<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
Monday, June 13, 2022

Meeting Minutes

</div>

I. Chair's Announcements, Approval of Meeting Minutes
Karen Bales, UCORP Chair

- *UCORP Statement on Impact of Graduate Student Unionization on Research – update*

CCGA will write an accompanying memo regarding potential impacts of graduate student unionization. If the committees can't coordinate this month then this will be taken up again in the next academic year.
Try to get memos to Council for June meeting.

Action: Meeting minutes from May 9, 2022 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
Lourdes DeMattos, Associate Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination

- VP updates

The Research & Innovation team will be presenting at next Thursday's meeting of the UC Regents' Special Committee on Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship.

There was a recent change to the State's proposed climate crisis funding for UC. UC's three-part proposal for climate resilience research, hubs, and workforce development administered at the systemwide level is now proposed for direct allocation to three UC campuses: Merced, Riverside, and Santa Cruz. President Drake sent a letter to the governor and legislature requesting that the $185 million be designated as proposed.

The Council on Research is still in the planning stages. Issues that arose in recent searches for directors of UC systemwide entities revealed structural issues that could be helped by such a council.

- Office of Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC)

[See notes from UC Research Data Ownership Policy, below.]

III. UC Research Data Ownership Policy
Agnes Balla, Research Policy Manager

Research Policy Manager Agnes Balla shared the comments that she compiled from the second systemwide review of the policy. She noted that, although many comments related to procedures and related information, only three of the comments were about the policy itself. Many faculty responses questioned the timing of the policy issuance. RPAC Executive Director Deb Motton said that the drafting of the policy at this time was an outcome of a recent internal foreign influence audit by UC's Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services (ECAS). It was one of several "management corrective actions" that were reported to the Regents. The intent is for the policy to be issued in July. A guidance document will be released shortly thereafter.

Changes made to the proposed policy since the last review included edits to the definition of research data, a refinement to the definition of PI, and changes to the description of the VC-R responsibility to include appropriate consultation. New questions were added to the FAQ.

Balla and the RPAC team say they are committed to ongoing revisions and to updating and adding to the FAQ as needed. The guidance document will address questions of data management and governance. Balla is working with staff at the CDL and with UCSD's Professor Emerita Maryann Martone, who is a national leader in the area of data management and scholarly communication.

A final note was to express faculty concern about unfunded mandates and a call for awareness regarding the amount of additional work for researchers to comply with the new policy.

IV. MRU Five-Year Review Template Changes
Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives
Anna Ward, Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives
Erin Marnocha, Program Officer, UC Research Initiatives

When asked about revisions to the MRU Review templates, MRU Directors requested that the spreadsheets be easier to manipulate, e.g., with copy-and-paste, adding rows, etc. They did not have complaints about the amount of information requested. A meeting is scheduled in a few weeks to go over the new templates with MRU personnel. This will also be an opportunity to go over the narrative prompts and to emphasize the information that would be useful in an Academic Senate review.

Other ideas for the MRU review narrative and templates included:
- Suggestion to include an organizational chart for the MRU that has names and titles.
- Adding metrics for diversity, especially for student participants.
- Thinking about how to assess the impact of the MRU and how to determine the extent member output that is attributable to the MRU.
- The need to highlight the involvement of multiple campuses in order to justify MRU (vs ORU) status.
- Schedule a meeting with MRU Director, UCORP Chair, and UCOP Research Initiatives staff prior to review cycle in 5th year.
- It might be possible to remove one of the spreadsheets in Appendix 2 that categorizes subgrants into thematic topics and discipline.
- Related to impact, whether to include *all* external funding in the Appendixes, or just the funding that comes specifically to the MRU.

VP Maldonado noted that there was a 2017 APLU study on public impact of research that might offer ideas: https://www.aplu.org/our-work/2-fostering-research-innovation/public-impact-research/

Action: Chair Bales asked the R&I staff to hold off sending the revised templates to the MRUs for one more week in order to see if anything else comes up from committee members. Otherwise the revised templates are fine to move forward.

V. Academic Senate Leadership Update
Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Chair
Susan Cochran, Academic Council Vice Chair

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

Faculty climate memorial to the Regents – The memorial to the Regents passed systemwide with approximately 85% in favor of the resolution. Only around 18% of faculty eligible participated in the vote.

UC budget – UC's "compact" with the Governor is intact in the State budget, although UC's request for $1.6 billion for one-time capital funding was not included. Climate resiliency funding is being steered to the campuses instead of systemwide. With the State budget surplus and rampant inflation, Chair Horwitz has asked administrators whether UC could request a greater increase in faculty salaries. President Drake indicated that there may be an opportunity to address this next year.

Regents May meeting – At their May meeting, the UC Regents endorsed the UCOP budget and approved capital projects. UC is creating a central "bank" to reduce borrowing risks to campuses. Chair Horwitz told the Regents about successes in intersegmental transfer criteria and the IGETC singular general education pathway. The next issue will be Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) and streamlining pathways for admission to UC and CSU. President Drake talked about the new UC debt-free path for Native American students, and there was a presentation on the "hidden curriculum" of things that faculty should be aware of with regard to first generation students. Another presentation featured an update on the "Advancing Faculty Diversity" program that has used more than $8.5 million in one-time State funds to support the development of innovative and focused campus projects – mainly pilots – that are designed to increase faculty diversity at UC.

Mitigating Covid Impacts on Faculty – The final report of the Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group includes information on how to write a "Covid Impact Statement" or "COVID Opportunities and Challenges Statement" and Chair Horwitz wants to be sure that

Cybersecurity – The Board of Regents held a closed session on cybersecurity at its last meeting. Chair Horwitz and Vice Chair Cochran participated and provided faculty perspective primarily about the way the Chief Information Security Officers (CISOs) go about this work and their interactions with faculty.

Senate Regulation 424.A.3 and the creation of a new Ethnic Studies requirement as part of the A-G freshman admission requirements - A proposal from a working group was sent for full Senate review at the beginning of the year. After consideration of the comments, the Academic Council decided to send the proposal back to BOARS, the parent committee of the working group. The Senate leadership want to avoid politics and do what is best for students coming to UC.

Political statements on departmental websites. UCAF offered guidance that was approved by the Academic Council after full Senate review. Statements are allowed, but departments should clarify who the comments are coming from (e.g., faculty only, staff, etc.). After many public comments at a recent Board of Regents meeting, the Regents are now interested in the topic.

Online degree programs – The Academic Council will continue to discuss this in June (and possibly July).

Health Center Affiliations issue – UC has formed a joint affiliations advisory committee co-chaired by the Academic Senate Chair. The Senate wants to make sure there is clarity about what medical procedures can be conducted in what circumstances, and that UC personnel know what to do in case there are problems.

VI. Disclosure of research grants from fossil fuel companies
Craig Callender, Professor of Philosophy, Co-Director, Institute for Practical Ethics, UC San Diego

Professor Callender from UCSD joined the meeting to talk about an initiative of the UCSD Campus Climate Change committee. In 2007, the UC Regents adopted Regents' Policy 2309, which requires each campus to process for proposals for funding from the tobacco industry to undergo scientific peer review. Like tobacco, the fossil fuel industry is seen as influencing the research that it funds. The UCSD Campus Climate Change Committee has discussed two main options to deal with the issue: banning and disclosing. Both are used by other institutions. The emerging consensus is that disclosure is the optimal solution, but the details will need to

be worked out. UCORP members talked about enforcement and accountability. Disclosure of funding sources is the norm in the biosciences. Options include national or global databases, or disclosures when publishing or presenting.

In committee-only discussion, UCORP members suggested that disclosure be the norm across the board; not just for fossil fuel companies, but all funding. Members also wondered about consequences if researchers do not disclose their funding, but there are structures within the university – such as the promotion and tenure process – that could deal with noncompliance.

Action: Chair Bales will write to the Senate leaders and Professor Callender regarding UCORP's proposed idea.

VII. Systemwide Review Items *(https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/under-review/)*

- Presidential Policy on Affiliations with Certain Healthcare Organizations - Comments due June 15, 2022

There were minimal comments so UCORP will not respond.

- Report of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program Phase 2 Taskforce - Comments due July 19, 2022

Perspectives on the trial program were largely positive. UCORP supports the recommendations of the taskforce to expand the program. It should be made uniformly to all faculty, and there should be outreach and publicity efforts. UCORP members also thought that the tracking of participation (gender, URM) should continue.

- Second Systemwide Review of Presidential Policy on Abusive Conduct in the Workplace- Comments due October 18, 2022

No comments.

VIII. Round Robin of Reports from the Campuses

UCLA: Mark Cohen from UCLA's Institute for Digital Research and Education joined the COR meeting to talk about cybersecurity and FireEye implementation on the campus All end-point devices must have security software installed to participate on the UCLA network. The process for this new requirement lacked proper consultation with faculty, and some are concerned about medical devices, research data, implications for HIPAA, and liability.

UC Santa Cruz: The new faculty allowance program was announced and the COR is working on implementation so that faculty can apply in the fall. Faculty are eligible to receive $2,000 per year. A spending report is required for future funding. The campus conducted a Covid impact survey and had a 25% response rate. One question was about financial impact, and the median was around $10-20,000.

UC Riverside: The UCR COR is working on faculty grants. One is for tenured faculty who are trying to create a new line of research, and an issue has arisen about how new the research needs to be. The grants will be distributed in summer.

UC Irvine: The local committee (CORCL) is talking about disclosure for conflict of interest and cybersecurity. A new protocol was implemented by which every link in an email are evaluated using URL defense. There is concern about giving third parties access to email. Faculty also felt there was not enough consultation. CORCL will attempt to provide more faculty input.

UC Davis: The COR was able to fund 24 large grants of $25k each over a wide breadth of disciplines. 200 small grants of $2k each were provided for those over a specified course load. The COR has approximately

$3k left for travel grants and is extending the deadline for using travel grants. The COR appreciates the ongoing updates from the group working on transparency for animal research.

UCSF: The local committee's issues are very specific to the health sciences and UCSF. The members have spent a great deal of time discussing affiliations and related issues over the past few years.

Meeting minutes drafted by: Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst
Attest: Karen Bales, UCORP Chair