

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, April 10, 2017

Members attending:	Isaac Martin (Chair, UCSD), Jeffrey Richman (Vice Chair, UCSB, via phone), Kimmen Sjolander (UCB), Janet Foley (UCD), Raju Metharate (UCI), Richard Desjardins (UCLA), Richard Arnott (UCR), Andrew Baird (UCSD), Janet Myers (UCSF), Jianwen Su (UCSB), Steve Whittaker (UCSC), Jim Chalfant (Academic Council Chair, UCD), Shane White (Academic Council Vice Chair, UCLA)
Consultants, Guests, and Staff	Arthur Ellis (Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies), Mary Croughan, (Executive Dir., Research Grants Program Office), Kathleen Erwin (Director, UC Research Initiatives), Wendy Streit (Exec. Dir., Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Jeff Hall (Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)

Meeting Minutes

1. Chair's report, announcements

- Agenda review
- Status of UC-Labs White Paper Proposal

Chair Isaac Martin reviewed the agenda and provided updates on the Academic Council, which has been discussing a potential policy on non-resident enrollment. The Regents are expected to approve a policy as specified by the State that caps non-resident freshman enrollment. Details are still being worked out by the administration with input from the Academic Senate, Board of Regents, and California legislators.

In March, the Academic Council met with Regent John A. Pérez, the chair of the Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee and a former California Assemblymember and Assembly Speaker. One of the interesting things he said was that he thought it was critical for UC to emphasize its research mission when talking to State government about funding. As a former legislator, he thought that the legislature needed a broader understanding of UC's full portfolio. UC continues its attempts to raise awareness of UC's research enterprise with Sacramento, but the support of an influential Regent may be helpful in communication efforts. Committee members felt that UC should show the role of incremental research in producing "big news" results. The university should also emphasize the relationship between research and graduate education. UC data show that graduate student enrollment has been relatively flat since 2005.

Regarding MRU reviews, Chair Martin acknowledged that the ORGS proposal to use analytics in place of external review letters was yet to be resolved. Committee members proposed alerting Vice President Art Ellis to the committee's interest in letters, and that more discussion could take place at a later meeting. Committee members seemed to like the two-stage reviewer model used at UCSB where the MRU suggests people to suggest reviewers.

The meeting minutes from March 13, 2017, were approved.

2. Campus Reports

UC Irvine: At the beginning of the year, UCI's main concern was about too many ORUs that seemed to be getting renewed past their sunset dates and preventing new ORUs from receiving funding. The COR sent a report to the Office of Research recommending that ORUs be required to sunset after 15 years. The proposal is that existing ORUs would have the option to set up an alternative arrangement after sunset, and that new ORUs known as "Irvine Research Units" would have a non-renewable term of three years. The campus is currently considering how to implement the recommendations.

UC Riverside: The Chancellor and Provost (who resigned in December) have made many changes, including bringing in new deans and greatly expanding the university population. Laboratory space, teaching space, and housing are huge concerns for the campus. COR recently expanded the charge of the committee.

UC Berkeley: Berkeley's COR has been talking about animal care issues. The "Berkeley Excellence Accounts for Research" (BEAR) grant pilot that distributes awards of \$4,000 per faculty per year is not guaranteed to continue. When the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Research appropriated the funding for the BEAR grants, COR kept \$50,000 for the provision of emeriti grants. Due to the large number of applications this year the individual grant amounts ended up being very small. UCORP members were interested in knowing whether any Berkeley faculty are unhappy about the BEAR grants and would prefer a return to the larger grant competitions.

UC San Diego: UCSD's COR is very interested in UC Berkeley's pilot program and what the other campuses are doing. A couple of the San Diego ORUs – the Data Center and Cancer Center – are very stable. There are numerous centers, institutes, etc. at UCSD (and elsewhere) with multi-campus involvement and there's a feeling that it would be useful to have definitions for the various names. Some feel that the ORU/MRU label brings prestige.

UCLA: UCLA's Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research is providing transdisciplinary seed grants with funding up to \$40,000. One grant opportunity is set aside for "big data." UCLA's Vice Provost of Interdisciplinary & Cross Campus Affairs Timothy Brewer is working on cross-campus initiatives, including ORUs. At UCLA, the names for units have specific meanings and requirements for FTEs and research ability. One unit has been in existence for 60 years. Some are running educational programs. Committees are convened to review the ORUs, and COR can recommend reviewers, view documents, and provide comment. However, most of the reviews move faster than the COR meetings occur.

UCSF: Like the rest of UCSF, COR is concerned about insufficient and inappropriate workspaces. A new Warriors basketball stadium is going to be built in Mission Bay, which adds to the concern about the area's expansion. Apparently 30% of indirect cost reimbursements goes to debt on new buildings. The Senate is trying to get more involved in building planning. For research grants, UCSF's RAP review process determines the allocation of funds, which can be up to \$1 million/year. COR serves as a council for the process. Faculty grants can be as large as \$75,000. The centralizing of administrative functions a few years ago has had negative results on the process.

UCSB: COR's main function is allocation of research grants. The cap was raised from \$10,000 to \$20,000, which attracted a lot of proposals. UCSB also has travel money to allocate to anyone who applies.

UCSC: COR feels that a 15% cut in seed funding is short-sighted because these awards frequently bring in larger amounts of external funding. UCSC is providing “strategic funding” for collaborative grants with double the money, sort of like a competition. The maximum amount is \$16,000 and the quality of proposals received was very high. COR is advocating for an ORU-like seed-funding model instead of big ORU establishments, as well as for embedded research support instead of centralized. The UCSC grant submission process uses the NSF model, and due to questions about previous funding is biased toward a return applicant.

UC Davis: COR successfully requested the restoration of small grant budget funding when it was cut, in part by demonstrating the leverage of that funding. Applications now include seed funding information. The applications can be difficult for those not accustomed to writing STEM grants, but the committee made a conscious decision to fund some non-STEM proposals. Last year the committee suspended the very small grants program, which had always been funded previously. UC Davis convenes a joint Senate-administration committee to conduct ORU reviews.

UCORP members discussed whether there could be a systemwide way of keeping track of the impacts of changes in policy and funding from federal government. UCSD has organized a series of “federal research budget town hall meetings” with the Associate Vice Chancellor for scientific affairs and representatives from Washington.

Members continued to be interested in the range of research funding offered by campuses.

Action: Committee analyst will circulate compiled information that was collected at the beginning of the year.

3. Systemwide Review Items

- *Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls (Comments due May 17, 2017)*

Committee members felt that the proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls could benefit from a FAQ and scenarios to help explain what situations the policy is meant to cover. There is a fundamental research exclusion, but the committee wanted a clearer explanation of which items and technology would be *included*. For included items or technology, it would be helpful to include a scenario about what procedures to follow.

There was also some concern about the decentralization of compliance authority to the campuses creating divergent requirements at different campuses. Export control officers should be expected to coordinate their positions to reduce situations in which colleagues from UC campuses are following different rules.

In short, the policy raised a couple of concerns but no red flags. More specifics on procedures would be welcome. Committee members suggested that campus export control officers create a FAQ with scenarios, that there be cross-campus coordination about compliance requirements, and that an appeals mechanism might be useful. Although the committee is against mandatory training, training should be available for those who would find it useful.

- *Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336, Round 2 (Comments due May 17, 2017)*

The committee voiced no concerns with the revised bylaw.

- ***Proposed Revisions to APM - 285, 210-3, 133 and 740 (Comments due June 21, 2017)***

UCORP members discussed potential issues around the proposed revisions, but were also interested in knowing the rationale behind the changes. There was some concern expressed about eliminating a series (the “senior” LSOE), and about PI eligibility (which is a campus issue). It was noted that adjunct professors and other positions that are outside of ladder-rank faculty have increased in certain departments in recent years. The changes include establishing that the chancellor can implement a quota on faculty hired in the series.

UCORP did not reach a conclusion about the proposed revisions and will discuss them again in May, possibly with input from a representative from Academic Personnel.

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

- ***MRU review consultation***

Vice President Art Ellis gave a brief update on the status of the request for MRU reviews. The annual reports will be submitted by May 22.

The ITS and the Cancer Research Coordinating Committee will submit their five-year review documents by September to be reviewed by UCORP in the 2017-18 academic year.

UCORP alerted VP Ellis that it doesn’t see SciVal as a substitute for review letters. Nevertheless, committee members would like to learn more about the metrics SciVal can provide and will schedule time for going over its capabilities with VP Ellis at the next meeting.

- ***Laboratory Fees Research Program RFP release and workshops***

In conjunction with the Lab Fees Research Program RFP, the Vice Chancellors for Research are organizing three workshops for May in the three research areas identified in the RFP. The workshops are intended to bring people together to discuss ideas and develop connections. Faculty leaders on the campuses have been asked to nominate attendees. Vice President Ellis’ office has contributed some funding in part to help broaden participation. More information at: <http://ucop.edu/research-initiatives/programs/lab-fees/workshops.html>

- ***Updates on policies and rules affecting research at UC***

Director of Research Policy Analysis and Coordination Jeff Hall provided an update on pending issues, including:

- A new NIH policy on the use of a single Institutional Review Board (IRB) for multi-site research. The single IRB of record now needs to be identified upon application (rather than at acceptance). This will mean more work for contracts and grants offices, but in some instances, it is expected to streamline the review process and reduce duplication and systematic inefficiencies. With implementation date of for Sept. 25, RPAC has put together a systemwide work group to develop implementation guidance and procedures for campuses.

UC developed an MOU to facilitate voluntary single IRB review under which one UC campus IRB could serve as a reviewing IRB for the others on a multi-site study. UC also developed an on-line tool called reliance registry to administer it. While campuses can now opt-out of this

reliance arrangement for multi-site studies, under the new NIH rule that will not be an option for NIH-funded studies.

- Revisions to the “Common Rule” regarding human subject research include a new allowance for faculty to self-certify, subject to modified IRB review and approval, in certain specified types of research, that their study is “minimum risk” (e.g., social science research). The change will take place after January, 2018.
- \$2 million in funding generated by California’s Proposition 64 (marijuana legalization) will be distributed to UCSD’s Center for Medicinal Cannabis Research. Prop. 64 also provides an additional \$10 million annually to be used for research on topics specified in the Proposition and this funding will be administered by a Bureau for Marijuana Control. There is potential overlap of some health research priorities identified in Prop 64 with those identified for funding under Prop 56, the tobacco tax. UC is meeting with state agencies to discuss coordination and priorities. In addition to health research related to marijuana, Prop. 64 will also fund research on marijuana-related crime, and environmental impacts on wildlife and the environment, among others.
- Follow-up bills to Prop. 64 that are being considered in this legislative session include AB64 and AB1002. AB 64 would advance \$3 million to the Department of the California Highway Patrol for investigation of safety issues. AB1002 renames UCSD’s Center for Medical Cannabis Research program the “Center for Cannabis Research,” and expands its state authorized scope of research, among other changes.

Hall noted that possessing marijuana is still illegal under federal law and guidance has been issued to campuses on how to handle various research situations.

- Guidance is being issued for state conflict of interest disclosure. A regulatory policy shift allows expedited review (threshold at NSF levels), which means faster responses from conflict of interest officers.

Discussion with Director Hall included questions about the mechanisms for campus centers and individual faculty members for getting state authorization and funding for research. Although committee members noted that scientific societies encourage members to go out and lobby legislators, direct faculty communication with legislators about funding for their research interests has been highly discouraged. It poses a problem for systemwide budget negotiations and priority-setting. The University encourages communication with state officials through the proper channels at UCOP or coordinated with their campus government relations offices. UCORP and UCOP hold converging interests in investigating the ways that research funding comes to UC without scrutiny. The committee would like to work with the administration to help figure that out.

Every fall there’s a systemwide call from UC’s State Government Relations Office for sponsored legislation ideas. It goes to Vice Chancellors for Research and other high-level offices. SGR looks at overall priorities for the University to balance limited resources for the year. UCORP members expressed interest in seeing the call, which could also help get the word out to faculty about who to contact with their ideas.

The committee posed its question about uncertainty around federal funding and tracking of policies and grants. VP Ellis noted that his department is working with UC’s Office of Federal Government

Relations in Washington, DC, on advocacy initiatives such as the March for Science. Senior Vice President for Government Relations Nelson Peacock made a presentation to the Regents in May, and noted that some cuts could be backfilled with state funds. Part of UC's effort is in educating the policymakers. Higher education associations are also very engaged at the federal level. The ORGS guests noted that cuts are always threatened by Republican presidents and they are generally not fully realized. Every year the UC President works with Federal Government Relations to establish a list of funding priorities, including research funding, and this can be shared with the group.

Actions: Committee analyst will share with committee members:

1. Annual call for sponsored research
2. President Napolitano's research priorities

Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair

The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair provided an overview of current activities of the Senate, including:

- A state audit of UCOP will come out by the end of April.
- The California legislature has requested that UC develop a policy to limit non-resident freshman enrollment. The Senate would like UC to show that the additional money raised by non-resident tuition is used to benefit California resident students.
- Regent John A. Pérez was a welcome guest at the last Academic Council meeting, providing insight into the legislature as well as the Board of Regents.
- Changes to the LSOE series in the Academic Personnel Manual are undergoing systemwide review. A cap on the number of faculty in the series was introduced during preliminary stakeholder review of the revisions. Right now the number of faculty in these series is small but may be growing on some campuses.
- Regents approved a revised PDST Policy and two PDST programs at the last Regents' meeting.

VP Art Ellis' "Collective Excellence" document was sent to UCAP for review. UCAP responded with a letter that included suggestions for the document's usefulness for campus promotion processes. UCAP's letter will be shared with UCORP.

A document describing complaints from graduate students about mentors made its way from the Council of Graduate Deans to the Academic Senate. Immediate options for addressing concerns include mentorship guidelines (under review by CCGA), a joint meeting with the Graduate Council, and the student-proposed idea of two-way evaluations (a longer-term option).

Executive session

Committee members should prepare for a discussion of the "LSOE" APM changes at the May meeting by carefully reading the redlined version linked from the agenda and available from the Academic Senate website: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/under-review/>

Meeting adjourned: 3:35pm

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCORP Committee Analyst

Attest: Isaac Martin, UCORP Chair