Meeting Minutes

1. Chair’s announcements, approval of minutes

Meeting minutes from March 9, 2020, were approved.

2. Academic Senate Leadership Update

*Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair*

*Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair*

- Board of Regents:
  - The March Regents’ meeting, which was held via videoconference, included a discussion of the history of standardized testing at UC. The discussion was meant to set the stage for a May meeting agenda item on the use of standardized tests at UC and the results of the Academic Senate’s Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF).
  - Cohort tuition was pulled from the March Regents’ agenda.
  - The Regents have asked the UC Chief Financial Officer for a “stress test” of UC finances. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the budget for California and for UC are of great concern, but specifics for next year will not be known until September.

- Admissions requirements for UC have been temporarily eased, including requirements for letter grades, standardized testing, and documentation.

- The General Obligation bond did not pass in the last State election, which means that UC will not be getting $2 billion for capital projects.

- The search for a new UC President is still in progress. If there is a delay, President Janet Napolitano has said that she will be flexible in her timing. The faculty advisory committee for the search has met with the Regents a couple of times and helped to cull the 600 names originally presented.

- The search for a new Chancellor for UC Merced is almost completed. President Napolitano is talking to the final candidates and will make a decision soon.

- Next week, a survey will be distributed to all instructors who are teaching courses online to ask about the transition to remote instruction. The results will be used in various ways, including to inform the work of the Academic Council’s Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force.

- The Extending Faculty Diversity Task Force is working with the administration and brainstorming ideas to improve retention of faculty from underrepresented groups.

UCORP members wanted to know about the impact of COVID-19 on the research enterprise and research funding, and how can faculty could help the situation. Theresa Maldonado, the new UC Vice President for Research and Innovation, has been hosting daily calls with the Vice Chancellors for Research. The meetings, which are now held twice per week, also include representatives from UC’s state and federal government relations offices. UC personnel have been writing to funders and advising on the fourth phase of congressional funding to turn the focus to higher education. Research faculty should be in touch with their campus VC-R and Divisional Chair. Campuses are sharing information but decisions are made locally. The issue now is when and how to ramp up and restart research. It will likely be a phased approach.
UCORP members also asked about furloughs. There has been no word about what cuts are to be made, but the Academic Senate will be involved in any decisions. Some campuses have implemented hiring freezes; it’s not clear whether hiring freezes are taking place systemwide.

In anticipation of upcoming budget cuts, some UCORP members suggested that the committee write a letter expressing the importance of research to the university. Chair Bhavnani said that the Academic Council will likely draft a letter that incorporates all faculty contributions and is asking Academic Senate committees to contribute to a document that combines two or three talking points from each committee about what each considers essential. She also noted that the Academic Senate as a rule does not propose cuts.

**Action:** UCORP will come up with two or three points or issues about research to contribute to a systemwide letter.

### 3. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Innovation

- **Introduction to New UC Vice President for Research & Innovation**
  
  Theresa Maldonado, Office of Research & Innovation Vice President

UC’s new Vice President for Research & Innovation Theresa Maldonado introduced herself and talked about the daily calls with the Vice Chancellors for Research. The calls initially focused on ramping down research and are now focusing on continuing operations in remote settings. They are starting to plan for ramping up and discussing costs and funding. A big issue right now is research personnel and adhering to UC human resources guidelines. The Systemwide Office of Academic Personnel has been working on a second set of FAQs that addresses academic personnel, and animal research facilities are among the primary concerns. The Office of Research and Innovation is coordinating with Federal and State Government Relations personnel and UCHealth on the emergency response situation, and with the Chief Investment Officer on identifying UC start-up companies and to involve in the response.

UCORP members asked about tangible resources for researchers, including laboratories with the necessary biosafety levels. Grants are available, but obtaining one may be difficult for anyone who is not already associated with an infectious disease lab. Some UCs have shared resources, but capability will need to expand.

UCORP members expressed concern for graduate students and how to pay them. Some mentioned that job banks have been started. UC is lobbying Congress. At the state level, UC is advocating for extensions for contracts and grants (without administrative burden). The guidance right now is to keep paying staff and track all expenses.

In future communication with the State legislature, VP Maldonado is preparing a campaign that tells compelling stories about UC’s research and impact. UCORP members suggested that the message not just focus on how great UC is, but also how much better it could be with more funding. The Academic Senate will be involved on an ongoing basis.

- **Research Funding for COVID-19**
  
  Bart Aoki, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
On April 6th, the UC Research Grants Program Office released emergency funding for up to $25,000 ($2 million total) to support urgent research and mitigate the effect of the pandemic. In 24 hours, one hundred applications were submitted, and there are now more than three hundred. The proposals are being reviewed as fast as possible. The funding comes from state monies for the RGPO programs for 2019-20. Block grants of $50,000 from the Laboratory Fees Research Program were also distributed to campuses through the VCRs. The campuses are partnering with national labs on Covid-19 research. New webpage: https://uckeepresearching.org/

The deadline for the MRPI RFP that went out in mid-March is extended for letters of intent (LOIs) until May 14. The Graduate Student Fellowship through the LFRP also went out last week. The submission deadline is September, but will be extended if necessary.

Vice President Maldonado welcomes input on moving forward, coordinating, and getting research started once that is possible. She invites UCORP to contribute to talking points to bring to UC Provost Michael Brown to help articulate the importance of research.

1. **Proposed Openness in Research Policy (Draft)**
   A proposed “Openness in Research Policy” has been revived after being put on hold a few years ago. The policy aggregates UC statements about accepting funding with citizenship and publication restrictions, and describes any exceptions (for example, national security). Some researchers are bumping up against these restrictions in their research and want the ability to accept restricted research funding. Although there were concerns that the Trump presidency would exacerbate the issue, it is in fact bi-partisan. There are many philosophical and practical issues to consider, and the policy draft will be disseminated for wide review and discussion. The result of implementation of such a policy would be to increase the circumstances under which UC could accept research funding with restrictions.

   Issues raised in discussion included interest in the practices of other research universities, how practices have changed over time, what the VC-Rs are thinking, and the number and type (and identities) of researchers and research projects that are missing out on the funding. There was also concern that the policy be thoroughly vetted with all constituencies. The anticipated timeline is for a systemwide review in the fall.

2. **Proposed Policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation (Revised Draft)**
   A new policy on Native American Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation Will be released for comprehensive review soon. A prior draft was circulated for review, but was withheld from issuance pending additional consultation with Native American tribes, who wanted further review. This has resulted in major changes to the policy that was circulated last year, including removal of legal language, the addition of repatriation flow charts, and more. As part of the 60-day systemwide
review, the Research Policy staff will attempt to target researchers with relevant research interests to ensure they understand changes and that their concerns are heard. RPAC staff have asked for UCORP’s help in identifying these researchers on the campuses.

There are revisions in the new policy that restrict the ability to do research on remains and certain items, including DNA extracts. UCORP members discussed potential issues, such as whether researchers will know whether their “items” are considered sacred under the policy. Going forward, the policy mandates that any use of Native American remains must be approved by the tribe. Some tribes allow research on their items, and even bring samples to researchers for testing.


The policy currently under review is a revision to a policy that dates back to the early 1980s. RPAC staff worked with IRB directors to bring the policy up to date and remove outdated language. In doing so, they also gave more consideration to protections for those who participate in research studies and to incorporating additional ethical aspects. In addition to updating references to federal regulations (the common rule), the policy clarifies that procedures for protections in non-federally funded research do not need to follow the same procedures for federal funded research. The substantive protections are the same, but the specific processes are allowed to differ. This a change in legal requirements, as UC is no longer legally obligated to apply federal processes to non-federally funded work. If more time is needed, the deadline for review of this policy can be extended.

4. **COVID-19, UCORP, and Research Policy – Campus News and Updates**

The overwhelming research-related issues on the campuses are preparations for ramp-up of research once restrictions are lifted, and the economic impacts of the pandemic. Campus representatives shared more information from their divisions:

**UC Berkeley:** Essential research is continuing, with access granted to limited personnel. PIs are concerned about time cards, the ability to check labs, and paying workers. Researchers are using laboratories that are available, for example starting work in BSL-2 labs. There are daily encouraging email messages, and the college of engineering has task force on use of PPE.

**UC Davis:** The VC-R consulted with COR Chair (Karen Bales, UCORP rep) and with the Divisional Chair before sending the research shut-down order. There have been weekly town hall meetings and calls to initiate Covid-19 research. There has been no discussion among faculty about ramp-up yet, but the research committee hasn’t met yet.

**UC Irvine:** COR Chair Lee Bardwell and the UCI Divisional Chair were (quickly) consulted on UCI’s research curtailment plan, which was distributed on March 17th by the VC-R. Some labs were granted extensions, and some allowed to continue, such as those related to Covid-19 or that involve animals. Undergraduate research is all online now, which mainly comprises reading papers and discussing. The university cannot force graduate students to come to work, even if it’s deemed essential. Other work of the local committee includes reviewing a proposal for a new school of pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences. The proposal mentions “complementary and alternative medicine,” which was not well received by COR members.

**UCLA:** On the medical side of the campus, the VC-R statement left decisions and further communication to the medical school dean, who described the plan for which categories of work
could continue and which could not. There are daily email messages about numbers of patients and other Covid-related work at UCLA. The medical school has convened task forces on Covid-19 research and potential clinical trials. The new department of computational medicine is very involved. The VC-R came to the recent COR meeting to discuss funding options for Covid-19. The VC-R is also involved in helping faculty in the humanities and others who are limited without access to libraries, those with concerns around graduate student degree progress, and the job market for graduates.

On the main campus, the VC-R has noted that UCLA is positioned to receive around $30 million in higher education federal funding. NSF and NIH are also receiving funding. The EVC/Provost gave a briefing to the local COR, and the CFO provided an overview of the budget through June and the likely impact for the next few years. The State of California’s budget will be even more impacted in the next two to three years. The campus is also planning for re-opening in a safe manner, with social distancing, etc. There is no specific timeline at UCLA yet.

**UC Merced:** There has been good communication between faculty and the administration. Waivers to come to campus and considerations for essential work were offered. Like other campuses, there are webinar meetings and updates. Information technology staff are working to provide resources for people whose computers are in labs. The local COR is still working on restructuring their faculty grants program, which is becoming even more important.

**UC Riverside:** UCR’s VC-R and Divisional Chair sent messages together at the beginning of the shutdown, which was done in phases starting on March 17. The most recent message was April 3, and there is still a lot of uncertainty, including how research was categorized as critical. The local COR met last Friday and reviewed one category of faculty grants. Other concerns are around library books and the ability of graduate and undergraduate students to access the resources they need from home.

**UC San Diego:** Faculty have been asked to keep track of all Covid-related work that is not funded. The idea is that there will be a fund to repay expenses. COR was not involved in the initial administration response, but will be more involved going forward. The VC-R’s message is that the campus is allowing research to go on as much as possible, and that whatever can continue with physical distancing and disinfecting will go on. There were submissions for essential personnel, and shifts of two at a time are allowed. Separately, there are efforts to work on Covid-19, including a campus-wide Covid-19 response team.

**UCSF:** The UCSF administration acted in accordance with San Francisco and other local requirements for shutting down. Exceptions to shutting down were made for human subjects’ treatment studies, and some others, in addition to limiting personnel. Work was classified as essential, non-essential, or a grey area that was left up to the PI. The UCSF administration did a good job with providing information as the situation changed rapidly. There are weekly research town halls with the research administration and Academic Senate that attract thousands of participants. Questions are put into a FAQ. UCSF is offering rapid-response research funding for $5K or $40K, and may redeploy idle research staff with technical/medical skills to serve the needs of UC Health. Some graduate students have set aside their own research and theses to work in Covid-19 testing labs. It would be good have this recognized and rewarded at some point.

**UC Santa Barbara:** The local committee met two weeks ago. Like the other campuses, most research has ramped down, but some essential research was allowed to continue.
**UC Santa Cruz:** There was some consultation from the VC-R’s office before the shutdown. In-person teaching ceased first, then the ramping down and stopping of nonessential research. Exceptions were granted by deans. Some work, like with marine mammals has to keep going. Instructors are allowed to go on campus. Discussions about ramping up will start next week.

**Graduate students:** There is concern about graduate students having access to sufficient technological equipment as they work remotely, and disparity in resources. Since it will take a while to ramp up these disparities will continue for a while. Some labs and research projects have large computing needs that are not feasible at home.

Another impact of the shutdown is on international students. International students have three years (9 quarters at UCSB) to finish their degrees with in-state tuition. If they have not finished in that time they must pay out-of-state tuition for any future quarters/semesters. Committee members did not know if the requirements were the same systemwide, but concern about losing time due to the pandemic could be alleviated if the timing was extended.

**Undergraduate Students:** Undergraduate students are concerned about research funding for undergraduates.

5. **Articulating the benefits of graduate students to the research enterprise (new item)**

In thinking about funding for graduate students, the Academic Senate would like to make sure that graduate student education is recognized in the coming hard times. Chair Baird asked committee members to brainstorm about graduate students and how their work benefits the research enterprise. Ideas included:

- Coming up with new ideas
- Research is – in part – where the teaching happens
- Creating continuity in the workforce and in research knowledge
- UCSF would cease to exist
- Contributions to scholarly articles and papers
- Legislators like talking to actual graduate students.
- Bring in external research funding.
- Making discoveries, doing the work in the labs
- Drawing talent from all around the world.
- Sharing research knowledge with even younger generations (undergrads)
- Broadening research connections.
- Sharing knowledge in the community, non-profit settings, as a public good.

Chair Baird will draft a letter to Academic Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani on the importance of graduate students and their role in the research enterprise.

6. **Priorities for Research (new item):**

With a new UC Vice President for Research and Innovation and in anticipation of a new UC President, Chair Baird asked UCORP members for a list of research priorities. The top ideas were:

- Climate change
- Infrastructure (including the post-pandemic reality of retraining, job creation, and loss of funding)
- Leveraging cross-UC research impact.
7. Climate Change Follow-up: Academic Senate Interim Climate Change Working Group
UCORP Vice Chair Richard Desjardins provided an update on the Academic Senate’s Interim Climate Change Working Group, which met for the first time at the end of March. Chaired by Academic Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani and consisting of incoming chairs from a few systemwide Academic Senate committees, the group is tasked with developing a charge for an Academic Senate Climate Change Task Force and identifying potential members. IUCORP members can help by suggesting potential members from their campuses. The group is moving quickly, and will meet again at the end of April. Desjardins noted that he encouraged the Working Group to use UCSD’s recent climate change report as a basis for moving forward.

8. Transfer of Administrative Burden to Researchers
Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair
The topic comes to UCORP from the UC Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), which has asked for UCORP’s research perspective. Chair Baird requested volunteers to review UCFW’s letter and provide suggestions related specifically to research. One preliminary suggestion was to include an assessment in departmental or administrator review regarding how well the administrative burden was eased.

Action: Irina Conboy, Stuart Gansky, Karen Bales, Michael Scheibner, and Tannishtha Reya will look at the UCFW letter and provide specific suggestions related to research.

9. Issues Under Systemwide Review
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Protection of Human Subjects in Research (Comments due May 20, 2020)
  Action: Committee members are asked to review the revised policy and be prepared to discuss any issues at the next UCORP meeting.
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Travel Regulations (Comments due May 20, 2020)
  Action: Committee members are asked to review the revised policy and be prepared to discuss any issues at the next UCORP meeting. Preliminary concerns were expressed about the use of “physical handicap” as a term and about mentioning specific contracts with vendors by name.
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Gender Recognition and Lived Name (Comments due April 22, 2020)
  UCORP did not have any concerns with the policy and will not comment.

10. MRU Review Reports
Postponed. Draft MRU review reports will be circulated via email and discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting minutes prepared by: Joanne Miller, UCORP Committee Analyst
Attest: Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair

Meeting participants:
Members: Andrew Baird (Chair), Richard Desjardins (Vice Chair), Irina Conboy (Berkeley), Karen Bales (Davis), Lee Bardwell (Irvine), Kathrin Plath (Los Angeles), Michael Scheibner (Merced),
Kelly Jeong (Riverside), Tannishtha Reya (San Diego), Stuart Gansky (San Francisco), Liming Zhang (Santa Barbara), Paul Roth (Santa Cruz), Jeanmarie Gonzalez (Graduate Student Representative, UCSF), Atreyi Mitra (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCSD), Kum-Kum Bhavnani (Academic Council Chair), Mary Gauvain (Academic Council Vice Chair).

Consultants, guests, and staff: Theresa Maldonado (Vice President, Office of Research & Innovation), Bart Aoki (Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office), Kathleen Erwin (Director, UC Research Initiatives), Emily Rader (Research Strategy and Portfolio Manager), Janna Tom (Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Lourdes DeMattos (Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination), Agnes Balla (Research Policy Manager), Emily Rader (Portfolio Manager), Ellen Auriti (Principal Counsel, Office of General Counsel), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst).