

## UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

**Minutes of Meeting  
Monday February 6, 2005****I. Announcements, *George Sensabaugh, UCORP Chair***

Chair Sensabaugh welcomed the alternates from Irvine, Riverside, Santa Barbara, and San Diego, and the new UCLA representative. In view of the number of new faces at the meeting, participants were asked to introduce themselves.

*December meeting of the Academic Council*—Acting Provost Hume reported on long-range academic planning goals that will emphasize and build on the distinct strengths of campuses and seek to eliminate redundant weaknesses while defining the best of each campus. The Senate will be involved in these planning efforts through committees and the Academic Planning Council (on which the UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA sit).

*January meeting of the Academic Council*—No hard time line for the review of the Cal ISIs is in place, but it is hoped it can begin in the spring. All of the Institutes will be reviewed over the course of the coming 4 to 5 years. A number of options are being considered to increase support for graduate education by the Graduate Support Advisory Committee (GSAC) (see information item C). The Davis Senate division has initiated a Memorial to the Regents, calling for the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students. Council has responded to issues of compensation for senior managers and the press coverage of UC compensation practices in resolutions to the Assembly, and will be considering further recommendations specific to senior management salaries and the use of private funds.

**Action:** The update on GSAC was moved to new business for fuller discussion.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of the November 14, 2005 Minutes
2. Approval of the December 5, 2005 Minutes

**Action:** The consent calendar was approved.

**III. Updates from Systemwide Groups****1. Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL), *Wendy Max, UCORP Vice Chair***

A draft RFP for management of the Lawrence Livermore Lab (LLNL) is expected soon. Although the decision has not yet been made by the Regents, UC is preparing for a bid, which will probably be modeled on the LANL bid, and has set up a website and submitted an expression of interest in bidding.

The transition of management of the Los Alamos Lab (LANL) to the UC –Bechtel team is in progress. Michael Anastasio, current Director of LLNL, will take over as Director at LANL effective June 1, which has raised some concerns about the impact of that move on LLNL. Current employees of LANL will have 60 days to consider employment and retirement options with the new management structure. ACSCONL plans to meet with President Dynes at its next meeting.

**2. Research Compliance Advisory Committee (RCAC), *Dorothy Bainton***

This group was established in October and meets once a month by phone, with two in person meetings planned per year. The group was formed in response to and has drafted comments on a draft program of guidance for recipients of public health service research funds. The elements of the program include communication, training, record keeping, internal auditing, enforcing disciplinary standards, and oversight. UC will urge that program be honored as guidelines and not be made mandatory. Also, a number of the recommendations were found to be inconsistent with Circular A-21. The UCORP representative expressed the concern that since all of these compliance areas affect faculty, there should be strong, effective links to faculty to keep them informed and supported.

#### **IV. Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18b(4)**

**Issue:** A preliminary review was conducted last year of proposed changes, and the Senate is responding to the formal review. The changes to APM 220-18 amend the language defining the criteria for advancement to Step VI and to above scale.

**Discussion:** After brief comments, UCORP approved the changes as being consistent with what the Senate had endorsed in the preliminary review of the changes conducted last year.

**Action:** UCORP approved the proposed revisions to APM 220-18b(40).

#### **V. Consultation with the Office of the President, Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost of Research; Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, , Research Policy and Legislation** Vice Provost Coleman

*MRUs.* A joint senate/administrative group has been established to look at how MRUs are defined ,reviewed and funded, which will hold three all-day meetings and plans to have recommendations ready for implementation for next fall.

*State budget.* UC is starting to discuss development of a large research initiative to propose, that will be tied to the economy of the state and will provide much needed support for graduate education. UCORP and the Academic Council will be consulted in this effort.

#### Executive Director Auriti

*Stem Cell Initiative.* Funds for training grants should be available soon to the California Institute of Regenerative Medicine. UC is providing comments on draft policy for grantee institutes. Three main areas of focus are ethical review oversight (a process that will be similar IRB review), grants administration policy, and intellectual property issues. The policy basically follows the Baye Dole model, but requires that the institute shares the IP revenue with the state (in part as compensation for money that came from state bonds). UC's position is to promote wide sharing and dissemination of research tools and data. President Dynes has also forwarded the Academic Council suggested policy on public access and archiving of research results to the Institute, which recommends publication in an open-access repository within six months.

*IRBs* – In an effort to create greater consistency throughout the UC system, an MOU is being developed to allow for one campus to be the IRB of record for low risk protocols of multi-site research projects. The MOU applies for a one year trial, includes the labs.

*UCUSE* - The 'UC Undergraduate Student Experience' is a regular report based on results of a survey of undergraduates. The current survey will be sent out in the spring.

*Systemwide training on ethics.* Last year a statement of ‘ethical values’ was developed at the request of the Regents. Current Council Vice Chair Oakley was part of the group that worked on the statement to ensure it did not encroach upon the Faculty Code of Conduct. It was approved by the Regents and now implementation is in progress.

*Federal legislation.* There has been national response to the National Academy’s report ‘The Gathering Storm’ and the need for policy change to address the need for science and engineering education in order to remain globally competitive. A number of federal bills have been introduced bearing on this and this and the improvement of K-12 education. UC will be following these developments closely, as well as the possibility of an effort in California to develop statewide recommendation on how to proceed in implementing some of the report’s suggestions.

**Action:** UCORP’s input will be sought for the development of a research initiative that is being considered as a way of providing more state revenue for UC research and graduate education. Vice Provost Coleman will keep the committee informed on developments.

**Action:** UCORP’s draft IRB report will be forwarded to Coordinator Landes, Vice Provost Coleman, and Director Auriti for their information and for input.

## **VI. Earmarking : Campus Practices**

**Issue:** UCORP would like to determine what kinds of earmarking requests are going to congressional legislators at the campus level, and the number of requests. This issue was discussed with the Office of Research consultants.

**Discussion:** Vice Provost Coleman clarified that the California Senators have requested a priority earmark list from President Dynes; members of the House have not asked for requests to be prioritized, but may be moving in that direction in response to current initiatives in Congress calling for limitations on earmarking. The need was noted for better communication on campuses among the Senate, the government relations offices and the Vice Chancellors for Research. UCORP members asked what the best avenue would be for getting information on UC earmarking activity initiated by campuses and individuals (as constituents) with legislators.

**Action:** Director Auriti will provide information to UCORP on legislators that have been approached with earmarking requests from UC, once that information is available.

## **VII. Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) Draft White Papers- Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication - 5 Papers and 1 Proposed Policy**

**Issue:** The white papers address copyright issues, best practices for book and journal publishing, new technology for publishing and presenting scholarly work, and the role of scholarly societies. They are accompanied by a SCSC proposed policy of a default copyright agreement. The papers and proposal are out for general systemwide review by committees and divisions.

### **Discussion:**

*Publications and the academic personnel process:* Members agreed that the emphasis should be on evaluating the quality of the piece, not the nature of the outlet. The paper was seen as a good alerting document highlighting that there are new publishing venues,

of which all faculty, including senior members, should be aware. It was suggested that evaluation letters may need to be double-pronged addressing both research and venue. Member wanted more clarity on the intended audience of the paper(s) and how they will be disseminated. Premier journals are known by reputation, but it will take time for electronic publications to establish themselves. It was noted that the document assumes that peer reviewed outlets set the standard, whether print or electronic, with suggestions as to how publications can provide information to departments and CAPs to help judge their selectivity. The need was noted for departments, CAPs and junior faculty to have more direction in this area and for this sort of guidance to be provided to CAPs for the evaluation of e-publications. There was a consensus to endorse the sentiments of the evaluation on this topic and encourage the primary reviewers at the ad hoc level to be sensitive to these issues and provide guidance to succeeding evaluators.

*Copyright issues.*

One member felt that obtaining first publication only copyright will take more leverage than individual faculty members have. Another saw the opt-out statement as an unrealistic requirement. Others noted that many journals are amenable to faculty retaining copyright.

The proposal could better clarify that this default position is in a way putting the weight of the faculty behind it and provides the individual with a position that does not have to be negotiated and that he/.she can opt out of. It would also be helpful if an online list were developed of publishers that have accepted these terms.

Suggested language that faculty can use in making a counteroffer would be a helpful inclusion;

UCORP should urge that UC negotiate for acceptance of this position at the general level, which would take the burden off of individual except when opting out.

*Scholarly societies.* This area is sensitive because faculty trust in scholarly societies to promote knowledge, but they are also dependent on publication and in some cases on page charges. It is worth trying to get the support of societies for negotiation with journals and some of the for-profit publishers as well. They need to be brought into the dialogue. Page charges also need to be mentioned.

**Action:** A draft of the committee's comments will be circulated before being submitted to the Academic Council.

### **VIII. Nominations to Systemwide Information Technology Guidance Committee**

**Action:** Members may forward names of suggested nominees to sit on the Systemwide Information Technology Guidance Committee to Chair Sensabaugh.

### **IX. UCORP Report on IRB Operations at UC**

**Issue:** Members' review / discussion of second draft of the UCORP report with Research Policy Coordinator Rebecca Landes.

Chair Sensabaugh noted changes in this draft reflecting input from the last UCORP meeting, from Coordinator Landes, and other sources as well as some formatting decisions. . A section on the national discussion of the extended scope of IRBs has been included and members might consider to what extent the report should be focused on issues at UC. More information is needed from faculty as to problems they have experiences with IRBs.

## **Discussion / Information Points**

- There is a contradiction in claiming knowledge about faculty dissatisfaction, but also noting a lack of actual evidence. The language should be changed to reflect that there is supporting documentation.
- One member suggested that complaints might naturally go to the local P&T committee. It was noted that no complaints have come to UCORP from P&T committees and that faculty who have had problems don't generally see Privilege and Tenure committees as an avenue of recourse for IRB complaints.
- Faculty IRB service. One member stressed the difficulty of getting faculty to sit on IRBs, noting that if faculty see a problem with staff, then they should focus on better recruitment of IRB members and recognition of the intensive demands of being on the IRB. The report should be sensitive to the position of IRB members and try to avoid a demoralizing effect.
- Review timelines are extended because of lack of quorum for meetings and lack of peer review by schools and departments beforehand (particularly for the social sciences and humanities).
- Timelines and processes are not consistent across campuses and each campus may have different kinds of requirements. The report will recommend the extent to which there should be conformity regarding training.
- The report could inadvertently reinforce the attitude among PIs that IRBs are unnecessarily difficult.
- Staff issues:
  - Exemptions are decided by staff;
  - Staff are the primary interface faculty have with an IRB; they can be the target and source of complaints, and therefore a source of resolution of some of the problems. From the 'customer service' aspect, faculty can perceive staff as serving their needs or as an impediment to their research.
  - Staff are in an untenable position: faculty are clients but also charged to protect the institution from liability as well as protect human subjects. Sometimes investigators see and issue of basic protection as being interference with research design.
  - Staff turnover can be a problem, and are at times treated without proper consideration.
- Graduate students
  - The report should include more specific mention of the impact of IRBs on graduate student research.
  - Graduate students sometimes take a tutorial on animal and human subjects regulations before advancing to candidacy, but more mentoring may be needed on the process.
- Annual reports of IRBs should be required and include besides the breakdown of types and number of protocol, response times for approvals, and the number of transactions that may be involved in the course of a review.
- Electronic submissions – San Diego, Irvine and San Francisco have electronic tracking systems. The medical campuses have greater resources to set up and maintain these systems.

**Action:** The IRB report will be revised to incorporate further information as well as the suggested changes from today's discussion.

**Action:** Coordinator Landes will provide more information on the Irvine and San Diego electronic tracking systems.

**X. Corporate Influence on Research:**

Review of Issue and planned Consultation with UCAF

[Item not addressed.]

**XI. New Business – GSAC**

[Item not addressed.]

Attest:

George Sensabaugh,  
UCORP Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Brenda Foust,  
Policy Analyst