Committee on Research (COR)  
Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, October 19, 2016

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 11:02 AM on October 19, 2016 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David Noelle presiding.

I. Chair’s Report  
a. Division Council Meeting (DivCo) – October 20, 2016 (Member Saha representing COR)  
Among the topics discussed, the following highlights were provided:
• DivCo discussed intermediate reviews for all of the Deans, in light of the current review for SNS Dean Meza.
• The ideas and planned activities of the new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP were discussed.
• Several proposed modifications to the APM will soon be disseminated for review.
• There was a discussion concerning the renaming of LPSOE and LSOE positions to being “Teaching Professors”.
• Restructuring the administration was also discussed, with a report expected in mid-November.
• With regard to 2020 Project building construction, schematics on Building 1A and 2A have been delivered. COR is expected to play a substantial role in the review process, with an immediate emphasis on Building 2A. Senate Chair Amussen requested that all Committee Chairs nominate participants for the building review process, as well.
• Regent John A. Pérez visited the Academic Senate on October 13 to learn more about work being done at UC Merced.
• Memos from FWAF regarding faculty start-up and incidental funds were discussed, with DivCo requesting that COR opine on the associated issues.
• COC may have identified a Vice Chair for COR.

Chair Noelle reported that he has been invited to a 2020 Project meeting regarding the new building review. Member Scheibner was already planning to attend this meeting, having participated on the review panel last year. Chair Noelle would officially represent the Senate at the reviews, along with the UGC and GC Chairs.

A member raised a question about the status of the Provost and the SAFI plan: Chair Noelle noted this will be a recurring topic. The Provost is meeting with DivCo on October 20th, and CAPRA is also working on the issue, with the proposed plan being available for discussion in December.

b. UCORP Meeting – October 10, 2016
• Arthur Ellis, Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies, was introduced to the COR membership on October 4th. There is some concern over the fact that this position reports to the systemwide Provost, unlike the Senior Vice President for Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship, which reports directly to the President. This might suggest that the UC President may not be taking the role
of basic research as seriously as desired. VP Ellis is looking at increasing the number of new multi-campus research units, pushing for international collaborations, and arguing for knowledge transfer more than technology transfer. In an effort to visualize collaborations and co-authorships to quantify these efforts to the Regents, his office has purchased SciVal from Elsevier.

- There was a report from the Academic Senate on the last Regents Meeting, where there are efforts to move policies into the Bylaws. This would result in a cementing of some key components of the UC shared governance structure that were not already in the Bylaws of the Regents.
- There will be an audit of the Office of the President, with a possible focus of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). This comes after a call for an audit last year, which was postponed by UCOP.
- The Senate is having conversations about tuition increases, and how tuition may track inflation, etc.
- The Health Services Committee presented a report on the lack of coordination between various hospitals in the system, and also the use of faculty titles for clinicians and what role they play in shared governance.
- One member of the Board of Regents is now also the head of Long Beach Community College, increasing pressure for smooth transfer processes from community colleges into the UC system.
- There may be issues with how current enrollment growth targets will specifically impact certain majors, and there being no plans in place to mitigate these impacts.
- A fund of $2 million has been allocated to support projects designed to improve faculty diversity.
- The Legislature appears to be pushing for growth in undergraduate enrollments, but does not seem engaged by the issue of growing graduate student numbers.
- There is an effort to establish and grow innovation centers across all ten campuses, with $2.2 million being allocated to each campus.
- There is a possibility that a systemwide policy regarding the enrollment of non-residents will be proposed. There are some campuses that are seriously dependent on non-resident tuition, but there is great concern about the service of the UC to the state. There is also concern that putting a cap on these numbers could negatively affect campus diversity.
- There may be a systemwide policy proposed on undergraduate admission packets including letters of recommendation. There is a concern that some high schools do not have the staff resources needed to produce strong letters of recommendation, and this could disadvantage students from these schools.
- There is a push to harmonize general education requirements across all three educational systems in the state.
- The role of faculty in contributing patents and other intellectual property to the UC portfolio was discussed, focusing on making the patent process easier for faculty and ensuring that faculty patents play a substantial role in the promotion process.
- There will soon be an announcement of the awards for this round of Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI). The budget has been
reduced to $8 million a year. Requirements/strong suggestions for successful MRPI proposals have become more difficult to meet.

- The lab fee research program is still operational.
- Issues concerning export control were discussed.
- There is an effort to simplify Conflict of Interest disclosure.
- Policy documents are being worked on regarding ownership of research data, so that the University does not lose their rights, but so that people who leave campus can still have access to the data that they produced.
- A major effort surrounds modifications to policy on “openness in research”: some faculty would like to do research with agencies on confidential or sensitive subjects. These would be sources of income to the campuses and opportunities for the training of graduate students for government and industry positions, but, in many ways, these efforts collide with established University policy regarding open access to the results of UC research.
- UCORP requested that COR share our existing policies on ORU establishment. On some other UC campuses, there is a sense that some departments are losing support when a related ORU starts up, shifting resources to the new start-up and away from established departments.

II. Consent Calendar
   a. The September 21, 2016 Minutes were approved as presented.
   b. The October 4, 2016 Minutes were approved as presented.
   c. The October 19, 2016 Agenda was approved as presented.

III. Export Control Regulations – VCORED Traina
   a. VCORED Traina was not in attendance for this meeting, Chair Noelle provided the following preview of the discussion to be had on this subject:

      The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) started a policy of contacting faculty and requesting interviews regarding “deemed exports”. This is when a piece of technology that has export control placed on it (it is restricted from export to specific countries identified by the federal government) is “deemed exported” by exposure to a citizen from one of those countries, working for the UC. This has generated heavy fines for a UC campus where this happened. So far, the DHS interviews are voluntary. There is a sense that this is being used by DHS to gather additional information about research projects on campus, using export control regulations as a means to meet with faculty and ask exploratory questions. If a faculty member agrees to be interviewed, they have the right to schedule such an interview at their convenience, and to request that other parties be present (ORD, Campus Counsel, etc.).

      Chair Noelle will contact VC-ORED Traina and informally request more information on what is being communicated to faculty on this matter.

IV. ORU Proposal Initiation Issues
   a. COR discussed the ORU proposal process, and specifically discussed the issue of a center on campus preparing an ORU proposal, and having concerns about the relevant Dean reviewing their proposal. The center requested that the Senate provide advice
concerning how to move forward, given the perception that the Dean is preventing the ORU from proceeding towards creation. Chair Noelle shared that, under the current process, there is no means to compel a Dean to transmit a favorable statement in support of the center. There is no systemwide guidance on this matter, as the issue is campus-specific.

Chair Noelle will contact VC-ORED Traina regarding clarification of proposal comments that can come from the Dean. There is currently a single paragraph in the current policy document regarding what a proposal must contain. Chair Noelle will also suggest that the relevant Executive Committees should be consulted in situations like this one. This topic will be added to a future COR agenda, considering the potential modification of the ORU policy to include the Executive Committee(s) as part of the review process, with the relevant Dean(s) providing final review.

V. Recommendations Regarding Faculty Start-Up and Incidental Expense Funds
   a. The Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF) committee circulated a memo regarding faculty start-up funds in May 2016. At the time, COR reviewed and opined, supporting the recommendation from FWAF of having a more systematic way of allocating start-up funding and providing faculty with reasonable strategies for its use over time. A member brought up the issue that the handling of these funds is currently done differently between the schools.

The COR Analyst will circulate the FWAF memo, as well as the COR response from May, for review and comment before the next DivCo meeting. This topic will be included in the agenda of the COR meeting scheduled for November 2, 2016, for further discussion.

VI. Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI) ORU Review Committee
   a. The Committee on Committees has contacted the Executive Committees from each school and asked them to find representatives for this review committee. Chair Noelle verified that COR members still had not been able to find volunteers through their internal searches.

VII. Survey of Faculty Concerning Staff Support for Extramural Funding Efforts
   a. A draft of the survey, and the survey application, has been sent to the Survey Coordinating Committee for their review and approval. Chair Noelle intends for the survey to be announced for availability on October 21, 2016. A member requested that the full text of the survey be included with the announcement, allowing survey respondents to have the opportunity to review the full survey content rather than go through the survey one question at a time. The survey closure date should also be stated for clarity.

VIII. Purchasing and Research – Ramen Saha

IX. Identify AY 2016-2017 High Priority Issues for COR

X. Systemwide Review Items
   a. Presidential Policy on International Activities
UCORP is recommending that the issue of risk to the institutional reputation could artificially elevate the level at which these proposals are evaluated. This topic came up in COR during the last academic year, when the draft policy did not have an FAQ. COR members felt that additional clarity is required, and to revisit the issue of risk.

Chair Noelle will circulate a draft memo via email for COR members to review and comment on, with a final memo to be sent by COR Analyst by the deadline.

b. Proposed Revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336

COR has no comments for this review request.

XI. Upcoming Business

XII. Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:04 PM.

Attest:
David Noelle, COR Chair