

Minutes of Meeting**May 10, 2010****I. Chair' Announcements***Greg Miller, UCORP Chair*

Chair Miller updated the committee on relevant news from recent meetings:

1. Academic Council of April 28: The Council rejected UCORP's letter calling for the restoration of COR funding on the grounds that it would unduly restrict local autonomy. Retirement benefits and pay increases are under attack due to the state's dire fiscal situation. Even current employees' retirement and current retirees' health and welfare benefits could be scaled back. Faculty pay increases may have been squeezed out by union-negotiated increases for those groups.
2. Academic Assembly of April 21: Berkeley economist Robert Anderson was confirmed as Academic Council Vice Chair for 2010-11.

II. Consent Calendar**ACTION:** The minutes of the teleconference of April 12, 2010 were approved as amended.**III. Systemwide Review Items**1. Area 'd':**ISSUE:** It is proposed to expand the area 'd' entrance component to include earth and space sciences, not just chemistry and biology.**DISCUSSION:** Members were split on the merits of this proposal. Some argued that earth and space sciences are not building-block sciences, and that some could misconstrue the change as an unfunded mandate to local high schools to offer earth and space sciences, if they do not already. Others asserted that the definition of basic science was unclear, drawing an analogy with algebra, calculus, and trigonometry.**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft a response reflecting both major positions and circulate it to the committee prior to transmittal.2. APM 241 (Faculty Administrators):**DISCUSSION:** Members were concerned that the revised APM did not include metrics for evaluating faculty administrators' research contributions, suggesting a parallel section, similar to APM 245-11, be added.**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft and circulate a memo reflecting this position.3. AB 2656:**ISSUE:** It has been proposed in the state legislature to approve state spending only for research projects that pass peer review.**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that peer review in the proposal stage could incur heavy costs, both fiscal and opportunity. Other suggested that this proposal is targeted at climate change studies and that UCORP should not enter this political fray. It was noted that some federal research programs do not have peer reviews;

reconciling the two directives could foreclose some research options. Members were unanimous in their opposition to the proposal.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft and circulate the committee's response prior to transmittal.

4. UCPB's Choices Report:

DISCUSSION: Members were unclear as to how to respond to the Report, noting that it was more of a discussion than a set of proposals or principles. Nevertheless, many lauded UCPB for putting in one place all the budget discussion threads to present a comprehensive picture. It was also noted that the message of "quality before size" was clear and supportable.

Some members voiced concern over UCPB's approach to indirect cost recovery: the balance between transparency and autonomy is a fine one.

ACTION: The committee will endorse the report as a debate-catalyzing document without commenting on specific items within; Analyst Feer will draft and circulate the response.

5. Compendium Revision:

DISCUSSION: Members focused on the unchanged MRU section. Members agreed that the definition of MRUs should be as encompassing as possible to preclude future "funding versus establishing" debates, while noting that MRPIs can receive funding from any source. Further, that changes to any aspect of MRU governance must follow established procedures, not fiat, must be made explicit.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a memo reflecting the committee's comments for circulation then transmittal.

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

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination, ORGS

Executive Director Auriti updated the committee on three items of interest:

1. NAGPRA:

UPDATE: The Department of Interior has issued a new rule, which will take effect on May 14; under it, culturally unidentifiable remains will now be transferred to federally-recognized tribes who currently occupy the geographic area where the remains were found, even absent any cultural ties. Previously, museums and such were required to store the remains indefinitely. The impacts of these changes on scientific access, non-federally recognized tribes, and repatriating institutions are unclear at present.

DISCUSSION: Members inquired what would happen to remains where the proximate tribe does not wish to acquire them. Director Auriti indicated that the regulations do not address that outcome at present; further regulations for unclaimed remains are forthcoming. Members also asked how much UC would be impacted by these regulations, and Director Auriti noted that UC is currently custodian for a significant amount of remains, especially at Berkeley. Members asked how repatriation differed from disposition, and what would happen in the case of multiple claimants. Director Auriti agreed that in some instances, a difficult compliance onus would result. The cases of ancient nomadic tribes present a further challenge, as well. Director Auriti noted that UC's previous

statements on the matter are part of the public record. Any new developments will be reported.

2. State F&A Costs:

UPDATE: The state and UC are in negotiations to develop a standardized contract to cover intellectual property, invoicing, indirect cost recovery, etc., to replace the current practice of one-at-a-time negotiations. UC will ask for an increase in the state rate of reimbursement as part of this process.

3. AB 2656:

(See above.)

V. Commission on the Future

Mary Croughan, Co-chair, Research Strategies Working Group

UPDATE: Co-chair Croughan reported that the second round recommendations are being finalized, so any comments need to be received by June 1. Still undergoing final editing are sections on a research mission statement, the importance of basic research, and the removal of institutional barriers like restrictions on fund transfers and educational cross-enrollments.

DISCUSSION: Members asked if new recommendations were being developed for indirect costs, and Co-chair Croughan replied that given the amount of activity on the topic in other fora, such as the AAU and AALU, a wait-and-see approach might be more useful at this time. Members asked if the new recommendations would place priority on the state as a funder of research, and Co-chair Croughan said that it was included, but not specified.

Members renewed their call to have more grounded recommendations, not just “wish lists” of items that will not solve the stated problems, either singly or in combination. Members also restated their concerns of the process: the first round recommendations were evaluated, but the second round recommendations do not take that feedback into account. The second round recommendations will not be reviewed before the final report is due. And none of them has the potential to solve any of UC’s major problems.

Note: Consideration of this topic occurred under Item VII below.

VI. Campus COR Updates

ISSUE: UCORP was asked to investigate the role of campus CORs in limited submission RFPs, if any.

DISCUSSION: All but one campus reported that local CORs were not consulted in naming limited submission RFPs, even though mechanisms exist. Most reported that campus vice chancellors for research made these decisions, sometimes in consultation with departmental deans.

ISSUE: UCORP has previously taken the position that COR funding should be protected during difficult budget times. How loudly should this call be made going forward?

DISCUSSION: Members reported mixed outcomes from previous communications on the matter, ranging from restoration of funds to loss of local political capital. Gift funds and other non-institutional monies further complicate the matter. UCORP will return to this topic in the future.

VII. Additional Discussion

Note: Item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

ACTION: The draft statement will be recirculated for further edit and comment.

VIII. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: Greg Miller, UCORP Chair