



President's Planning and Policy Council

November 4, 2024 – 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

1. Welcome (Kaia Tollefson)

- Everly Sue: 1 week old
- Policy on Animals on Campus
 - 1st reading 4/29/2024
 - Was to be 2nd reading today – but with new advisors at the table this year and new concerns raised about the policy, we will return it to first reading.
- Polling:
 - While we are not a voting body, given our conversation about the hospitality policy we need to anticipate that we will not always be unanimous in our policy recommendations to the President.
 - I want to be sure that people's dissenting voices "count." While we can keep coming back for third, fourth, fifth readings if we determine that to be needed (I'll be the decider on that point), we need to have a process in place for the President to know how strongly recommended any given policy is.
 - So far, we have sent unanimous recommendations to him.
 - Today, if there is any dissent when I ask the question about whether there is objection to a policy being ready for the President's consideration, we'll take a poll.
 - It will be helpful for Rich to know if a policy is coming to him with 75% PPPC agreement, 90%, etc.

2. Policy Manual Updates

- a. University Advancement (Ritchie LeRoy) 10 min
 - i Three policies – fund raising events, gifts to agency, gifts-in-kind
 - ii All three are things UA will be working on in April for first reading
 - iii Last updated in 2018 which came after an audit of UA

3. Policies for Review (Link to all policies)

a. Recommendation (2nd Reading)

- i Policy on Animals on Campus (Drake Massey) 10 min – ready for President's review (unanimous)
- Chief intro 9:08
 - Had been to the point of approval in 2023
 - Most recent changes – dogs to service animals
 - Added two questions that can be asked to determine whether an animal is a service animal
 - Matt:

- Definitions and animal nuisances – a lot in here that ensnares wild animals as nuisances. Drake: Intent of the policy – animals that have been brought to campus vs. disposing of an animal in the wild.
 - *Revision: This policy purposely excludes wild animals as well as those used for research and teaching purposes.*
 - Feeders:
 - Feeding of cats – feral cats work their way under buildings. People feed them, and we go to 15 cats meowing under a building. Attracts other predators onto campus to hunt them.
 - Prohibited human intervention includes but is not limited to feeding, etc. Residential areas not included in this policy.
 - Domestic animals may be confined in vehicles – add something about conforming to law. *“for a reasonable period of time, in accordance with law, as long as...”*
- ii Policy on Sustainable Practices (Roxane Beigel-Coryell) 10 min 9:23-
 - Last meeting suggested removal of goals, timelines – create an admin detail to link to which can be adjusted over time
 - Add link to policy
 - Unanimous agreement
- iii Policy on Hospitality, Prizes, Awards, Gifts and Incentives (Bradley Olin) 10 min 9:27-
 - Third reading
 - Receives a lot of scrutiny at CO / audit level – navigating both local needs as well as striking balance with systemwide dynamics
 - Break out Administrative Detail -- GSA rates change regularly
 - Stephanie:
 - Stripped out parts that are duplicated in CO policy
 - Rates – procedure not policy
 - We are navigating systemwide tightening of hospitality policy
 - We are pivoting to Concur
 - Team is navigating CO as well as local
 - Benchmarked local restaurants – 2088, Wood Ranch. Dinner rate came up, highest at \$67. Reasonable to say \$75 was enough. However, went to a higher-end restaurant – Larsen’s in Oxnard. That was \$120 as highest meal. Oxnard has a higher tax rate (9.5%, Camarillo is 7.25%)
 - Compared our 75 benchmark with SF, Northridge – both \$80.
 - Recommendation to keep the rate at \$75 – as is. If we do run into challenges with local spend, opp to adjust with Cabinet.
 - Keeping in mind budget challenges ahead.
 - Perceptions need to be considered
 - Covers campus, Site Authority – trying to navigate a finding for the SA, a finding on hospitality, have an audit starting next week – have to clear this finding so it’s not caught up in SA. Are some political things to navigate. Also a finding with UAS audit. It’s ready to be cleared by CO and have one pending policy that if PPPC recommends so we can clear that policy as well. Trying to avoid a red mark at the system level. We are measured by how quickly we clear these audit findings.
 - Discussion
 - Dr FT – appreciate the team’s research for due diligence

- Clarification – price points you are recommending, per meal of inclusive of taxes and fees and gratuity?
 - \$75 includes gratuity and tax
 - Helen: The text – not getting here what is an allowable vs. not allowable expense. This is really stripped down. Don't see policy – will it all be in procedure?
 - This will be in procedure
 - Allowable expenses are in CSU policy
 - Dottie: Will there be an opportunity to see the procedure once drafted?
 - Stephanie – will bring back for review
 - Dr. Olin – recommend this remain policy governing body exclusively, work with administrative groups to refine and/or address procedures
 - Eboni: There will be a sub-administrative meeting/conversation across divisions for feedback on the procedure. This policy/procedure impacts everyone. Clarify – there will be formal feedback? Bradley: Yes
 - Stephanie: We do reach out to campus partners for feedback regularly.
 - This policy was shared with two groups and procedure, too
 - Have this practice in place in Financial Services
 - Unanimous agreement – ready for President's review
- iv Policy on Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (Colleen Forest) 10 min 9:40
 - One change – University Registrar is responsible for biannual review of policy
 - Borrowing an approach from SF and Humboldt which designates registrar as responsible for this
 - No other changes made
 - Updates overall
 - Definitions – added def of parent, student to include applicants
 - Cleaned up duplication of custodians of record
 - Unanimous agreement
- v Policy on Principal Investigator (Saiqa Anne Qureshi) 10 min 9:42
 - No changes made
 - Unanimous
- vi Policy on Misconduct in HHS-Supported Research (Saiqa Anne Qureshi) 10 min
 - Policy on Misconduct – removed in HHS Supported Research
 - Title change
 - Unanimous agreement
- vii Policy on Research and Sponsored Programs Records Retention (Saiqa Anne Qureshi) 10 min 9:44
 - Consulted with Carlos
 - Data retention and disposal – he wanted to specify secure disposal. Added in detail. Ahead
 - Access control measures to control sensitive measures – added that detail at his request
 - Electronic records – he wanted us to highlight security measures – using approved systems of record
 - Discussion
 - How does it work once we've

- Christina – these three policies to Policy Clearinghouse – will look for follow-up on that process

b. **Discussion (1st Reading)** All Saiqa Anne – whatever time remains is hers

ii. Policy on Sponsored Projects Administration (Saiqa Anne Qureshi)

- Like the opportunity to be able to look at it and be responsive to it
- Unanimous support for sending to President

iii. Policy on Principal Investigator Financial Conflict of Interest (Saiqa Anne Qureshi)

- Removing financial adding commitment
- More substantive changes –expanded to match usual expectations – includes financial conflict of interest, just not in title
- Removed references to NIH
- Same defs of financial conflict of interest – highlights types of conflict of interest – financial, non-financial, conflict of commitment
- Not removal of anything but expansion/addition expected at a national level
- Training is now for conflict of interest and conflict of commitment – joint commitment
- Discussion:
 - Christina: recommendation – when and if this comes to Senate there are a couple of committee to have look at it: AEBC Committee – have been looking into the question of what constitutes conflict of interest. Appointments, Elections, and Bylaws Committee. Second committee – Faculty Affairs Committee. Recommending bc so much of this document useful for us to understand how it impacts RTP process. Making sure everyone is aware of their various levels of responsibility and expectations are.
 - Is that OK? That Senate proceeds with feedback prior to second reading?
 - Kaia and Saiqa Anne: Yes – do this feedback concurrently
 - Greg: Nonfinancial conflict of interest examples. This policy applies only to PIs. Are we – is there a hole in our policy? Imagine I'm asked to review the paper of a close colleague but I'm not a PI, so this doesn't apply to me... SA: It does say PIs, co-PIs, and key personnel on external grant applications. But you're right – one should be holding oneself to this standard at all times. You just wouldn't review a close colleague's paper or grant application. But this is framed around external grant funding.
 - Greg: For now, maybe something could be pulled into a larger umbrella for everyone, go with this for now.
 - Some people may be confused on what a close colleague is. Have you been co-authors on a paper within x years. Not saying you need that, but makes it really concrete.
 - Conflict of commitment: Seems like it almost goes without saying. Can't have a commitment that impacts our job responsibilities. Effectively that it's only being asked of PIs at this point – interesting.
 - Advocating for a policy that aligns strongly to personal beliefs if not directly to professional role. That raises questions for me. If I'm on a committee – is that enough of a professional role?

- SA: Where this comes from is issues around things like belief with stem cells, people objecting to all sc research. Is where this comes from. Related to personal beliefs. Asks people to step away from those beliefs when reviewing. Related to prisoners, highly-protected groups. Some people reject to any work with prisoners. If you personally object, mitigate your own conflict by stepping away.
- Greg: Advocating for if “it’s” not directly...
 - Jessica: Re making a decision about a project that benefits a family member. Not just PIs. Required to be dealing with as an institution. Coming out of some nepotism kinds of policy. This is in alignment with what is happening across the institution.
 - Erica: Current policies: Nondiscrim policy states you cannot have prohibited consensual relationships With anybody that reports to you; can’t be married in the same depts – find love at work is fine, just can’t report to each other. Goes to students too. Ras can’t date someone on their floor. Understanding disclosures. Not policing but requiring a level of disclosure.

- Second reading in January

iv. Policy on Cost Allocation, Cost Recovery and Cost Sharing on Externally Funded Grants and Contracts (Saiqa Anne Qureshi)

- Not significant changes
- Highlighted IDC – language is shifting back to using both terms – facilities and administrative (F&A costs) and IDC
- Tightened up definitions
- Cost-sharing: normally only mandatory and at the level required – normally we would not expect to cost share unless required to
- Highlighted additional information – some of which we already do anyway
- RSP can negotiate with sponsors on final approval of IDC rate – no other office can do this
 - When an exception is required must be submitted prior to providing any draft budgets
 - Won’t process any policy that doesn’t budget for IDC or have documentation of an approved exception
- We have agreements on rates with some state funders, etc.
- We should be aiming to recover based on sponsors published rates or rates directly negotiated with that sponsor
- We are doing this already – if we recover IDC at a lower rate, applicable project costs normally funded as Indirect costs should be included as direct costs wherever possible
 - Post-award support – we want to articulate that we can
- Discussion
 - Add’l support on training? If someone is
 - Deminimus is 10% or below. Zero rates tend to be on personal fellowships. No IDC there. But

- Want to make sure it's stated in policy – what has been our practice, but not happening consistently.
 - We need more agency to state this is not just our practice but our policy – that we can make sure ID
 - Come back for 2nd reading
- v. Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring (Saiqa Anne Qureshi)
- Not substantive change
 - Focused on federally funded, but policy applies to all subrecipients
 - Part of our duty: Make sure that we as primary recipient ensure subcontractors are completing the work, and in addition beyond SOW, finances are being managed appropriately, etc., we are good stewards of funds
 - Typo corrections
 - No change in monitoring, who does what
 - Unanimous agreement – send to President
- vi. Policy on Intellectual Property (Saiqa Anne Qureshi)
- More substantive changes
 - Based on Faculty Gov and dReview Committee that was never put in place
 - Had to reconstruct what has actually been happening
 - This policy covers IP and economic generation and distribution from any IP that may be commercialized – none of these have happened on our campus
 - SA reconstructed the policy to match our institution size – tried to better define “extraordinary support”
 - The university's rights to IP are about if something were commercialized, our rights to revenue share
 - Better defining “extraordinary support” – compensation, we would have a right to some %
 - Discussion
 - Greg: On Extraordinary Support – never gets used. It's in CBA with faculty. You were saying, faculty member writes a grant, is compensated through that grant, so univ shares.
 - If univ provides reassigned time to write the grant, that's extraordinary support. If the fac member writes the grant on own time... it has to be the university supporting, not the grant that the university provides.
 - SA: When people have internal support – they are arguing it's not extraordinary. E.g., internal money like mini-grant.
 - What we should be doing is an IP report, documenting existence of IP at the beginning of every stage of those processes. When it goes to litigation, no one does that documentation. When did the IP exist. At what point in the work, at what point was the money extraordinary or not extraordinary.

- Greg: Some kind of compensation to pursue this research. We all have compensation as employee. But this is extra compensation to work on this project which might result in something big. It's in there at the end, "including programs and internal support" – but that should be the headline. The univ provided support for this research and therefore is entitled to some share.
- JLM: A word or two – ES includes compensation for research, not your base pay. In the second part, you clearly state that it's directly from CSU or CI and not an external partner. Greg and SA have a conversation offline about massaging that language.
- Other changes:
 - Going to the President rather than to the faculty committee – since that committee never was created Don't need that committee. President can delegate
 - Chagne in terms of money – about net proceeds received. Norm has been to remove dollar threshold – extremely confusing to define net proceeds. Depends on if we're commercializing it or they are.
 - Equity interest isn't the shift
 - Dominant stakeholder will always be the academic
 - Setting employee at odds against you to lie – people have been in litigation. Attempts to terminate bc they misled institution about amount of proceeds. We don't want to do that. Don't want to be in a position where we're doing this
 - Ritchie: Want to meet with SA on this as well on gifts that have IP attached
- 2nd reading in Jan

Next PPPC Meeting: January 27 | Please sign up your policy in the Policy List