

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting
Monday February 7, 2005**I. Proposed Review Structure for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation**, *Susanne Huttner, Associate Vice Provost for Research, Leslie Sunell, Special Assistant to the Provost*

Issue: UCORP, UCPB and CCGA are the lead committees in the preliminary review of the proposed Cal ISI review structure. Associate Vice Provost Huttner and Special Assistant Sunell, who worked on the draft, have been invited to present and discuss the proposal.

AVP Huttner's Report: Three of the Institutes are now in their fifth year of operation, and CITRUS is in its fourth year. The State funding received has been almost entirely for capital development. Only 5% of the funding was earmarked for operational costs, and securing permanent support has been an ongoing concern. There has also been some turnover in leadership. The Institutes are in various stages of development; a number of buildings will be completed this year. The institutes have been successful in getting grant monies significantly above the baseline level. Cost-sharing and use of overhead have been part of the strategy to make up operating costs on a temporary basis. The review structure proposal is intended to get appropriate levels of input from the key players – the directors, the chancellors, the administration, the Senate, and industry partners. A five-year review cycle is likely, but the structure should be seen as evolving and flexible so as to adequately address the differing foci and progress of the four institutes.

Discussion: Members expressed concern that, in the proposed structure, the Senate committees were not involved in the review until a later stage, and that the Senate's advice be included in ways that are timely and most effective. It was also felt that the proposal should include an indication of when the review cycles will start as well as their frequency and the review turnaround time. In response to a query about the report on the Cal ISIs mid-launch review, AVP Huttner said it would be made available to the committee along with other information. Members also emphasized that Senate advice on the membership of the review committee is important. The concern was raised in general about the Cal ISIs' integral relationships with industry, and the need to avoid both real and perceived co-optation of the academic research mission. UCORP also expressed concern about the metrics that will be used in evaluating the Cal ISIs and is interested in taking part in developing the review guidelines in the near future.

Action: Analyst Foust will draft a committee response, based on points raised in discussion, that will be circulated to UCORP tomorrow for comment and finalization.

Action: Analyst Foust will follow up with AVP Huttner to arrange access to the mid-launch review report and other Cal ISI information that is available through the IUCRP website.

II. Chair's Announcements *Max Neiman, UCORP Chair*

Chair Neiman briefly updated members on recent Academic Council actions, including: the election of a 2005-06 Senate Vice Chair, the status of the national labs contracts, the Provost's Long-Range Guidance Team, the state budget outlook, CSU's interest in the being given authority to grant independent doctorates, and the Senate's draft Concurrent Resolution on the importance of graduate education to the state of California. He announced the upcoming meeting of the Assembly and the joint Academic Council / EVC meeting in March, and reported on the Senate's response on the California Sea Grant review and its funding situation.

III. Consultation with the Office of Research

Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost for Research.

Restrictions on funding. The "strings" Resolution continues to percolate and has been revived in the press in several articles. The conclusion of the Senate's current deliberations is awaited.

Export controls. The Berkelyan recently published a detailed article on export controls that should be of interest to UCORP. In particular, it explains that once a PI agrees to pre-publication review or capitulates to requests regarding publication, e.g., material on a website, she/ he steps out of the "safe harbor" of basic research under university policy.

Federal grants administration. The Federal Demonstration Project, an effort to streamline government grant administration at universities, is promoting collaborative and multi-disciplinary research by encouraging the use of a set uniform terms for awards. Separate from that, OSTP has published a memo encouraging agencies allow more than one PI to get credit on an award. Efforts are being made at UC to structure this change in a way that will be consistent with campus practices while taking advantage of the streamlining benefit.

Ellen Auriti, Director, Academic Legislative Issues.

Data security issues. Proposed SB 13 would prevent state agencies from releasing personally identifiable information to university researchers. Currently there is an exception that allows UC to receive this data, and this legislation would remove that exception. Efforts are being made to gain support for amending the bill and to assure the author that UC is putting protective measures in place. A larger question is the need to develop minimum standards and to increase researcher awareness. The HIPPA safeguards that are now being put in place for health care data may trickle down to other areas.

NIH Policies. NIH recently released its conflict of interest policy with new regulations on outside activities and financial holdings for NIH employees. The policy is seen as drastic, and UC is concerned that there may be similar regulations developed for grantees. NIH also recently announced their open access policy, which calls for scientists to make their manuscripts openly available within 12 months of publication and is voluntary.

California Stem Cell Initiative. The ICOC has been meeting in subgroups, and there is significant UC participation on the governing board and other workgroups. They have released solicitations for nominees for a President, who will be the chief academic advisor, and for members for various workgroups. Nominations can be sent to Director Auriti or submitted on the CIRM website.

IV. MRU Update *Cathie Magowan, Director, Science & Technology Research Programs*

Budget information. A presentation on MRU budgets was made to UPCB last month and has been distributed for this meeting. The MRU directors will be happy to make the full presentation to UCORP as well at a later meeting.

15-Year Review of CalSpace. Not all of the comments are in yet from the campuses, but some of what has been received echo the Senate's concerns regarding CalSpace's financial accountability, administrative costs, lack of competition, and lack of industry collaboration. The review committee recommended a new host campus and new director and vision. The Office of Research is considering an alternative proposal of running CalSpace out of UCOP (similar to the way the UC Marine Council is administered), which would dramatically lower administrative costs and could be set up quickly. A council of space scientists would be assembled from throughout the system for oversight and to set up programs and re-set priorities. Reviews would be handled online. This plan would be in place of competing the MRU to another host campus. A core question is what is the best way to provide central support and leadership for multi-campus programs. UCORP's comments on this proposal are requested.

V. 15-Year Review of CalSpace *George Sensabaugh, David Salmon, UCORP review subcommittee*

Report: The last CalSpace review pointed out significant problems including, among other things, inappropriate FTE allocation and lack of vision. This review is looking at how those problems have been addressed. The review committee recommends the continuation of CalSpace, but that all aspects of the MRU go out for systemwide competition. There seems to be, however, a disconnect between the main conclusions of the review and the serious issues raised in the report. It is not clear why CalSpace should not be disestablished altogether, or why a "new" CalSpace should be constrained to the current model.

Discussion: Members noted that CalSpace has long been divorced from its initial mission, and that a fundamental problem is the lack of competition along with the administrative problems. There is also the question of the need for space science research at UC, and what form it should take. There was general agreement with subcommittee's position to encourage the Office of Research to consider taking a complete departure from the CalSpace model that would generate a new vision for the program, a truer multi-campus identity, and administrative alternatives

Action: The committee voted to adopt the subcommittee's report and recommendation as written. The transmittal letter to the Council will comment on the new plan of central administration through UCOP as one alternative to consider in the overall re-structuring of CalSpace.

VI. General Review and Reconsideration of the Academic Council Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources

Issue: The committee will submit its comments to the Academic Council as part of the general Senate review.

Discussion: Members reported on the progress and process of discussions among local CORs and Academic Freedom committees on this issue. It was noted that a number of campuses seem to be in support of the resolution, but also that there is strong interest in clarifying who has the authority to institute a ban and what the mechanisms are to appeal the position of the resolution or alternatively to recommend a ban on a particular funding source.

Action: UCORP's response will indicate that the committee maintains its support of the Resolution, is awaiting the outcome of the general review, and is willing to reconsider the resolution and/or other issues brought out in the review, should that be the desire of Council.

VII. Corporate Influences on Research – Joint UCAF/UCORP Effort

Issue: In email exchanges, Chair Neiman, UCAF Chair Fox, and UCORP members have discussed possible ways of addressing the issue of corporate influence on research.

Discussion: Referencing some of the literature on this issue, Chair Neiman noted that the University is vulnerable exposed to criticism of its research, since there is evidence suggesting that in some cases there is a predictable relationship between a sponsor and the research outcomes. He recommended that the next step should be to establish a task force with UCAF as soon as possible to review and conduct a meta-analysis of the literature; to review current university policy; and to report findings. The group could include members outside of the Senate committees who have expertise in this area. Since this is actually a UCAF initiative, the establishment of the group should be proposed by UCAF, if a formal proposal is needed.

Members comments:

- The effort should be not look at the issue narrowly, not be limited to clinical trials, but include e.g., engineering research.
- A bigger concern is how industry is driving the research agenda.
- Disciplines have different cultures and different relationships with corresponding corporate cultures. More information on this is needed from sponsored projects offices.

Action: The establishment of a joint task force will be proposed to UCAF with a three-part charge of: conducting a meta-analysis of the literature; reviewing current university policy; and reporting the outcome and formulating recommendations.

VIII. Consent Calendar

- 1. Minutes of the December 6, 2004 meeting**
- 2. UCORP has elected not to opine on the Proposed Excess Units Fee Policy**
- 3. UCORP endorses the following proposals:**
 - a) Proposed Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations**

b) Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

Action: The consent calendar was approved.

Meeting adjourned, 3:40 p.m.
Attest: Max Neiman,
UCORP Chair

Minutes prepared by
Brenda Foust,
Policy Analyst