<div align="center">
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, April 8, 2019
Videoconference
</div>

Meeting Minutes

1. Chair's announcements, approval of minutes

UCORP Chair Andrew Baird described the agenda for the meeting, which includes a follow-up to the UCOP Policy on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (Drones) that was issued last year, an update on Elsevier, and information about Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) at UC.

- Report from latest Academic Council meeting: the Council discussed and accepted mandated changes to the Senate's bylaws having to do with disciplinary cases (Bylaw 336). The college admissions scandal is a matter of significant discussion. The Academic Council Working Group on Privileges and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees has released its proposed policy (the proposed APM-011) for review. The new transfer guarantee arrangement with the California community colleges is also moving forward.

- UCORP's two MRU Review Reports will be sent to Academic Council Chair Robert May for approval by the Council and then forwarded to ORGS VP Art Ellis.

- The Task Force on Agriculture & Natural Resources is now a subcommittee of UCPB (in its previous incarnation it was an Academic Council Special Committee), with one UCORP member (the UCORP Chair, ex officio). UCPB is interested in expanding UCORP membership on the Task Force.

UCORP's meeting minutes from March 11, 2019 were **approved.**

2. Multicampus Research Unit Reviews – Broader Discussion
- ***Reviews of California Institutes for Science & Innovation – UCORP Recommendations***

UCORP members discussed potential recommendations for how it might participate in a UC review of the California Institutes for Science & Innovation (CalISIs), as requested by Provost Michael Brown and Vice Provost Art Ellis in February. The group agreed that UCORP should be involved although not as the primary reviewing body. Chair Baird proposed a model whereby ORGS would form an ad-hoc committee to conduct and/or assemble reviews of the CalISIs and then UCORP would assess these reviews and make specific recommendations. UCORP members agreed that any ad-hoc committee should include at least two members of UCORP.

Action: Chair Baird will draft a proposal to send to the committee for review.

- ***MRU review process***

The committee discussed potential changes to the way the five-year MRU reviews are done. Members discussed the effectiveness of the current review process, including the guidelines in Appendix H of the Compendium. Suggestions from members included streamlining the process and shortening the resulting report. Members also discussed whether the MRUs could be asked provide simpler, easier-to-assess materials.

One idea to ease the burden is to review MRUs according to their size, so as to deploy appropriate resources for any particular review. The possibility of using a "long form" or "short form" depending on the MRU was discussed as was the need to get broader input and perhaps revise the compendium. In discussions with the ORGS personnel, VP Ellis noted that most MRU directors feel that there are too many reviews but the expectation that annual reports will now be submitted should make the five-year report easier to compile.

Having a documented, systemwide review process is seen as valuable to the Academic Senate and the State for monitoring budgetary management and level of academic quality.

3. Unmanned Aircraft System (Drone) Policy – Implementation Follow-up
Ken Smith, UC Environmental Health and Safety Executive Director
Brandon Stark, Director, UC Center of Excellence on Unmanned Aircraft System Safety

Brandon Stark, the Director of the UC Center of Excellence on Unmanned Aircraft System Safety, joined the meeting along with UCOP Environmental Health and Safety Executive Director Ken Smith to provide the committee with an update on the implementation of UC's Drone Policy, which was issued last year. UCORP had asked the administration last summer to provide a report in spring, 2019, to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the policy. UCORP also asked for data on drone usage at UC.

Stark said that the UAS Advisory Board was finally populated and is scheduling its first meeting. He presented slides with data about drone usage by campus, as well as information on the flight request and approval process. As requested by UCORP, a survey has been drafted to supplement the assessment of the impact of the policy on research and is just waiting for the Advisory Board to convene to finalize and send out.

Committee members wanted to know how faculty members are informed about drone use regulation. In addition to campus project managers, Stark personally reaches out when he learns that someone at UC has bought a drone. The policy might not reach 100 percent of drone users, but the intent is to keep the number low enough to maintain safe working environment. The regulation of drone flights at UC is an ongoing process and UCORP will continue to monitor the landscape.

Executive Director Smith noted that Stark has received nationwide attention for his work on drone regulation, and has been asked to sit on an FAA drone advisory panel.

Action: In Executive Session the committee agreed to send a letter to Academic Council Chair Robert May conveying its positive impression of the work being done by Brandon Stark on implementation and follow-up with the drone policy and related materials.

4. Reports/Updates from Other Systemwide Committee Chairs
UCOLASC Chair Richard Schneider
UCACC Chair Maryann Martone

- ***Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) at UC***
UCACC Chair Maryann Martone, a Professor Emerita in neuroscience from UCSD, joined the meeting to describe a recent report on Research Information Management Systems (RIMS) at UC. Co-authored by Martone and UCOLASC Chair Richard Schneider, the report was unanimously endorsed by the Academic Council at their last meeting and forwarded to UC leadership for additional study.

The topic stems from concerns that commercial entities are aggressively marketing their systems to provosts, research administrators, and other university administrators. Last year, UCAP brought the issue to the attention of the Academic Council with a letter expressing concerns about the UC's use of the services provided by the commercial provider Academic Analytics. Since many companies providing analytics services come from the publishing field, the libraries are familiar with them; yet in the current environment the libraries are bypassed. The data included in the systems is being marketed for use in faculty and institutional evaluations. The major points of the report are: 1) although simple metrics such as impact factors can be useful when used properly, they are not appropriate for faculty evaluations, which needs to be more nuanced; 2) algorithms and use of UC's data need to be transparent; 3) UC needs to take control of its own data. Commercial companies are selling UC's own data back to the university. Third-party commercial entities seem to be more integrated into core work of university, and Elsevier is a primary example. It now presents itself as an "information analytics" business rather than a publishing company.

Last year, the UC libraries tried to get a handle on these RIMS by conducting a systemwide survey, but the response rate was low and produced unreliable results. More research is necessary, but should be directed from a higher level. After unanimously approving the RIMS report, the Academic Council forwarded it to President Napolitano and Provost Brown with a request that the Provost conduct "a system-wide review of all RIMS currently being employed by academic units and elsewhere" across UC in order to gain a "comprehensive understanding of what products are in use, under what contractual terms, who is responsible for acquiring and implementing them, and for what purpose." An analysis of the systems and their adequacy compared to other current evaluation and measurement methods was requested. Martone also noted that an examination and update of current UC data policies is also overdue.

Faculty can help by talking about the issue locally at committee and departmental meetings and with colleagues. It will also likely be necessary to follow-up on the request for the survey, so letters of support may be requested.

- *Elsevier update*

If and when UC loses access to current Elsevier content, the libraries have contingency plans in place to meet individual needs. UCOLASC Chair Richard Schneider, who is a professor of orthopaedic surgery at UCSF and a member of the Elsevier contract negotiating team, said that several countries did not renew their contracts with the publishing giant. Other institutions are currently negotiating their contracts and may walk away based on UC's experience.

When asked about joining together with other universities and institutions in order to have greater impact on the publishing industry, Schneider said that he is a member of a multi-institutional working group that was formed over two years ago. Although contract terms have in the past been confidential, UC has agreed not sign nondisclosure agreements with publishers and to be transparent about terms. Committee members noted that some faculty are even now not aware of open access and the Elsevier situation, and may be surprised when access to content disappears. Schneider acknowledged that communication is big issue, and even though email messages have been sent from University Librarians and high level administrators, not everyone pays attention.

The central source for Elsevier-related news is the Office of Scholarly Communication: https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-at-uc/publisher-negotiations/uc-and-elsevier/

- *Faculty IT Support*

Professor Martone briefly updated UCORP members on the work of the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) gathering information and making recommendations for research IT infrastructure and the provision of sufficient technical support for faculty. The committee is putting together documentation on faculty needs to be shared with the rest of the Academic Senate and with information technology administrators.

5. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)
Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Bart Aoki, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives
Emily Rader, ORGS Portfolio/Strategies Manager
Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, RPAC

1. LFRP (Lab Fees Research Program) update

The call for proposals began on April 1. The message was forwarded to UCORP.

2. MRU reviews for next academic year

The UC Observatories Director has asked whether members from the review committee could visit the Lick Observatory (near San Jose) and if input for the review could be solicited from the UCO advisory committee.

UCORP members informed VP Ellis that the committee is discussing how to potentially streamline the MRU review process, including tailoring the review to the specific MRU. VP Ellis said it would be possible to convene the current nine MRU directors on a phone call to talk about the process and solicit their opinions.

3. NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) update

The first meeting of the new Working Group on Native American Repatriation is scheduled. Four of the participants were selected by Academic Senate. There are also four representatives from Native American communities, among others. Meanwhile, there is new proposed legislation in California that follows up on the NAGPRA legislation with more directives about committee composition and Native American representation. Another draft bill requires UC to give equal or greater weight to "traditional tribal knowledge" when determining cultural affiliation of remains and cultural items.

4. Cannabis developments

A workshop on May 30th at UC Irvine for faculty and administrators will look at the legal and regulatory landscape as well as offer an opportunity for researchers to find potential collaboration partners. The workshop can hold around 120 people and should be widely promoted to attract a variety of participants.

5. Potential legislation on Sexual Harassment & Research Funding

There are a few members of Congress that are interested in sexual misconduct in the STEM fields. Some are drafting legislation to address the issues, which include concerns about harassment by PI, when notification takes place, and whether conclusions of investigations – including exoneration – can be built in. VP Ellis and UC Title IX Coordinator Suzanne Taylor traveled to Washington DC to talk with legislative staffers about all aspects. The National Academies is starting a "National Collaborative" for discussing and sharing practices regarding sexual harassment in research. There is interest in harmonizing policies and procedures across funding agencies.

6. Chinese Scientific Data Law

As UCORP learned at the last meeting, there are new Chinese laws that give the Chinese government sovereign rights over all data that results from research funded by the government or private agencies. ORGS is working with UC's Office of General Counsel to try to understand the impact on UC research. Although the law is being touted as an effort for open access, the government retains rights that could also be used to restrict data publishing.

7. Foreign Influence

The committee discussed a letter from President Napolitano regarding a new escalation process for foreign influence claims. Modeled on the whistle-blower procedures, the process was developed by the UC Offices of Ethics, Compliance & Audit services and General Counsel to establish uniformity in responses. Cases often go to research administrators alone and are not communicated to the systems administrators. A coordination process at UCOP has begun, with various offices involved, including research policy, compliance, communications, the Senate, and others.

NIH, NSF, DoD, and DoE are still developing policies and requirements. Universities have encouraged federal agencies to coordinate, especially when putting out new guidance.

Committee members asked about communication with faculty about new regulations and requirements. Conflict of Commitment is part of the Academic Personnel Manual, so communications will likely come through Academic Personnel offices. UCORP members were concerned that faculty may have heard the news, but they don't really know how it impacts them. VP Ellis said he will follow up with the Vice Chancellors of Research on ideas for how to get the information out more aggressively.

8. UCORP input on California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CalISI) Reviews

UCORP members told VP Ellis that UCORP does not want to become a review committee (other than as required by the Compendium for MRUs), but the CalISIs receive funding and need to be reviewed. They were previously reviewed as part of the Systemwide Research Portfolio Review Group in 2014, and were part of the

slate of programs that State auditors called out as concerns in their audit of UCOP in 2017. UCORP will discuss further and send a proposal to VP Ellis.

9. Composite Benefit Rate

Researchers at UCSB are concerned over the recent implementation of the Composite Benefit Rate on that campus; some grants have been hit particularly hard and without compensation. Recently, as faculty have spoken out, the campus administration has responded and assistance has been provided in individual situations.

An Academic Council group is beginning to investigate and the issue will be discussed at an upcoming Academic Council meeting. In planning for the implementation of Composite Benefit Rates, remediation was pushed to the campus level, but execution has been uneven.

Although the benefit rate is a major problem in some situations, others may have benefited. It was also acknowledged that that the initial UCORP discussion helped raise the issue on campuses and is an example of the Senate doing its job in looking out for the faculty.

6. Campus business and other follow-up

UCSC – UC Santa Cruz representative Jarmila Pittermann had previously brought up concerns about support for faculty computing needs, which is a major issue for the local committee. She learned that UCSC just renewed its subscription to Academic Analytics and feels that the money might be better spent on increased IT support for faculty. UCORP members thought that a letter describing the problem could be sent from UCORP to local committees to then be shared with local Vice Chancellors for Research. Pittermann agreed to draft a letter for UCORP review.

UC Davis – UC Davis representative Karen Bales provided an update on the campus F&A rate issue that she described at the last meeting. The Vice Chancellor for Research came to the COR meeting and said he would consider a process for anyone adversely affected. The local COR will send memo to campus Senate leadership.

UCSF – UCSF is exploring an affiliation with Dignity Health to add bed space that UCSF's hospital desperately needs. Concerns center around Dignity Health's religious affiliation and questions about limiting health care. The issue is being discussed by the UC Board of Regents.

UCORP members are interested in comparing funding for research support across the system. Analyst Miller will share the Google doc that resulted from Professor Pittermann's questions.

Meeting participants: Andrew Baird (Chair, SD), Nasrin Rahimieh (Vice Chair, I), Irina Conboy (B), Karen Bales (D), Jeffrey Barrett (I), Michael Scheibner (M), KK Ramakrishnan (R), Tannishtha Reya (SD, sub) Stuart Gansky (SF), Harry Nelson (SB), Jarmila Pittermann (SC), Arthur Ellis (UCOP), Bart Aoki (UCOP), Kathleen Erwin (UCOP), Emily Rader (UCOP), Lourdes DeMattos (UCOP), Ken Smith (UCOP), Brandon Stark (UCM), Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, UCORP analyst
Attest: Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair
Meeting minutes approved: 6/10/2019