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Linda Cohen, Chair  
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MEETING
A regular meeting of the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly was called to order by Chair Linda Cohen at 3:34 p.m. on Thursday, January 31st, 2019, in the Academic Senate Conference Room in Aldrich Hall 338.

1. Roll Call
Quorum was met. Members of the Administration and the University community were present. No members of the press were present.

2. Draft Minutes
The Assembly unanimously voted to approve the minutes of December 6, 2018 as distributed.

3. Proposal to Change the Name of the Campuswide Honors Program to the Campuswide Honors Collegium
Charles (Ted) Wright, Faculty Director of the Campuswide Honors Program, presented the Campuswide Honors Program Board’s proposal to rename the Campuswide Honors Program to the Campuswide Honors Collegium. The proposed name reflects the program’s increased size and expanded academic and pedagogical goals and is consistent with the name of UCLA’s honors program. Members of the Assembly asked about how the name “Collegium” was decided upon, if students had opined on the proposed new name, and if consideration was given to the various interpretations of “Collegium.”

Action: The Assembly voted 30 to 2 with 3 abstentions to approve the proposed name change.

4. Student Information System Project Update
Jeff Lefkoff, the Associate Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, provided an update on the status of the Student Information System project.

5. Federally-Funded Research
Pramod Khargonekar, the Vice Chancellor for Research, provided an update on federally-funded research.

UCI has made progress towards the campus strategic plan in its awards, grants, and research expenditures.
In September 2018, UCI joined several research universities and nonprofit organizations in signing a letter to Congressional leaders to express collective opposition to restrictions that would further impede the use of federal funding for fetal tissue research.

6. Announcements by Chair Linda Cohen:
Chair Cohen announced that the 2019 Senate election would open on February 27th, 2018 and be accessible for two weeks. An email reminder will be sent.

Chair Cohen called attention to Bylaw 27, C. which requires faculty representatives to be elected during the winter quarter.

Chair Cohen reminded Assembly members that the next Divisional Assembly meeting would be held on Thursday, March 14th from 3:30-5:00pm.

7. Announcements by Other Administrative Officers
University Librarian, Lorelei Tanji, provided an update on UC Negotiations with Elsevier and thanked the Senate for its continued support during negotiations.

8. Reports of Special Committees:
   None

9. Reports of Standing Committees:
   None

10. Petitions of Students:
   None

11. Unfinished Business:
   None

12. University and Faculty Welfare:
   None

13. New Business:
   None

14. Roll Call
Quorum was met. Members of the Administration and the University community were present. No members of the press were present.

15. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.
Minutes prepared by Laura Gnesda
Attest: Linda Cohen, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division
February 5, 2019

ENRIQUE Lavernia  
PROVOST & EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

MICHAEL DENNIN  
VICE PROVOST FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING  
DEAN, DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

CHARLES E. (TED) WRIGHT, FACULTY DIRECTOR  
CAMPUSWIDE HONORS PROGRAM

RE: PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR THE CAMPUSWIDE HONORS PROGRAM (CHP)

At its meeting on January 31, 2019, the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly reviewed and approved the proposal to change the name of the Campuswide Honors Program (CHP) to the Campuswide Honors Collegium. The Senate Cabinet reviewed and approved the proposal on January 22, 2019. The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) likewise thoroughly reviewed and approved the proposed name change.

This name change will require conforming changes to the name of the Campuswide Honors Program Board and to Bylaw 138. Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience, Council on. The proposal packet is enclosed. If you have any questions related to this action, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Linda Cohen, Chair  
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

C: Judith Stepan-Norris, Vice Provost, Academic Planning  
Tracy Molidor, Associate Vice Provost, Academic Planning  
Miryha Runnerstrom, Chair, Campuswide Honors Program Board  
Patricia Morales, Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management  
Ryan Cherland, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Institutional Research  
Elizabeth Bennett, University Registrar  
Aliya Thomas, University Editor  
James Steintrager, Chair Elect, Academic Senate  
Hugh Roberts, Chair, Council on Educational Policy  
Scott Bartell, Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction  
Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Michelle AuCoin, CEP Analyst  
Laura Gnesda, Senate Analyst
DIVISIONAL SENATE ASSEMBLY

RE: Proposed Name Change for the Campuswide Honors Program

At its meeting of January 22, 2019, the Senate Cabinet reviewed and endorsed the proposal to change the name of the Campuswide Honors Program (CHP) to the Campuswide Honors Collegium. The proposed name better reflects the program’s increased size, expanded academic and pedagogical goals, and is consistent with UCI’s strategic plan. The Senate Campuswide Honors Program Board approved the proposed name change. The Council on Educational Policy also reviewed and approved the proposal. The Cabinet noted that the Campuswide Honors Collegium name is also used at UCLA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENDORSEMENT HISTORY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY</td>
<td>January 10, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENATE CABINET</td>
<td>January 22, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete proposal and relevant documents are enclosed for your review and consideration.

Sincerely,

Linda Cohen, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division
Linda Cohen, Chair, Academic Senate  
James Steintrager, Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate

RE: Interim Report on the Status of the Campuswide Honors Program

We are sending this memo as a status report on changes since the 2014 Review of the Campuswide Honors Program (CHP) and the addition of the creation of an Honors College as an element of the UCI Strategic Plan. We will briefly summarize the key elements of the CHP, the concerns raised in the review, and the actions taken since the review including those related to the campus strategic plan.

Now entering its 30th year, the CHP is a four-year program available to undergraduates in all majors that, at its core, provides a “cohort” experience. With an entering freshman class that has grown in the last several years to over 350 students, the CHP now serves over 1000 students. CHP students take a common set of general education courses together, share Honors housing and space on campus, and are supported by specialized academic advising and co-curricular programming. These elements and the diverse group of motivated students that they help attract to UCI create a unique academic experience that, while integrating with each student’s major, offers a combination of breadth and depth not achievable in typical general education courses. The original, “classic,” CHP curriculum consists of three, year-long core course sequences: Humanities Core, Social Science Core, and Science Core. Under this curriculum, nearly all students take Humanities Core (with some exceptions in Engineering) and essentially all take Social Science Core. Non-science majors take Science Core, while students in the sciences take either Honors Chemistry or Honors Biology. To accommodate growth in the number of students, both four-year students and community college transfers, recent innovations include the newly introduced (AY 2017-18) Sustainable Societies track option in the second and third year, and a number of small elective CHP seminars. Finally, all CHP students conduct undergraduate research and produce an honors thesis or creative project as the capstone of their CHP experience.

Among the challenges facing CHP, the following five were raised in the 2014 review:

1) Potential growth of the program
2) The need for small classes typically associated with “honors” education
3) The perception by some that the program is “elite”
4) Sustainability of and constraints associated with the budget model
5) Visibility of the program

At the time of the review in 2014, the CHP had grown steadily for the previous 4 years, maintaining its size at about 3% of the undergraduate population of UCI, the rough target for the previous decade. 3% is definitely at the low end for honors programs at R1
universities. Since then the CHP has grown somewhat faster than UCI. Initially, this growth reflected primarily growth of the Honors-to-Honors, a joint initiative of the CHP and Admissions to increase community college recruitment into the CHP. More recently there has also been significant growth in the number of four-year students; currently the size of the CHP is close to 4% of the campus. Consistent with Pillar 2 of the Campus Strategic Plan, we expect to grow the size of CHP to be approximately 5% of the undergraduate population, admitting 350 – 400 students per year.

As noted in the review, although there are clear benefits to the campus of increasing the size of the CHP, there are also real risks of diluting the cohort experience that is central to the program. Our solution to this challenge was to see that, for the most part, the cohort experience did not arise from being a part of the program as a whole but from participation in various strongly bonded subgroups within the program: e.g., in the specific honors halls, in co-curricular activities, as well as in the academic sphere. To keep the cohort size experienced by students in the academic program manageable, we introduced the concept of a “track.” We have already implemented the aforementioned second curricular track, Sustainable Societies. This track offers students an additional option in the second and third years that fulfills social science and science GE requirements with an integrated social science/science, 6-course experience. In addition to exploring new content, this track focuses on innovative pedagogy and explicitly addressing key “soft-skills,” such as complex problem solving, critical thinking, teamwork, and communication. It is focuses on addressing current problems in society using an integrated approach. We are currently assessing the impact of this new track as it enters its second year. The plan is to develop a third track that is especially designed for science majors, but includes and invites all majors. This will address one of the issues raised in the review, as we recognize the current structure can be a challenge for certain STEM majors.

Another change instituted largely after the review was the addition of smaller honors seminars, usually capped at 20 students but often smaller. These seminars, open to CHP students in all majors, explore a single topic in depth. Examples of topics include: “How Nations Remember,” “Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics,” “What is Disease?” “Experiments in Music,” “Jurisprudence and Constitutional Law,” “Ethics, Technology and Design,” “The Philosophy and Biology of Sex,” and “Exploring Memory.” Within the context of these topics, students have the opportunity to explore the research process in a variety of disciplines. The seminars help respond to the expectation that an honors program includes smaller classes. Because the core courses that make up the two tracks are GE courses, they tend to be large by these expectations, even though they are smaller than the bulk of GE classes at UCI. The seminars also provide a UCI honors-course experience for the transfer students who enter the CHP through the Honors-to-Honors program; because these students have already satisfied their GE requirements, they do not take the core courses.

As the external review pointed out, in 2014 some administrators, faculty, and students saw Honors education as elitist. Indeed, the rhetoric of attracting like-minded students and offering these select students a curriculum unavailable to other students would seem to fit this label. In point of fact, the CHP is no different from other competitive majors on
campus (e.g., Computer Science, Engineering, Business) in being selective or in offering its students a curriculum unavailable to those not in the major. The CHP differs from a major in that the students represent the diversity of thought found across all university majors and its curriculum is intentionally interdisciplinary. The fact that CHP students take a majority of the same courses together provides an experience not dissimilar to a major, but the focus of this program is interdisciplinarity, an approach to learning and research that has become more and more critical in the 21st century. Thus, CHP has the opportunity to model interdisciplinarity in general for the rest of the campus.

The way in which the elitist label came closer to the mark was in the lack of diversity of the students recruited into the CHP prior to the fall of 2014. Since its inception, CHP invitees have been selected by the schools from a subset of UCI applicants. For pragmatic reasons before 2014, the process of generating the pool from which the selection was made relied solely on high school GPA and composite SAT scores. This was back in the era of the API (Academic Performance Index) rankings of California high schools. When we looked at the API breakdown of the class that entered in 2013, we were shocked to discover that 50% of that year's class came from high schools in the top API decile and fewer than 10% came from schools in the bottom half of this ranking. (For UCI as a whole that year the analogous numbers were closer to being evenly distributed, 21% and 33%.) To rectify this imbalance, working with Admissions, the CHP began to make three changes.

- We initiated an outreach program to rural high schools and community colleges.
- We quadrupled the number of community colleges eligible to participate in the Honors-to-Honors program, eventually doubling the number of students entering the CHP through this path.
- We developed a much broader set of selection criteria and created a tool to help the schools use these criteria to select invitees.

Although there is still a long way to go, the results of these initiatives have already been dramatic. The API rankings are no longer available; however, between the CHP entering classes of 2013 and 2017, the proportion of first-generation students has increased from 8% to 31%, the proportion of low-income students has increased from 3% to 21%, and the proportion of Hispanic/Latino students has increased from 6% to 17%. The remarkable thing is that this increase in diversity has been achieved without low average high school GPA or SAT scores.

An issue raised in every review of CHP is the budget model. The current staff/programming costs are approximately $426,000K per year. This includes the necessary academic advising support and targeted programming. With the current student population growth, this number will expand to approximately $700K. And, it does not include funding for faculty to teach in the program or interact with the students. Historically, the CHP has been successful relying on the good will of faculty and Deans who largely support the cost of the classic-track courses. It is true that the student credit hours from the core courses, which are relatively large GE courses, do go to the relevant school. However, as the 2014 review explicitly noted, this "compensation" model places real constraints on curricular innovation. The Sustainable Societies track was developed
and implemented using a different model. Initial support from DUE has provided funding so that CHP provide the home departments of the faculty teaching these courses with partial buy outs. This in turn allowed the faculty director to work with those faculty members to develop innovative, interdisciplinary courses – each of the six quarters of this track are co-taught by faculty from different schools. Ideally, if it is successful, this approach might even be adopted/adapted beyond CHP for all UCI students.

Moving forward, an Honors College, with an endowment through both a naming gift and named faculty fellows would provide the CHP with financial independence and stability. It would also free up the budget currently used to support the Sustainable Societies experiment for other student-success initiatives within DUE. There are two main funding opportunities moving forward. We are pursuing with potential donors the concept of “Faculty Fellows”, named at $1 million each. The basic structure of these positions is that faculty fellows would serve a 3- to 5-year term, remain in their home department, but teach one honors course and interact with students in various out-of-class settings. The endowments would cover a contribution to teaching buyout for their home department/school, a small research fund for the faculty, and some operating costs of CHP. The other funding opportunity is a naming gift in the $30 - $50 million range to cover operating costs, instruction, and if large enough, student scholarships. Separately, we are fundraising to increase the scholarship funds.

The 2014 review also highlighted the lack of visibility of the CHP. The CHP budget does not include funding for alumni development, advancement, or, most importantly, recruiting students prior to their application to UCI. Together, these omissions limit the impact of CHP as a recruiting tool. Historically, the CHP has made a major contribution in helping bring outstanding students to UCI. Program staff recruit actively, and work closely with the Office of Admissions, to yield students in all majors who become some of UCI’s best. However, due to lack of funding, efforts have by necessity focused primarily on helping yield students already admitted to UCI through major recruiting events such as Honors Experience Day. This event is important. Data show that attendance at it increases the odds of a prospective student accepting our invitation by a factor of 10. Also, as noted in the external review, many students report that invitation to the CHP was what changed their estimation of UCI from a backup to their first choice. Expanding on this experience and aligned with UCI’s Strategic Goal to be a “Campus of First Choice”, we are looking to leverage the best qualities of CHP to recruit top students to apply to UCI as their school of choice.

At its core, planning to convert the CHP into an Honors College has involved a strategy that focused on preserving the core principles of a supportive, diverse learning community that make CHP excellent, while expanding the experience to more students (multiple tracks), attracting more and diverse top students to UCI (name recognition and resources for individualized review of students), and increasing visibility to donors (to finally achieve the goal of stable funding and supporting creative academic efforts). Given the changes already in place, the Senate Campuswide Honors Board approved the concept of changing the name to Campuswide Honors College, with the name reflecting the increased size, multiple curricular tracks, and the goals of enhancing the prestige and
visibility of the program and in so doing making it more attractive for donors. After discussion with Senate leadership, administration, and UCOP, we are proposing to initially change the name officially to *Campuswide Honors Collegium*, using the Latin for “College.” This name change captures a number of features of the current process. First, an official change to College requires system-wide approval and an exception, as the official use of “College” within UC is a “Degree granting entity,” which CHP is not, nor do we plan for it to become. Electing to use “Collegium” at this stage is a simple name change that requires only campus approval. Also, the main use of the Latin will be in official communication and on the diploma (achieving CHP is recognized on the diploma), where Latin makes sense. There are some concerns that a switch to *Collegium* may not be as recognizable as “College.” However, in conversations and everyday usage, we expect people to use “College,” as it is natural to use the translation of Collegium (as UCLA does), and at UCI, we expect the acronym “CHC” will be used more often than not. Also, testing with an admittedly small sample, of faculty, students, staff, and community members found positive views of *Collegium*, with admittedly some of the concerns already mentioned being acknowledged. Finally, using *Collegium* initially, as it only requires local approval, leaves open the remote possibility of returning to the CHP name should it become clear that fundraising is not going to be successful and we have to return the original program. In summary, the proposed use of Campuswide Honors Collegium captures the increased scope and prestige of the program and provides a level of excitement appropriate to the fundraising efforts while retaining maximum flexibility moving forward to adjust the name, if needed. The Honors Program Board has approved the change to *Campuswide Honors Collegium*. Please advise on any further steps that would be necessary for this simple name change.

Charles E. (Ted) Wright. Faculty Director
Campuswide Honors Program

Miryha Runnerstrom, Chair
Honors Program Board

Michael B. Dennin
Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning and
Dean, Division of Undergraduate Education
January 16, 2019

LINDA COHEN, CHAIR
UC IRVINE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: CEP approval of name change to Campuswide Honors Program

Dear Chair Cohen,

CEP has approved a request from the Campuswide Honors Program’s Faculty Director, the chair of the Academic Senate Honors Program Board, and the Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning to change the name of the Campuswide Honors Program to the Campuswide Honors Collegium. CEP agrees with the proposers’ thinking that the name, Campuswide Honors Collegium, better reflects the program’s expanded academic and pedological goals, as the new name conjures a more prestigious honors program of larger scale and depth. This image of the program, in turn, is expected to provide a heightened level of visibility and enthusiasm consistent with UCI’s strategic plan and the program’s intensified fundraising efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh Roberts
Chair, Council on Educational Policy
February 1, 2019

JANET NAPOLITANO, PRESIDENT  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL BROWN, PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Federal Restrictions on Fetal Tissue Research

Dear Janet and Michael,

At its January 23, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed the attached letter from the San Francisco Senate Division urging the Academic Senate and UCOP to speak out against new federal-level restrictions on NIH funding for legally-acquired fetal tissue in biomedical research.

UCSF makes four specific recommendations to UCOP for coordinating a response to these threats: 1) organize the University’s scientific community into a policy advocacy network; 2) sponsor academic forums on bioethics; 3) commission white papers that defend fetal tissue research; and 4) organize direct action on advocacy for fetal tissue research. It will be the pleasure of the Academic Senate to participate with Academic Affairs and the campuses in bringing these recommendations to fruition.

It has been noted that the recent political realignments in Washington may reduce the immediate urgency of the matter and make is less likely that the next budget appropriation will include the threatened restrictions. However, these short-run political changes in no way eliminate our more general and ongoing concerns about political attacks on science and academic freedom that threaten not only UC researchers but also the nation’s prosperity, health, and scientific leadership. These attacks only underscore the need for UC to take a public stand in support of a broad range of research and fundamental principles concerning science and academic freedom.

The Academic Senate looks forward to working with you on this issue. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

DMS

DMS 15 - Item 2-1
January 3, 2019

Robert C. May, PhD
Chair, Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: NIH Sponsored Research – Fetal Tissue Research

During the second half of 2018 the federal government increased its attention and apparent opposition to the use of legally acquired fetal tissue in biomedical research. The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate urges the University of California Office of the President to coordinate a response to the federal government’s recent threats to fetal tissue research.

We present the following recommendations:

• UCOP should create a network of scientists who engage in research that may be subject to political opposition. The network should amplify the voices of subject matter experts in the process of developing public policy including but not limited to federal legislation and regulations. We offer the UCSF Program on Reproductive Health and the Environment as an example of a rapid response network that operates at the intersection of science, medicine, policy, and community.

• UCOP should sponsor a forum for academics from the humanities, social sciences, and health sciences to consider key questions of bioethics. UC could expand its support of the UC North Bioethics Collaboratory as a first step.

• UCOP should engage UC researchers who conduct fetal tissue research to develop a white paper defending the use of legally acquired fetal tissue in biomedical research.

• UCOP should organize direct action to engage policymakers and advocate for federal sponsorship of research using fetal tissue. UC Advocacy Network could be the platform for this effort.

We believe these actions will strengthen UC and better prepare it to respond to an uncertain political climate.

Enclosed please find a letter from the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Research addressing specific concerns about the current threats to fetal tissue research.

Sincerely,

David Teitel, MD, 2017-19 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Encl. (1)
December 20, 2018

Professor David Teitel, MD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

RE: Federal Research Policy – Fetal Tissue Research

Dear Chair Teitel,

We are writing to express concern about the federal government’s recent actions to limit fetal tissue research and its politicization of science.

- On September 24, 2018, HHS terminated a contract with a provider of fetal tissue and began an audit of all acquisitions involving human fetal tissue. In addition, HHS has initiated a comprehensive review of all research involving fetal tissue.¹
- On December 3, 2018, the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) notified UCSF of its intent to modify a longstanding contract with the National Institutes of Health (NIH).² The contract in question funds a laboratory that conducts research using fetal tissue, and the contract modification would allow only a 90-day extension as opposed to an annual renewal.
- On December 13, 2018, the House Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits, and Administrative Rules and House Subcommittee on Government Operations convened a joint hearing to evaluate the ethical considerations of fetal tissue research and explore alternative research methods.³

The University of California (UC) is a world-class research institution that values scientific inquiry. UCSF shares that value as a premier biomedical research university committed to transforming health through scientific discovery. Breakthroughs and innovations that enable treatment of diseases require access to the best available resources for experimentation. Some laboratories investigating critical diseases

---

currently use legally procured fetal tissue. However, some policymakers\(^4\) and interest groups\(^5\) have called into question the future of fetal tissue research and advocated to limit or ban the use of fetal tissue in research. Limits on fetal tissue research have already caused interruptions to research programs and could permanently alter the capacity of investigators to develop therapies for diseases such as pediatric cancer, HIV, Zika, and eye disease.

This matter reflects a larger problem with the politicization of science. As scientists we value public policy based on scientific consensus. Unfortunately, government policy-makers can be “captured” by special interests that ignore, discount, manipulate, or reject scientific knowledge. The current federal government, influenced by interest-group activists, is politicizing science related to fetal tissue research. During the recent joint subcommittee hearing on fetal tissue research, Congressional Republicans invited the testimony of activists from the Lozier Institute, which is self-described as “an organization dedicated to electing candidates and pursuing policies that will reduce and ultimately end abortion.” The witnesses from the Lozier Institute called into question the necessity of fetal tissue research and asserted that alternative methods can substitute fetal tissue models. Their testimony was challenged by an internationally renowned scientist, and MacArthur Foundation awardee who represented the International Society for Stem Cell Research. The scientist testified that “Fetal tissue is an essential resource for study and developing therapies for cancer, HIV, Zika, tuberculosis, and other devastating diseases.” Currently, the use of fetal tissue to humanize mice models employed in HIV studies, for instance, is the best available method to recapitulate the human immune system and in them create viable vaccines. Also, fetal cells are essential for car-T therapy which is revolutionizing cancer treatment. Peri-natal research using fetal tissues is directly relevant to human health while alternatives are mere extrapolations. “The alternatives mentioned (in the hearing) may be useful at times but cannot fully replace fetal tissue.” A solution to the politicization of science is to ensure representation of the scientific community during public policy debates. In this instance, we should amplify the voices of subject matter experts of biomedical research.

As researchers we value clear and consistent expectations in the administration of research. Funding that is typically renewed annually, and expected to be renewed annually, should be terminated on short notice only in instances of good cause. At present, the federal government is considering whether to terminate a sponsored research agreement with a UCSF investigator on the basis that the laboratory uses fetal tissue. A sudden termination of the contract would threaten ongoing investigations. The NIH should renew the contract in question because political opposition to legal fetal tissue research is not a sufficient reason to terminate an existing sponsored research agreement. We urge UCORP to write a letter to UCOP advocating for the continuation of the contract in question.

\(^4\) “We urge all states and Congress to make it a crime to acquire, transfer, or sell fetal tissues from elective abortions for research, and we call on Congress to enact a ban on any sale of fetal body parts.” Republican Platform 2016. https://prod-cdn-static.gop.com/media/documents/DRAFT_12_FINAL%5B1%5D-ben_1468872234.pdf

In order to ensure biomedical researchers have access to the best available resources needed for scientific discovery, we urge UCORP to write a letter to UCOP condemning the politization of science and defending the use of fetal tissue research. Furthermore, we urge UCORP to write a letter encouraging UC to engage its biomedical community to identify scientists with expertise in fetal tissue research and create a forum for those researchers to communicate and engage with policymakers.

We anticipate further action from the government that will diminish our capacity to investigate disease and frustrate evidence-based policy making. In order to respond to those threats, the University should take coordinated and proactive measures to protect and preserve existing research programs, and elevate the voices of UC scientists in the realm of public policy.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

Lea T. Grinberg

Lea T. Grinberg, MD, PhD
Chair, Committee on Research
UCSF Academic Senate
2018-2019

Cc: Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Chair, UCSF APB
Andrew Baird, PhD, Chair, UCORP
Stuart Gansky, MS, DrPH, UCSF Representative, UCORP
Lindsey Criswell, MD, MPH, DSC, Vice Chancellor for Research, UCSF
Keith Yamamoto, PhD, Vice Chancellor for Science Policy and Strategy, UCSF
Kenneth Laslavic, JD, UCSF Senior Senate Analyst
Chapter III: Organization
Section 2: Divisional Senate Assembly
Bylaw 27. Election of Representatives
(Am 5 Jun 03)

A. Procedures
Each Faculty of the Division shall devise its own procedures for nomination and election of Representatives and for the filling of vacancies that occur. If vacancies are not filled within thirty (30) days, exclusive of administrative recesses, the Committee on Committees of the Division shall name a Representative from the Faculty.

B. Apportionment
The representation of the Faculties of the Division shall be based on the proportion of Senate membership in each Faculty, in accordance with the formula in Appendix IV. The Faculty Chair of each Faculty shall be a representative of the Faculty; any additional representatives shall be elected by the Faculties as Representatives to the Divisional Senate Assembly. The Divisional Senate Assembly shall be reapportioned by the Committee on Committees every five years or at any time when a Faculty is added or eliminated. The apportioned representatives shall be elected from the voting Senate membership of the Faculties. (Am 7 May 98)

C. Terms
Representatives of each Faculty shall be elected for two-year terms in the winter quarter and shall serve from September 1 following the election.

D. Multiple Appointments
Members of the Division holding appointments in more than one Faculty must vote for Representatives and be counted for apportionment in the Faculties in which their major appointments are held. Members holding equally split appointments shall have the option of choosing the Faculty in which they vote for Representatives and are counted for apportionment.

E. Replacement of Representatives
In Faculties with more than one Representative, terms of elected members are staggered, approximately one-half to be elected every year. In the first election, one-half of the members (rounded to the next higher integer) shall be elected for one year so that in each subsequent year only one-half the terms shall expire.

F. Limitation of Terms
No elected Representative may serve consecutively for more than two terms or portions thereof.
How far will Plan S spread?

Since the September 2018 launch of the Europe-backed program to mandate immediate open access (OA) to scientific literature, 16 funders in 13 countries have signed on. That's still far shy of Plan S's ambition: to convince the world's major research funders to require immediate OA to all published papers stemming from their grants. Whether it will reach that goal depends in part on details that remain to be settled, including a cap on the author charges that funders will pay for OA publication. But the plan has gained momentum: In December 2018, China stunned many by expressing strong support for Plan S. This month, a national funding agency in Africa is expected to join, possibly followed by a second U.S. funder. Others around the world are considering whether to sign on.

Plan S, scheduled to take effect on 1 January 2020, has drawn support from many scientists, who welcome a shake-up of a publishing system that can generate large
profits while keeping taxpayer-funded research results behind paywalls. But publishers (including AAAS, which publishes *Science*) are concerned, and some scientists worry that Plan S could restrict their choices.

If Plan S fails to grow, it could remain a divisive mandate that applies to only a small percentage of the world's scientific papers. (Delta Think, a consulting company in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, estimates that the first 15 funders to back Plan S accounted for 3.5% of the global research articles in 2017.) To transform publishing, the plan needs global buy-in. The more funders join, the more articles will be published in OA journals that comply with its requirements, pushing publishers to flip their journals from paywall-protected subscriptions to OA, says librarian Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, the chief digital scholarship officer at the University of California, Berkeley.

Robert-Jan Smits, the European Commission's OA envoy in Brussels, who is one of the architects of Plan S, says publishers have stalled by emphasizing the need for broad participation. "The big publishers told me: 'Listen, we can only flip our journals [to OA] if this is signed by everyone. So first go on a trip around the world and come back in 20 years. Then we can talk again,'" Smits recalls. "Some people try to do anything to keep the status quo."

OA mandates are nothing new: In Europe, 74 research funders require that papers be made free at some point, up from 12 in 2005, according to the Registry of Open Access Repository Mandates and Policies. But existing policies typically allow a delay of 6 or 12 months after initial publication, during which papers can remain behind a publisher paywall.

Plan S requires immediate OA; it also insists that authors retain copyright and that hybrid journals, which charge subscriptions but also offer a paid OA option, sign "transformative agreements" to switch to fully OA.

Some European funders think Plan S goes too far. "We and many German [organizations] think that we should not be as prescriptive as Plan S is," says Wilhelm Krull, secretary general of the Volkswagen Foundation, a private research funder in Hannover, Germany. The country is Europe's top producer of scientific papers, ahead of the United Kingdom and France, whose main funding agencies have signed on to Plan S. Germany's biggest federal funding agency, DFG, said it supports Plan S's goals but prefers to let researchers drive the change. Other funders, including the Estonian Research Council, say the timeline is too tight, and they will reconsider joining when Plan S's impact is clearer.
Other European funders are weighing pros and cons. Spain's science ministry says it is analyzing the potential repercussions of Plan S on the country's science and finances, and on researchers' careers. FNRS, the fund for scientific research in Belgium's Wallonia-Brussels region, is waiting for Plan S to announce its cap on article-processing charges (APCs), the fees for publishing in OA journals, which the coalition's funders have pledged to pay. "We're not ready to commit if the costs are too high," says Véronique Halloin, secretary-general of FNRS, whose existing OA mandate caps APC reimbursement at €500—which Halloin admits is on the low side.

Many await the European Commission's policy: Although its grants represent a small percentage of research funding in Europe, its OA rules can influence national mandates. The commission's research chief, Carlos Moedas, supports Plan S, and its 7-year funding program Horizon Europe, which will begin in 2021, contains general statements of support for OA. Plan S's rules will go into the program's model contract for grants, Smits says.

Smits has found unexpected support from China, which now produces more scientific papers than any other country. Last month, China's largest government research funder and two national science libraries issued strong statements backing Plan S's goals. "China needs to contribute to international open access [and] open its research results to its own people," says Zhang Xiaolin of Shanghai-Tech University in China, who chairs the Strategic Planning Committee of the Chinese National Science and Technology Library. Even if Chinese organizations do not join Plan S formally, similar OA policies in China would have a "huge, perhaps decisive impact on the publishing industry," MacKie-Mason says.

For now, North America is not following suit. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation was the first Plan S participant outside Europe, and another private funder may follow. But U.S. federal agencies are sticking to policies developed after a 2013 White House order to make peer-reviewed papers on work they funded freely available within 12 months of publication. "We don't anticipate making any changes to our
model," said Brian Hitson of the U.S. Department of Energy in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, who directs that agency's public access policy.

Nor are the three main federal research funders in Canada ready to change their joint 2015 OA policy. Plan S is "a bold and aggressive approach, which is why we want to make sure we've done our homework to ensure it would have the best effect on Canadian science," says Kevin Fitzgibbons, executive director of corporate planning and policy at Canada's Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council in Ottawa.

Outside Europe and North America, funders gave *Science* mixed responses about Plan S. India, the third biggest producer of scientific papers in the world, will "very likely" join Plan S, says Krishnaswamy VijayRaghavan in New Delhi, principal scientific adviser to India's government. But the Russian Science Foundation is not planning to join. South Africa's National Research Foundation says it "supports Plan S in principle," but wants to consult stakeholders before signing on. Jun Adachi of the National Institute of Informatics in Tokyo, an adviser to the Japan Alliance of University Library Consortia for E-Resources, says that despite interest from funders and libraries, OA has yet to gain much traction in his country.

South America has a strong tradition of OA repositories and fee-free publishing, often with government subsidies. Bianca Amaro, president of LA Referencia, a Santiago-based Latin American network of repositories, says Plan S takes a more "systemic view" than previous policies, and she values its pledge to monitor APCs and their impact—a worry for lower-income countries. "We'll see how Europe handles this," she says.

Of course, MacKie-Mason says, not every funding agency will agree that Plan S is the best way to universal OA. "But some will agree it's good enough and perhaps our best chance to transform the publishing industry soon," he says. It comes in the wake of often incremental OA initiatives in the past 15 years, and some disagreement about the best route to OA.

"In the OA movement, it seems to a lot of people that you have to choose a road: green or gold or diamond," says Colleen Campbell, director of the OA2020 initiative at the Max Planck Digital Library in Munich, Germany, referring to various styles of OA. "Publishers are sitting back laughing at us while we argue about different shades" instead of focusing on a shared goal of complete, immediate OA. Because of its bold, stringent requirements, she and others think Plan S can galvanize advocates to align their efforts to shake up the publishing system.

The Plan S team predicts steady growth in the coming months. Funders will discuss Plan S in São Paulo, Brazil, at the May meeting of the Global Research Council, an informal group of funding agencies. Although Smits will leave the European Commission in March, the Plan S coalition is seeking a replacement who can keep the momentum going.

"The combined weight of Europe and China is probably enough to move the system," says astrophysicist Luke Drury, of the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies and the
lead author of a cautiously supportive response to Plan S by All European Academies, a federation of European academies of sciences and humanities.

If Plan S does succeed in bringing about a fairer publishing system, he says, a transition to worldwide OA is sure to follow. "Somebody has to take the lead, and I'm pleased that it looks like it's coming from Europe."

*With reporting by Jeffrey Brainard, Sanjay Kumar, Dennis Normile, and Brian Owens.*
Elsevier journal editors resign, start rival open-access journal

Submitted by Lindsay McKenzie on January 14, 2019 - 3:00am


Today, the same team is launching a new fully open-access journal called Quantitative Science Studies[3]. The journal will be for and by the academic community and will be owned by the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI). It will be published jointly with MIT Press.

The editorial board of the Journal of Informetrics said in a statement that they were unanimous in their decision to quit. They contend that scholarly journals should be owned by the scholarly community rather than by commercial publishers, should be open access under fair principles[4], and publishers should make citation data freely available.

Elsevier said in a statement that it regretted the board’s decision and that it had tried to address their concerns.

“Since hearing of their concerns, we have explained our position and made a number of concrete proposals to attempt to bridge our differences,” Tom Reller, vice president of global communications at Elsevier, said in a statement. “Ultimately they decided to step down and we respect that decision and wish them the best in their future endeavors.”

Elsevier’s response to the board’s requests can be accessed in full here[5].

This is not the first time the editorial board of an Elsevier-owned journal has quit to start a competing journal. In 2015, the editorial board of top linguistics journal Lingua made headlines by leaving their posts[6] and announcing plans to start a rival open-access publication called Glossa.

Like Lingua, the Journal of Informetrics[7] is considered one of the top journals in its field. It was started in 2007 and focuses on research of measures used to assess the impact of academic research, including bibliometrics, scientometrics, webometrics and altmetrics.
There have been similar editorial revolts at journals owned by other publishers, many predating the *Lingua* case, but this method of so-called flipping journals from subscription-based access to completely open access is still relatively unusual [8].

The resignations of the *Journal of Informetrics* editorial team comes at a time of considerable scrutiny for Elsevier. Last month the publisher lost two large European customers -- the Max Planck Society [9] and the Hungarian Consortium [10] -- after rejecting their proposals to change its subscription model. Elsevier is also locked in negotiations with the University of California System [11], which has similarly threatened not to renew its contract unless the publisher changes how it charges customers to publish and access research.

Ludo Waltman, editor in chief of the *Journal of Informetrics*, intends to step down from his role and become editor in chief of the new journal when his current contract with Elsevier expires. His end date has not yet been determined. Waltman said the editorial board has agreed to review all accepted submissions to the journal but will not review any new submissions.

"The most important thing is that authors who currently have manuscripts under submission should not suffer negative consequences from the current situation," he said. "This is something on which Elsevier and the editorial board are in agreement."

Cassidy Sugimoto, president of ISSI and a former member of the *JOI* editorial board, said the decision to resign was not easy. The board has been negotiating with Elsevier for more than 18 months, she said.

Waltman said that it was, however, quickly obvious that some of the requests made by the board were "non-negotiable for Elsevier."

Sugimoto said that ISSI, a scholarly society whose members were heavily involved in the production of *JOI*, wanted greater control of the Elsevier-owned journal but were told by the publisher that its ownership was not up for discussion.

"The editorial board were members of ISSI, the reviewers were members of ISSI. Our society was actively participating in the labor of this journal without any remuneration," she said.

Proposals to transition the journal from hybrid to fully open access and reduce the journal's article-processing charges were also rejected, said Vincent Larivière, interim editor in chief of the new journal QSS. He said another sticking point was that the editorial board wanted the citation data in the journal's articles to be freely available because this information is very important to researchers in the field. Elsevier said in its response [12] to the board that it offers unrestricted access to some journal data, but it is not willing to make journal article reference lists available for free.

Elsevier launched the *Journal of Informetrics* in collaboration with the scientific community, the publisher said. Founding *JOI* editor Leo Egghe thanked the publisher for its role in developing and managing the journal in his final editorial [13] in 2014. The publisher intends to keep the *Journal of Informetrics* running and will move to appoint a new editorial team and board, it said.
Johan Rooryck, president of the Fair Open Access Alliance, said JOI is the sixth journal that his organization has helped to flip in the past four years.

"We have developed a blueprint to help journal editors leave big publishers and launch new journals," he said.

Rooryck, who was editor of Lingua and now leads Glossa, said the most challenging aspect of starting a new open-access journal is securing funding to ensure it survives. He said Glossa is doing well and has more submissions now than Lingua did. Lingua has been described as a “zombie” journal by some scholars, but it continues to receive hundreds of submissions.

QSS is being launched with some financial support from the MIT Libraries. In order to make all articles open access, the journal will charge an article-processing charge of $600 for ISSI members and $800 for nonmembers -- significantly less than the $1,800 Elsevier charged. For researchers without the ability to pay to have their articles be open access, their fees will be covered for three years by the German National Library of Science and Technology (TIB).

Representatives of MIT Libraries and MIT Press would not disclose how much financial support they are offering the new journal.

Nick Lindsay, director of journals and open access for MIT Press, said the press has a "long-standing commitment to open access across both its books and journals" and is a natural home for the journal because of its interest in data science. Lindsay said when ISSI approached him about creating a new journal, he "jumped at the chance to work with them."

Chris Bourg, director of MIT Libraries, said financial support for QSS is "part of a deliberate strategy of using our resources to support the kinds of changes in scholarly communication and access that are consistent with our vision: a world where enduring, abundant, equitable, and meaningful access to information serves to empower and inspire humanity."

There has been speculation recently that Elsevier may have offered extra money to journal editors who were considering resigning and launching rival journals. ScienceGuide published an article in December alleging the offer of extra payment.

Reller, Elsevier's spokesman, tweeted in response, “ScienceGuide has it wrong: Nearly all of our 20,000 handling editors are compensated for their fantastic work and conversations about the right amount occur all the time. There is nothing particular about that now in the context of 'flipping' journals."

Rooryck said he believes the rumor is true, but the publisher has denied that any such activity occurred.

JOI's editor in chief, Waltman, said he receives several thousand euros a year for his work on the journal and was not offered any more money to stay. No one else on the editorial board receives any compensation from Elsevier, said Sugimoto.

For his part, Larivière said he has no regrets or sadness about leaving JOI behind.
"A journal is a shell. It's what's inside the shell that counts," he said. "What we'll have at this new journal is exactly the same group of people, the same topics, the same science."
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