data. Zenodo is another repository that is free and available for more general data and software.

X. Campus Reports, New Business, Next steps

UCORP members look forward to learning more about the work group proposed by the Office of Research and Innovation to develop a mechanism for reviewing UC's research priorities.

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCORP Analyst
Attest: Richard Desjardins, UCORP Chair

Meeting participants:

Committee Members: Richard Desjardins (Chair), Karen Bales (Vice Chair) Javad Lavaei (Berkeley), Cynthia Schumann (Davis), Michele Guindani (Irvine), Marco Iacoboni (Los Angeles), Kara McCloskey (Merced), Tannishtha Reya (San Diego), Forrest Brewer (Santa Barbara), Paul Roth (Santa Cruz), Katie Uhl (Graduate Student, UC Davis), Daniel Halpern-DeVries (Undergraduate Student, UC Santa Cruz), Mary Gauvain (Academic Council Chair), Robert Horwitz (Academic Council Vice Chair)

Consultants, Guests, and Staff: Theresa Maldonado (Vice President for Research and Innovation), Bart Aoki (Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office), Kathleen Erwin (Director, UC Research Initiatives), Janna Tom (Interim Co-Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Lourdes DeMattos (Interim Co-Executive Director, Policy Analysis and Coordination), Emily Rader (Research Portfolio Manager), Agnes Balla (Research Policy Manager), Craig Leasure (Vice President for National Labs), June Yu (Associate Vice President for National Labs), John Chodacki (Director of Curation Services at the California Digital Library), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)