UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
         UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

                              Minutes of Meeting
                                March 9, 2009

I.   Chair's Announcements
James Carey, UCORP Chair
Note: The chair had no announcements, but members did. See Item III below.

II.   Consent Calendar
   • Minutes of February 9, 2009, teleconference
ACTION: The consent calendar was approved as amended.

III.   New Business
Members
   1. Multicampus Research Projects and Initiatives (MRPI) RFP:
      ISSUE: Santa Cruz Representative Kolaitis reported that his division is concerned
      that the new MRPI RFP circumvents Senate authority in the establishment and
      disestablishment of new multicampus research efforts. As indicated by the
      Compendium, five-year academic reviews must recommend disestablishment of
      existing MRUs, while for new ones, campus support and Senate concurrence are
      necessary. The RFP assumes the creation of a joint Senate/administration
      advisory board, but such a body, even if partially composed of Senate members,
      could not act in the name of the Senate.
      DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the new proposed process is significantly
      different from the status quo, and voiced concern about the perceived absence of
      local endorsement of start-up efforts in particular. Others pointed out, though,
      that local and systemwide bureaucratic hurdles sometimes can stop good projects
      from going forward. Irvine Representative Crawford noted that his campus's
      Office of Research intended to vet submissions, as implied by RFP requirements.
      Other members countered, however, that each step should be made more explicit
      in the RFP so that misunderstandings do not occur and so that each proposal
      receives similar evaluation. One member noted that the fifth recommendation in
      the RFP is to demonstrate sufficient campus commitment, and by implication,
      consultation with local authorities. Nonetheless, members felt more explicit
      direction would be useful.
              Members also observed that the current RFP differs significantly from the
      one considered by the committee in December. For example, the previous RFP
      indicated that each year, a portion of the portfolio would be recompeted, probably
      by thematic area; the current RFP submits all standing and potential MRUs to
      competition at once.
              Riverside Representative Hammond reported that the Compendium
      revision task force, on which she is representing UCORP, met last week and also
      discussed this topic. That group, too, was unclear on key aspects implicated in
      the new MRU, specifically the question of what happens to existing MRUs that

                                                                                        1

lose funding: What is their future following the cessation of central funding? Is this de facto disestablishment? Can they be disestablished without a sunset review? Who has the authority to make these decisions, and by what process? The Compendium task force also raised questions as to why certain MRUs' funds are not being competed, since no explanation is given in the RFP. Members agreed that meritorious research absent funding was a moot point, and that MRU overlap with various ORUs and the fact that several MRUs receive partial external funding complicated the question.

But members also observed that previous RFP reviews and last summer's MRU task force both neglected to consider these issues as framed by the Compendium. Members noted the absence of a roadmap for existing MRUs that do not receive funding but have not been formally disestablished, and it was agreed that many arts and humanities groups would have difficulty securing adequate external funding to continue, especially on such short notice.

ACTION: The committee will pose these questions to ORGS Vice President Beckwith during the upcoming consultation period.

2. Universities Allied for Essential Medicines (UAEM):

ISSUE: Irvine Representative Crawford reported that he had been contacted by student members of UAEM, who asked him to present to UCORP their proposal to make university research, especially in the fields of primary medicine and drug research, available at low or no cost to developing countries.

DISCUSSION: San Diego Representative Groves, who serves as UCORP's representative to the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC), noted that that body is to meet later in the week and that this issue is on their agenda for discussion. TTAC has been told that UAEM is engaged in a concerted effort to lobby university officials, both within and outside of UC, to adopt their position, but University policy on this issue is unclear. Undergraduate Student Representative Chen added that UAEM will have an op-ed in the UCI student newspaper as well as the Los Angeles Times. She added that UAEM started at Yale in the 1990s as a student-led effort to facilitate the dissemination of AIDS drugs to southern Africa, but has since expanded its scope.

The policy issues to consider center on whether PIs can self-amend contracts and the stewardship of and access to research data. Members also noted that UCORP is charged to protect PIs, so even if a proposal sounds good, it needs careful evaluation.

ACTION: Representative Groves (UCSD) will report back to the committee the findings of TTAC.

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

ISSUE: San Diego Representative Groves reported that his campus is involved in a dispute over the repatriation of skeletal remains unearthed during construction in the 1970s. NAGPRA requires a finding of genetic linkage between remains and a local tribe before repatriation can occur, but in the present instance, since the remains are nearly 10,000 years old, no linkage can be established. As such, the remains were to be retained by the University for research purposes. But university administration is seeking a waiver from the US Department of the Interior (NAGPRA's cognizant agency) to allow repatriation despite the absence

of a finding of genetic linkage. Three issues are under discussion: 1) Did University administration have the authority to seek the waiver independently?; 2) What is the University's policy on unidentified remains?; and 3) Are there any research benefits associated with the remains that could outweigh a repatriation request? The San Diego divisional COR is investigating both the second and third questions. Meanwhile, the issue is garnering national attention in interested circles and will be discussed at the next national NAGPRA conference in Seattle, WA, in May.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that this was a national issue, and noted that each state has differing policies on repatriation. The identification of such old remains is made more difficult by ancient tribes' migratory patterns and habits.

ACTION: The committee will pose these questions to ORGS Executive Director Auriti during the upcoming consultation period.

4. Stimulus Money:

ISSUE: Santa Cruz Representative Kolaitis reported that communications on disbursement of funds from the stimulus package have been confusing, at best. It is unclear, for example, whether current proposals need to be amended to be eligible for new funding.

DISCUSSION: Members reported anecdotal experiences of researchers simply contacting their federal program officers for advice since institutional communications have been poor. Chair Carey noted that many federal officials are probably also confused, which would make clear communication extremely difficult. Nonetheless, certain specifics need to be clarified, such as whether grants in their final year of funding are eligible for one-year extensions and whether new funds are available only to incumbent researchers. The expectation that all PIs should simply call their program officers seems unreasonable. Graduate Student Representative Serwer noted that her campus, UCSF, sends announcements on this topic via a clearing house, rather than just simply forwarding received communications.

Members noted that the integrity of the review process could be implicated if it does not proceed in an orderly and transparent fashion, and others added that while a new systemwide policy is unworkable given the short time frame, clearer guidelines are essential. The need for such guidelines is underscored by the fact that different agencies are using divergent methods for awarding their new grants. Further, given the small pot of funding, approximately $200M, promulgating the number of awards to be given, criteria for evaluation, etc., is still more important. Other members noted that clarification on whether equipment grants can be used for single items only or as needed up to the dollar limit could also persuade or dissuade some PIs for applying. Clarity is also needed on whether challenge grants would count as R01 grants.

ACTION: The committee will seek clarification on the processes and communications strategies involved from ORGS Vice President Beckwith in the upcoming consultation period.

IV. **Campus Research Issues**
   1. Campus Committee on Research (COR) Summaries

2. Offices of Research
3. New Concerns

ISSUE: UCORP has compiled a spreadsheet outlining each campus's COR's policies, guidelines, governance, and budget. The committee discusses how best to use this information.

DISCUSSION: Chair Carey noted a distinct lack of coordination between the campus CORs and between the CORs and UCORP. Members noted that many issues are campus specific, despite the establishment of best practices. Members also noted that institutional memory is quickly lost, but that versions of this and the committee handbook discussed previously would be useful assets at the campus level, too.

Members stated their surprise at the different funding models and expectations among the various campuses, and many wondered as to the efficacy of the different types and sizes of grants administered at the campus level. Davis Representative Miller observed that at his campus, recipients of the larger grants must now report back on their usage of the funds. Los Angeles Representative Lane noted that his campus also requires large grant recipients to report, but exempts small grant (<\$1K) recipients from reporting. At Los Angeles, the discussion has shifted to explore options for increasing per capita funding, as entitlement-like views exist, even for small grants. One member wondered whether campuses should end all grants to medicine and engineering and fund only the humanities and social sciences. Others responded that humanists only want a fair chance at the grants, not a special allocation.

Many of the differences between the campuses, it was felt, could be easily explicated with greater context, and it was noted that most CORs' annual reports are available online. Finally, the emerging prominence of interdisciplinary programs and projects may cause some CORs to evaluate their processes and guidelines.

ACTION: The committee will continue to investigate this topic at its next meeting.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President: Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS)

Steve Beckwith, Vice President
Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy and Legislation
Kathleen Erwin, Director, Program Application and Review Center (PARC)
Cathie Magowan, Director, Science and Technology Research

1. Stewardship of Research Data

   UPDATE: Executive Director Auriti reported that new guidelines are being developed and that her office is coordinating with research compliance officers on the matter. Additional language is being added that will help clarify questions of post-employment access to data and restrictions on student-generated data, such as from theses and dissertations. Storage capacity and infrastructural IT issues are still to be resolved.

   DISCUSSION: Members asked as to the difference between policies and guidelines, and Executive Director Auriti indicated that because these are first generation documents, they are only guidelines for now; further, placeholder language like "in accordance with subject area standards" will be amended before the final policy is issued. Members also asked for greater clarification on the distinction between access to and ownership of research data. Executive Director

Auriti replied that the University owns data generated by its employees or on its property, but the researcher retains access to the data. In response to a query about confidential data, ED Auriti noted that specific language is included that parallels contract language covering such data.

2. Suspended Grants

REPORT: Executive Director Auriti noted that budget offices and research administration offices were tracking state-funded grants that had been suspended due to state insolvency. Most suspended grants have since been reinstated, but the lack of retroactive funding combined with a lack of permanent new funding could yield personnel issues. More information will be shared as it becomes available.

3. Publication Restrictions

REPORT: Executive Director Auriti reported that this issue arose at a recent meeting of the Vice Chancellors for Research. The concern is that third parties have tried to impose restrictions on research, such as tribal officials seeking oversight for human subjects studies involving their citizens. This issue is still being investigated at the campus level, and more information will be shared as it becomes available.

4. Conflict of Interest Update (APM 028)
   Note: Item deferred.

5. Stimulus Package Money:

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith noted that there are two interrelated topics to consider: stimulus money itself and the president's overall budget. The stimulus funds must be used quickly, so consideration is being given only to projects "with legs." VP Beckwith encouraged members to contact program officers if they have an unfunded project that received good scores; new projects are not appropriate for this funding. The president's budget includes new categories, or grand challenge areas, for new projects, especially in the areas of health, climate, and energy research..

DISCUSSION: Chair Carey asked whether there were any better advice for securing stimulus funding other than contacting programming officers. VP Beckwith indicated that his office was working with campus officials to assemble and submit competitive proposals. Members noted that each campus is employing a different communication strategy and PIs are left to wade through voluminous and numerous documents; they suggested a clearinghouse approach which would limit the number of messages and itemize and summarize their contents. It was also suggested that a central repository of federal research communications be established to avoid piecemeal and contradictory approaches at the campus level.

Members asked whether the funding priorities and decision-rules were known. VP Beckwith said that either they were not known, or that they were still in flux; he again encouraged members to be pro-active in seeking funding through this opportunity. Members then asked about systemwide advocacy, noting UC's leverage if it acts as a whole. VP Beckwith indicated that regardless of scale, researchers who packaged their proposals to meet the stated needs of the administration, such as emphasizing graduate student education and socially

beneficial (rather than esoteric academic) pursuits, would likely enjoy more success.

6. <u>Stem Cell Research:</u>

   UPDATE: Executive Director Auriti reported that only this morning President Obama issued an executive order expanding federal funding for research on stem cells. Memoranda explicating the details of the change should be available soon.

7. <u>NAGPRA:</u>

   ISSUE: See Item III, 3, above.

   DISCUSSION: Executive Director Auriti noted that UC's policies that implement NAGPRA were currently being revised in the hopes of making such decisions as whether to seek a waiver a local one, rather than one that must be decided at the systemwide level. At present, though, such waivers must be approved centrally.

   ACTION: Executive Director Auriti will report back on this issue at UCORP's next meeting.

8. <u>MRU RFP Update/MRPIs and the Compendium</u>

   ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith noted that the new RFP is available online. Director Erwin added that while Letters of Intent are required, they are not binding; VP Beckwith noted that the software being used requires the Letters. Director Erwin also added that more specific instructions will be sent the first of next week.

   DISCUSSION: Members pointed out that the Compendium, which is currently being revised, contains specific processes for the establishment and disestablishment of MRUs, which the current RFP seems to omit. VP Beckwith noted that the impetus for the new process was not to circumvent or slight the Senate, but to revitalize the system; the established processes had become so onerous that they were ignored, and the Senate has called for years for a revision of the system and the process. Members reiterated their position that a streamlined approach in concordance with the Compendium is different from a new approach that omits any reference to the Compendium. VP Beckwith indicated his willingness to follow more closely established processes, even though doing so may lengthen the process and limit flexibility.

   Chair Carey asked as to the difference between defunding and disestablishing existing MRUs. VP Beckwith noted that MRUs who do not win funding in the competition will take time to close and a case-by-case evaluation of how to close them might be in order. Director Erwin added that many MRUs have multiple funding streams, so a loss of UCOP funding may not necessarily equate to disestablishment. She also stated that there are staggered start dates, with new MRUs being opened in January to allow for funding transitions. Members responded, though, that the question is not the circulation of funds, but who is making the determinations of merit and who is moving the money. VP Beckwith observed that the advisory board could be comprised of up to 50% Senate members, but he repeated his goal of transparency in the process since current methods seem to favor incumbents and the politically well-connected. Members then noted that peer review, even with Senate reviewers, does not equal the fulfillment of shared governance.

Note: Discussion continued in Executive Session, during which no notes were taken, other than action items.

ACTION: The committee will convey its concerns to the Academic Council for further discussion.

VI.   Synergy Project

1. Seminar Demo Debrief and Next Steps

    ISSUE: Chair Carey reported that he recently participated in a teleconference with Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination (UCOP), Catherine Candee, Executive Director of Strategic Publishing and Broadcasting Initiatives (UCOP), Liz Gibson, Director of Information and Educational Technology, Academic Technology Services (UCD), and Bernd Hamann, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research (UCD); all participants are enthusiastic regarding the both the demonstrations to date and the white paper. Three demonstrations have occurred so far, and notable technical improvements have been made in each successive attempt. Further, the white paper has been sent to PLoS Biology, and they have expressed interest in publishing the paper in the community notes section, with the current committee membership submitted as co-authors. As a matter of process, it becomes necessary to consider when and how to secure systemwide endorsement.

    DISCUSSION: Members asked how Chair Carey foresaw the end goal of this process, and he replied that a formal recommendation for implementation should eventually be sent to the president. The proposal would be strengthened by noting its ancillary benefits, such as an enhanced campus calendar system. Members observed that cyberinfrastructure may be the biggest obstacle, especially regarding storage and propagation. Chair Carey noted, though, that a simple $400 package (camera, laptop, and microphone) would suffice for most on-the-ground implementation. Santa Barbara Representative Stuart added that his department has had a version of this for some time, and it has been quite successful, but he cautioned against losing momentum by focusing too much on details at this conceptual stage. While other members concurred, they noted that some specifics, such as subscription costs and alternate software options, must be included. Chair Carey noted that he should have such information for inclusion soon. Finally, members suggested adding a section to illustrate that while the committee has not resolved the thornier issues, such as copyright and proprietary preliminary findings, UCORP is aware of them and that their outstanding status should not preclude moving forward.

    ACTION: Chair Carey will revise the white paper for submission to the Academic Council.

2. Manuscript Preparation, Authorship, and Submission

    Note: See VI, 1, above.

3. Next Synergy Topic: Departmental Complementarity?

    ISSUE: Chair Carey noted that at least 30 disciplines exist on 7 or more campuses, but that they compete with one another, rather than cooperate. Some overlap is necessary for general education requirements and such, but the overall lack of cohesion does not maximize UC's breadth and depth.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that much of competition between parallel departments arises from UC funding structure, and others wondered how much cooperation was realistically feasible in the classroom. Still others wondered about the preservation of campus specializations. On the other hand, lack of a critical mass of students at one campus could be overcome by greater systemwide departmental coordination. Members asked whether it would be possible to compete in the research field while cooperating in the academic realm. Others were unclear as to what value would be added by having greater coordination. Academic Council Chair Powell observed that five cooperative cancer centers might more easily produce life saving technologies and techniques, if there were a communications facilitator to enable their interaction.

Members also suggested that this could foster greater cooperation with the national labs and advertise better the development of interdepartmental programs created at one campus that could fill a need at another. But what prevents such cooperation from occurring now? It was noted that individuals cooperate, not institutions, and that individuals need to develop trust before they will cooperate. Graduate Student Representative Serwer posited that students could serve a useful role in engendering trust between faculty.

Another idea for academic cooperation among departments could involve minimizing text book costs via utilizing courseware and maximizing UC's economy of scale.

ACTION: The committee will continue to explore this topic at its next meeting.

VII.   Systemwide Issues
1. Stimulus Money Usage/Strategizing
    Note: See Items III, 4, and V, 5, above.
2. Compliance APMs (015-016)
    Note: Item withdrawn.

VIII.   The Value of Research at UC
Note: Item deferred.

Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst
Attest: James Carey, UCORP Chair