

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting
February 12, 2007

I. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The minutes of the December 11, 2006 meeting were approved as noticed.

II. Chair's Announcements

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

- Academic Council meeting of December 20, 2006

Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research investigators, among others, submitted a proposal in which they claim they lost UC-offered health and retirement benefits during their appointment with the private research contractors. The Academic Council did not endorse their proposal to have these benefits restored from UCRP funds when faculty return to their academic UC appointments. The Council also received an update from Council Vice Chair Michael Brown on the Regents' diversity workgroup, which is studying the impacts of Prop. 209 ten years later. The workgroup has four subgroups and is expected to issue their report at the end of this year. The Council will meet soon in a joint session with the Executive Vice Chancellors, and the Council's agenda items, including salary stratification and budget prioritizing, were discussed in detail. The Council also discussed the "Future's Report," recently issued by the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Provost Rory Hume discussed additional details of the Office of the President's re-organization. Mark Rashid, Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) updated the Council on its investigation into UC's freshman eligibility policy.

- Academic Council meeting of January 24, 2007

UCORP member Ajit Mal (UCLA) was approved as the committee's new representative to the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC), effective at the start of the next academic year. The state budget for UC included many large-scale research projects, though no new money for academic preparation for high school seniors or labor research. The state budget, though, is not finalized. Mary Croughan (UCSF) was nominated by the Council to be next year's Senate Vice Chair. The election is scheduled for the February 14, 2007 Academic Assembly meeting.

- Academic Planning Council meeting of 1/23/07

The Long Range Guidance Team has issued a draft report, which is available upon request. The UC Riverside proposal for a law school was deferred, in part because that campus is developing a medical school at present. UCR's medical school model is a distributed clinical one, where existing facilities will be used rather than constructing new ones. A request for proposals for a new school of public health has

been issued. Enrollment planning is expected to occupy a large part of the APC agenda in future meetings, especially in terms of evaluating the marked increase of online applications. Each campus is to share its academic plans with others in the system. Harold Levine presented to the Council an outline of three key areas of academic planning in the educational realm: educational leadership in the state, early childhood education, and special education.

III. Update on the Industry-University Cooperative Research Project (IUCRP) Steering Committee Meeting of January 4, 2007

Hans Schollhammer, UCORP Representative to IUCRP, via phone

ISSUE: Professor Schollhammer presented an overview of his written report, emphasizing the recently completed internal audit. Though the audit's final results are yet to be made public, the steering committee is preparing a response based on a draft they received.

DISCUSSION: Chair Max inquired as to the role and power of the steering committee, as well as the selection of new areas of research emphasis in the Project. Professor Schollhammer responded that the Steering Committee is an oversight board and that research areas are conceived broadly to allow for flexibility. Members asked about the progress of the IUCRP Fellows program, how success in the program was measured, and what determined the distribution of the Fellows on the campuses. Professor Schollhammer indicated that each Fellow must have a mentor and that the steering committee selected the Fellows. Further, since this is the first year of the program, evaluation may be difficult, though individual mentors are responsible for establishing and monitoring expectations of the Fellows. As to the distribution of the Fellows, Professor Schollhammer indicated that campuses also had to apply to participate in the program, and not all of them did so.

IV. Indirect Cost Recovery

ISSUE: The academic year is rapidly approaching its end; the committee should turn its attention from investigating the matter to determining what type of report it wishes to issue.

DISCUSSION: Several themes emerged during the committee's discussion. First, Andrew Fisher (UCSC) stated that the spark to this investigation in his mind was UCPB's "Future's Report" and the declining public investment in the University. Indirect Cost Recovery could be used as a concrete illustration of the trends outlined in that document. Another theme was the determination of the actual cost of research versus the amount of costs recovered. Many feel that reimbursement for actual costs would be nearer 70-75% percent, rather than the ~50% UC currently receives for extramural grants, and the 25% UC receives for state grants. A third theme was the use of ICR: If it is used as a slush fund, can it be redirected to augment research budgets exclusively, and would doing so involve more than shifting entries on a ledger? Further, is ICR generated through research in some fields being used to subsidize research in less lucrative ones? Overall, the question of how current ICR practices impact the output of research at UC remains unclear.

Additional perspective was provided by Vice Provost for Research, Lawrence Coleman, who indicated that the 2005-06 ICR systemwide report had just been issued

and that the various rates of 19900 contributions from each campus were codified during the Atkinson administration and reflect differential starting budgets, a shift to green money, and the cessation of counting graduate students as two-times undergraduates in the budget allocation process.

ACTION: Members are assigned to develop “bullet point” items that should be included in the committee’s final report. These items will be discussed at the committee’s March meeting.

ACTION: The invitation to Vice President for Budget Larry Hershman will be postponed until the committee has generated a list of more specific topics/questions for him to address.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost for Research

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director for Research Policy and Legislation

Director Auriti updated the committee on two issues. First, indirect cost recovery for state-issued stem-cell research grants is currently being treated as other state-funded research initiatives. This model is being reconsidered for this particular endeavor. Second, the Office of Research has developed a primer (see Distribution 2) to assist its staff when fielding questions related to the Regents RE-89, a proposal which would ban tobacco-related sponsors from funding tobacco-related research at UC. (Broader consideration of this topic continued under agenda item VIII.)

Vice Provost Coleman updated the committee on follow-up to the recommendations of the Joint Academic Senate/UC Office of Research Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) Workgroup. It is the Office of Research’s intent to convene the MRU advisory board recommended by the Workgroup as a first step toward implementation. VP Coleman will soon send to the Academic Council a request for nominations to that advisory board; some nominees will be Senate members. He also emphasized to the committee that any changes in the review process or in any other aspect that impacts the Senate’s oversight responsibilities regarding MRUs will be vetted through proper Senate channels.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

- Draft Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians

DISCUSSION: Members stated their concerns that the draft proposal may lead to a proliferation of issue- and discipline-specific regulations amounting to micromanagement. This position was upheld through anecdotal evidence of similar impugned practices occurring in various fields. The committee also considered whether the acts in question would more properly be considered as compliance issues, rather than research issues.

ACTION: Chair Max and Analyst Feer will draft a response indicating the committee’s preference for a more broadly conceived blanket policy with universal high standards regarding the acceptance of gifts from vendors of any kind. This draft will be discussed at the committee’s March meeting.

- Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation (SR) 694 and Proposed New Senate Regulation (SR) 695

ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

VII. “Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) at UC: IRB Operations and the Researcher’s Experience”

Joined by George Sensabaugh, 2005-06 UCORP Chair

Joined by Brenda Foust, 2005-06 Fall-Winter UCORP Analyst

Issue: UCORP 05-06 authored this report, which has been sent for systemwide review. The committee undertook a preliminary discussion of the feedback received and changes suggested. The primary authors of the report, George Sensabaugh and Brenda Foust, have volunteered to lead the revision process.

Discussion: Professor Sensabaugh indicated that the word “humanities” will be added to the report for clarity where appropriate. He also indicated that a recently issued American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) report will be cited in the revised UCORP document as evidentiary support for the recommendations UCORP makes. Members noted that automatically exempting or expediting all social sciences research may be problematic since, for instance, some psychology experiments could indeed result in harm to a human subject. Accordingly, as blanket statements are not appropriate, IRB staff expertise in various fields of research is considered vital.

Members also noted that this concern is exacerbated by IRB staff turnover rates. Professor Sensabaugh observed that longevity among IRB staff clearly implicates training and consistency, as well. Professor Sensabaugh and Analyst Foust asked committee members from campuses with electronic tracking for IRB submissions to provide specific feedback to them during the revision process. Analyst Foust also suggested the addition of better recognition for faculty for service on IRBs.

Action: Professor Sensabaugh and Analyst Foust will begin the revision process, keeping the committee apprised of its progress. Since the formal request from the Academic Council to revise the report has not been received yet, UCORP will wait to send the revision back to the Council.

VIII. Tobacco Funding Sources

**Note: This topic was discussed in executive session; no notes were taken.*

ACTION: The committee voted to empower Chair Max to call for an “up/down” vote on RE-89 during the upcoming Academic Assembly meeting.

ACTION: The committee voted to empower Chair Max to urge a “down” vote during that poll.

IX. Update on Relations with the National Labs

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

Several members of ACSCONL recently visited the Los Alamos National Laboratory, where they had the opportunity to visit with both researchers and technical staff. ACSCONL is currently reflecting on its role, and issues surrounding both the labs and ACSCONL are still being raised. Challenges to deciding how ACSCONL and its successor should proceed in the future include the still-unknown efficacy of the new Los Alamos management team, its use a model for the current Lawrence Livermore National

Lab management bid, and the unfamiliarity many have with the proposals. As a result, answering the question, “Can/Should ACSCONL (or its successor group) do more than monitor University relations with the DOE national labs?” is difficult. Chair Max will continue to keep the committee updated.

X. New Business and Planning

None.

Adjournment: 3:45 p.m.

Distributions:

1. RE-89 and supporting documents
2. UC Office of Research “RE-89 – Issues Regarding Implementation” (2/2/07)

Attest:

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

Prepared by:

Kenneth Feer, UCORP Analyst