

**Minutes of Meeting****June 2, 2011****I. Chair's Announcements***Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair*

1. Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI) meeting of May 11, 2011:

This meeting was held at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) and was followed by a site visit of the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI). In addition to presentations of ongoing research projects and a discussion about the plans for an LBNL second campus, ACSCOLI members also met with a group of LBNL researchers and discussed career paths and professional development. The July ACSCOLI meeting will be held at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) in July 2011.

2. Academic Council meeting of May 25, 2011:

Regent Bonnie Reece joined the Council and participated in a wide-ranging discussion, including a discussion on the pros and cons for differential tuition by campus and specific fees for certain majors. The Council endorsed a recommendation that the online education pilot project not expand without conducting a full evaluation of the program to date.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. Response to proposed new APM 668

**ACTION:** The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

**III. University of California Observatories***Mike Bolte, Director, University of California Observatories (UCO)**Allison Coil, Assistant Professor of Physics, UCSD (via phone)*

**ISSUE:** Director Bolte provided the committee with a comprehensive overview of Astronomy activities in the UC system, including a summary of UCO's history, research accomplishments, public outreach, and current operations. He noted UC's long-standing history as a national and international leader in the field, as well as the disciplinary breadth the impact UCO has had on UC. Professor Coil noted that the UCO has the same rate of oversubscription as the Hubble Space Telescope, an indication that the program continues to be both scientifically useful and professionally viable as a tool for recruitment and retention.

Director Bolte also discussed possible future operations for UCO, including participation in the thirty-meter telescope (TMT). This project is still in the planning phases, but for astronomy, planning involves spending pledged funds. So far, approximately \$50M have been spent from philanthropic donations. If approved, after contract closure in 2018, current expenditures on the Keck telescope administration contract would be redirected to operational expenses for the new project, thus not costing UC any additional investment in astronomy, but also not reducing the systemwide

astronomy budget. Director Bolte emphasized that the UCO budget was a systemwide investment, and likened it to the total cost of running 10 different chemistry departments. **DISCUSSION:** Members asked for Director Bolte's perspective on the current UCO review. Director Bolte indicated that the internal recommendations created by the UC Astronomy Task Force (UCATF) would be given the external review team assembled by Vice President Beckwith, but he reported the concern that some on the UCATF have, namely, that UC astronomy priorities should not be determined by external reviewers. Members also noted that the UCO review is not a typical MRU review, since the quality of the science is not in question, but the long-term strategic posture of the University in the field. The committee was unclear among themselves whether or not it would be appropriate to compete UCO against other "big science" projects in the future, rather than following on the default trajectory of continued investment into astronomy at this scale. Director Bolte noted that nearly all 60 annual observational astronomy PhDs graduated by UC cite either Lick or Keck in their research. Some members rejoined, however, that long-term contracts on resource-heavy, unproven endeavors are much riskier to the University than other scientific investment options, especially when potential cost overruns and renegeing partners are considered. Director Bolte indicated that contracts usually carry clauses that allow principals to trade cost for access, but some members wondered where the tipping actually lies, when the cost in a multi-year, multi-billion dollar project can be seen to outweigh the institutional benefits of the partnership. Director Bolte suggested that expenditure of philanthropic exploratory funds has already obligated UC to the project, and that now it would be UC that would renege if the project were abandoned. Some members were unclear as to how UC could be obligated if no contract had yet been signed, and they further questioned the assumption of steady-state astronomy funding on a systemwide level.

**ACTION:** UCORP will revisit this topic when the external review has been completed and the report is made available.

#### **IV. Systemwide Review Item**

##### **1. Library Planning Task Force Report**

**DISCUSSION:** Members felt the report did not specify clearly enough the efficiencies to be realized, nor plans to achieve them. Members also felt that the report did not explore adequately the implications and limitations of the recommended boycotting policy, nor did it address fully changes to the libraries' physical plant and their intersections with the still emerging new information stewardship strategy for the new century using new media.

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft a response memo and circulate it to the committee for endorsement.

#### **V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies**

*Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President*

*Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Programs Office*

##### **1. UCO:**

**DISCUSSION:** Members voiced concern over the widely divergent impressions of the current review, noting that some stakeholders seem to perceive a hidden agenda.

**ACTION:** Deputy Gautier will send to UCORP the parameters given to the review team.

2. Cancer Research Coordinating Committee (CRCC):

**ISSUE:** Executive Director Croughan reported that the CRCC operates under a legacy system which has been replaced in most other research units. The new distribution system clarifies the definitional and usage distinctions between stipends and grants. The locus of program administration would only change if demonstrable cash savings could be realized.

**DISCUSSION:** Members inquired how cost efficiency was determined in this area. Executive Director Croughan reminded members that it is difficult to make direct attributions from extended investments, especially in health research.

3. Centrally Funded Research Programs:

**ISSUE:** Executive Director Croughan reported that while some individual programs may benefit from targeted lobbying in Sacramento, not all programs enjoy such patronage. Further, any cuts to state-directed research programs would not automatically redound to UC in the form of general funds, but would be lost. No new money has become available for centrally funded research programs.

**DISCUSSION:** Members observed that due to the oddities of the state's fiscal calculus, protected earmarks could lead to even more drastic cuts in fungible allocations. Members also inquired as to the new "proof of concept" program included in the agenda enclosures. Executive Director Croughan responded that the program was pulled from the Discovery Grants program to help bridge the industry-university gap for open-source reliant technologies and programs; its funding and continuation are still contingent.

## **VI. Research Priority**

*John Crawford, UCORP Vice Chair*

**ISSUE:** Vice Chair Crawford reported the development of two statements: a shorter mission statement and lengthier statement of purpose. It is hoped that the Office of External Relations can assist in reviewing the linguistic connotations of the statements prior to their public issuance.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed at length the precise wording and phrasing of the draft statements.

**ACTION:** Vice Chair Crawford will continue to revise the statements and circulate them to the committee for further comment.

## **VII. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) Implementation**

*Robert Bettinger, Professor of Anthropology, UC Davis*

*Margaret Schoeninger, Professor of Anthropology, UC San Diego*

*Tim White, Professor of Integrative Biology, UC Berkeley*

**ISSUE:** Professor White reported concerns that UC's NAGPRA implementation guidelines were not being followed as intended because: the implications to research were not being weighed equally with competing concerns; no finding of fact to inform the advisory committee's recommendations had been conducted; and potential and perceived conflicts of interest should cause certain actors to recuse themselves from the process.

**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that not just research, but also academic freedom, was implicated in the question before the committee. Members also sought clarification as to why no finding of fact had been undertaken, given the length of time this question has been under investigation. Other members noted that professionalism in handling this delicate matter seems to have suffered, thereby exacerbating complexity and tensions.

**NOTE:** The remainder of this discussion occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

**ACTION:** UCORP will communicate to the Academic Council its recommendations for next steps in resolving this question.

### **VIII. Cancer Research Coordinating Committee**

*Joe Konopelski, Professor of Chemistry, UC Santa Cruz*

**ISSUE:** Professor Konopelski provided a history of CRCC's work, highlighting a 13-15 to 1 investment leveraging rate. The question before the committee today focuses on funding and administrative transparency: CRCC posits that it should be able to make internal funding allocations according to internally approved processes, a practice which they feel is in jeopardy since the CRCC's executive director's research stipend has not been released yet this fiscal year.

**DISCUSSION:** Members sought clarification on CRCC's maintenance of a research stipend for the CCRC Executive Secretary. Members expressed the sentiment that this policy does not align with best practices. Members also sought additional information regarding the withholding of funds for the stipend. Professor Konopelski indicated that the executive director is the de facto lead PI, and that the stipend is an augmented research grant; he agreed, though, that such a construct lies outside the norm of MRU operations, but had not been convinced that a change for symmetry's sake would enhance operations. Members noted that administration guidelines for the oversight of non-funded MRUs were still to be developed.

**ACTION:** UCORP will communicate to Vice President Beckwith their recommendation that the current year's funds be released, but that in subsequent years, CRCC revise its operating procedures to better incorporate best practices and current external factors.

### **IX. New Business**

None.

This being the last UCORP meeting for the academic year 2010-11, the Chair thanked the committee members for their contributions and also, on behalf of the entire committee, expressed his appreciation and gratitude to Analyst Feer for his outstanding support of the committee throughout the year.

Meeting adjourned at 4 o'clock p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst.  
Attest: Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP Chair