

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Monday, April 12, 2021

Meeting Minutes

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

Animal Research Support: UCORP Chair Richard Desjardins reported that UCORP's revised letter of support for animal researchers was sent to the Academic Council. The letter, along with an accompanying letter from the University Committee on Academic Freedom, was endorsed and sent to President Drake. Chair Desjardins is optimistic that the President will offer his support; funding for animal research is a major source of income for UC and the research benefits the public in many ways.

Multicampus /Systemwide Research Review Working Group Proposal: UCORP members briefly discussed the proposal from the Office of Research and Innovation. Committee members are interested in increasing Academic Senate involvement in determining research priorities at the beginning of any process. The current oversight and review processes occur during or after an organization or mechanism is in place. While a program like the MRPI (multicampus research programs and initiatives) may be functioning well, it still needs to be reviewed as a funding mechanism.

UCORP members want to be sure that the most effort is put where UCORP and the Academic Senate actually have influence. Some asked about the goal of Senate oversight, and questioned whether UCORP should be doing ad-hoc reviews and making recommendations for entities that cannot be sunsetted or don't receive UC funding. Other members pointed out that there are many cross-campus collaborations that do not have faculty or multicampus oversight. UCORP members understand that there is not a lot of fungible/discretionary money available. Some UCORP members are interested in seeing MRPI funding used more strategically.

UCORP sees the primary roles for the systemwide office to be providing a coordinating service and working to identify themes and foster development for future funding.

Action: Meeting minutes from March 8, 2021, were approved.

II. 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**Deborah Motton, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)**Janna Tom, Interim Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)**Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)**Emily Rader, Research Portfolio Manager***• Updates from the Vice President for Research & Innovation**

Searches for Executive Directors of the UC Natural Reserve System and UC Observatories are underway; both are using executive search firms. The search for an Executive Director of the newly-formed Office of Knowledge Transfer Innovation Partnerships is also underway, without the use of a search firm. Knowledge transfer and innovation at UC are topics of current interest to both UC President Michael Drake and the Board of Regents. There is an upcoming meeting of the President's Innovation Council, which is composed of members who are external to the system and meets twice yearly. At that meeting, Regent Leib will present the findings of the Regents' Innovation Working Group. The systemwide KTAC working Group recommendations will also be presented.

VP Maldonado said that she could use input from UCORP on strategies for moving forward on climate crisis activities. The scope is enormous, and many groups talking about issues such as how to structure a program, how to respond to Biden administration interest, and how to maximize the extensive resources of the campuses and labs. Maldonado reported that the VCRs met with leaders of three state agencies last Friday for the first time. Regarding the Covid pandemic, Maldonado is interested in finding out what was done wrong and what right in terms of UC's response. She said that one of the biggest issues was managing the vast amounts of data.

- ***Multicampus /Systemwide Research Review Working Group Proposal***

The proposal presented to UCORP is intended to address oversight and review of non-MRUs that are multicampus entities. As UCORP learned in the last meeting, in 2011 a task force was convened to develop recommendations for a framework and principles for multicampus entities. This process went through one round, called the Program Review Group (PRG), and reviewed 21 programs. The current proposal suggests that the previous principles be revisited and used as springboard for next steps. An ad-hoc group of four campus VCRs, plus the chair and vice chair of UCORP would be tasked with putting procedures in place for the next academic year. The group would also re-launch the Council on Research, a joint Academic Senate/Administrative committee chaired by the VCRI, and composed of the chair of the Academic Council, the chair of the Academic Senate University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), the chair of UCORP, and the VCR from each campus. The VCRs are still reviewing the proposal and giving input.

In discussion about the proposal, UCORP described the committee's interest in having front-end input for the Academic Senate on the nature and purpose of multicampus award funding, in addition to an ongoing process for determining how discretionary funds are used. The process should be sustainable, and evaluated every few years. Committee members mentioned the concept of a "grand challenge" format, the importance of strategic coordinating from UCOP, and the ability prioritize and to change as needed.

Research Director Erwin noted that some MRPI proposals are not necessarily strategic, but are nevertheless valuable to the State. One example is Native American Issues in California. There have recently been proposals for research collaborations dealing with Native American research materials, which is a huge area, but not necessarily strategic in terms of funding or leverage.

A related topic is UC's resources, and whether it can leverage its facilities for instrumentation, clean rooms, telescopes, and supercomputing facilities. It is unclear whether there has been a systemwide discussion about support for these valuable resources. That is also why VCRs need to be involved: they know the facilities and resources, as well as about potential funding opportunities.

- ***Updates from the Office of Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)***

A revised Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation is currently out for systemwide review. It incorporates new elements of State law that went into effect in January, 2021. There are still some challenges, including definitions and some provisions that conflict with federal law. These will be resolved in time. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has taken on more of a leadership role in the development and implementation of State law and policies, and there is more deference to tribal desires. There is some misunderstanding around rights of non-federally recognized tribes versus federally recognized tribes, which used to be significantly different, but the gap is closing. Another challenge is resources. The legal requirements are expensive to implement, and the campuses, especially Berkeley, will feel it. State law requires all collections be reviewed – even if previously reviewed – and in close collaboration with tribes.

A proposed Presidential Policy on Classification of Gifts and Sponsored Awards is out for systemwide review. This attempts to clarify the distinction between gifts and other types of funding, which has implications for compliance and reporting. In recent years it has become more difficult to distinguish the type of funding, and the new policy offers guidance and tools to make those distinctions.

III. Academic Senate Leadership Update

Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Chair

Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair

- ***Overview of current activities of the Senate***

Topics at the March Regents meeting focused primarily on financial matters and capital projects. There was a presentation by Provost Brown and Pamela Brown (from UCOP's Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning) about the societal impacts and public value of a UC degree to California.

A working group is continuing to evaluate the feasibility of finding a substitute for the SAT, which the Regents voted to eliminate last year.

The Academic Senate is working on a follow-up to last year's survey on remote teaching and learning due to the Covid pandemic. Academic Council Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz are working on high-level, systemwide guidance for fall re-opening. Many of the issues are health-related concerns, such as vaccine availability and vaccine mandates. Some issues are still unknown, and even if all goes well there will still need to be accommodations. The idea is for UCOP to develop systemwide guidance to help with decisions to be made by individuals or departments; to make sure that faculty are in a position of confrontation with students who are not following the rules. Chair Gauvain is also interested in de-coupling research planning from instructional planning. Research and other spaces have been operating for months and don't need to be limited by instructional calendars.

There was a special meeting of the Regents to discuss the latest data breach that impacted UC along with other organizations and institutions nationwide. Everyone in the UC community is encouraged to use the Experian protection option.

The websites Chegg and Course Hero continue to be a thorn in the side of instructors and administrators. There have been some conversation between UC Legal and Chegg, but it's unclear what the outcome will be.

Discussions of UC Health's affiliation with Catholic hospitals continues to generate controversy. The Academic Council has discussed the matter and will vote on a Senate position soon.

- ***Multicampus /Systemwide Research Review Working Group Proposal***

UCORP asked Chair Gauvain and Vice Chair Horwitz about their impressions of the Systemwide Research Review Working Group Proposal from the Office of Research and Innovation. A revival of a systemwide Council on Research would involve participation by the Academic Council Chair. UCORP members described the interest in having a deliberative, shared-governance process regarding the use of discretionary research funds. While supporting the opportunity to learn more about research funding and where it goes, the Senate Chair and Vice Chair voiced caution about effort versus impact. It is not sustainable to conduct a PRG-like process every few years, but focusing on principles and goals, rather than on reviewing proposals, may be sustainable. The Senate leaders asked to be kept informed on the progress.

IV. Campus Reports Round Robin

UCB: Despite fears of reduced research funding, the amount has increased. UC Berkeley expects research facilities to be open by June 15, following the lead of California as a whole. Several committees are working on various aspects of the opening. There is talk of a vaccine mandate, and whether that is possible, perhaps specifically for international students. While most classes are expected to be held in person in the fall, there may be size limitations.

UCD: UC Davis is still in "phase 3" of the campus re-opening, with roughly 66% capacity permitted, although there is some flexibility within that. Libraries and core facilities are open, local schools are back in session, and the campus is planning for fall. The campus COR has been discussing issues around cybersecurity

and options for regular data backups. The peer-review process for research grants is happening now. The budget is unchanged from last year, and travel grants are being repurposed.

UCI: UC Irvine is reopening for research, and there is no longer a cap on the number of people, as long as safety precautions are followed. So far, graduate students have not been required to go in.

UCLA: UCLA is also in “phase 3” of the campus opening, with undergraduates now allowed to return at a specific density based on square feet. An NIH-funded institute at UCLA (CTSI) is looking into the process for IRB review, which has been a lingering issue. The research committee reviewed the “Final Report of the Moreno Recommendations Implementation Committee” to assess UCLA’s activities, progress, and challenges regarding implementation of the Moreno Committee recommendations from 2013. The report shows that some progress has been made, but there are still improvements to be made around racial bias and discrimination. The COR also reviewed the proposed policy on gifts vs. sponsored awards. At UCLA, some felt the need to clarify that award recipients need to notify their school. Apparently some funding goes under the radar. There is some research grant funding left for faculty, and the COR is discussing how funding might be distributed in the next few months.

UCSD: UC San Diego’s COR discussed the proposed policy on gifts vs. sponsored awards and the revised NAGPRA policy and found both to be fine. The COR is now reviewing two ORUs. As of April 1, the campus is allowed to operate at 50% capacity. Most labs are reasonably functional, and many people have been vaccinated. Weekly Covid-19 testing is offered, even for those who have been vaccinated.

UCSF: UC San Francisco is also allowed to have 50% capacity in labs, 25% for some clinical research situations. Infection numbers are expected to decrease in next couple weeks. Vaccines have been offered to all at UCSF. The campus is also offering a second round of grants (\$25,000 and \$5,000) for faculty impacted by Covid-19.

UCSB: UC Santa Barbara has reached “Stage 4” of the campus re-opening. There is an overall cap of 25%, but research is moving to up to 50%, with some restrictions on density. There have been no on-campus Covid-19 cases, and the numbers look good. The library is open by reservation. The UCSB Divisional Senate Chair convened a Town Hall specifically for junior faculty that was well-received. A total of \$400,000 in (mostly) unrestricted funds is available to help those impacted by Covid. More undergraduates are being vaccinated and many will return soon to research settings. The campus COR does not know the budget for research grants yet, but it’s expected to be similar to last year, with the exception of travel. Last year’s travel grants were allowed to be used for online event registrations.

Two questions came up during the campus round robin:

- In talking about purchasing, UCORP members were interested in why the university doesn’t seem to use its massive purchasing power to extend better deals on needed equipment and services across the ten campuses.
- At the suggestion of the undergraduate student representative, members were interested in supporting the inclusion of students on the re-constituted Council on Research.

V. Reports from Liaisons to Other Committees & Task Forces

- *Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) Working Group (Michele Guindani)*

The RIMS Working Group received many responses to its survey, and will now review and follow up. A subcommittee is meeting every week and is now determining criteria. The specific features that comprise a RIMS are still being worked out. There are both commercial and in-house systems, and they are primarily used

for comparative research analysis, faculty reviews, and departmental review. The subgroup categorized the systems identified in the survey (83 total) into high (21), medium/low (16), and no follow-up needed (due to the system falling outside the scope of RIMS). The next step will be a request for additional information sent to the owners/managers of the systems.

- ***ANR Task Force (Karen Bales)***

The ANR Task Force is still looking into how to involvement the UC national labs and ideas for stimulating funding. VP Maldonado has been invited to the next ANR Task Force meeting to discuss how to better integrate ANR faculty at non-AES campuses. There should probably be more alignment between the ANR Task force and the ANR Governing Council. The future of the task force is still under discussion.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

UCORP will not comment on the current items under systemwide review.

- Revisions to SVSH Frameworks for Faculty and Staff — Stakeholder Input
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Classification of Gifts and Sponsored Awards - Comments due May 19, 2021
- Presidential Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation (v. 3)

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), Hai Che (Riverside), Tannishtha Reya (San Diego), Lea Grinberg (San Francisco), Forrest Brewer (Santa Barbara), 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), Deborah Motton (Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Janna Tom (Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Lourdes DeMattos (Associate Director, Policy Analysis and Coordination), Emily Rader (Research Portfolio Manager), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)