

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Monday, January 11, 2016

Participants: Judith Habicht Mauche (Chair), Ajay Gopinathan, Jeffrey Richman, Alex Dodge, Dieter Gruenert, Isaac Martin, Mark Cohen, Srikantan Nagarajan, Ramona Naddaff, Edward Dimendberg, Steve Whittaker, Kathleen Erwin (Consultant), Joanne Miller (Analyst)

Meeting Minutes**I. Announcements and Agenda Review**

Chair Judith Habicht Mauche

Chair Habicht Mauche quickly went over the expectations for the call, including the need to speak up and have your voice heard. She conveyed the brief updates sent via email from Senate Vice Chair Jim Chalfant and alerted the committee that the UCIE (International Education) bylaw was recently revised and will be sent out for systemwide review. The new bylaw incorporates suggestions made by UCORP during the revision process, including the specific mention of working in consultation with other Senate committees (including UCORP).

Chair Habicht Mauche will participate in the ACSCOLI phone conference this Thursday, where LANL news will be discussed. She will update UCORP at the February meeting.

Chair Habicht Mauche was asked by Provost Aimée Dorr to serve on the search committee for the new Vice Provost of Research Strategies & Graduate Studies (the new name for ORGS). While UCORP members would ideally like to have a meeting with final candidates for the position, it is probably more realistic that they bring questions and concerns about the candidate through Habicht Mauche as their representative on the committee.

The Academic Planning Council, a joint administration/Senate body on which the UCORP chair serves, is working on an “International Activities” draft policy. The draft policy has important issues related to research and research policy. The end result might impose additional bureaucratic hurdles for international research. Chair Habicht Mauche will monitor the draft’s progress and alert the committee of any news.

II. Consent Calendar

- DRAFT Minutes of Meeting, December 14, 2015

December 14, 2015, meeting minutes approved by committee.

III. UC Mexus Review

Background:

- Draft Questions for Program Directors and Draft Questions for Advisory Board

UCORP members report on any research/analysis of UC Mexus data. Firm up UCORP’s questions and strategies for moving forward. Questions generated by CCGA and UCPB will be coordinated via subcommittee.

About the Review

Phone interviews with the UC Mexus program directors and advisory committee members will be conducted on Tuesday, January 12, by representatives from UCORP, CCGA and UCPB.

Jeffrey Richman volunteered to participate in at least a portion of the January 12th calls in place of Sri Nagarajan, who is unable to participate.

In answer to a question about conflict of interest for committee members who have had direct involvement with UC MEXUS, Chair Habicht Mauche noted that the Compendium (which governs these reviews) doesn't consider it a "conflict of interest" when a reviewer has had an interaction with the program. It is seen an asset to balance a review with those who know more about the program with those who know less. Revealing one's connections with the program under review is generally a good idea.

A question came up about MRU review guidelines and whether the review should include a look at whether the program fosters collaboration among UC campuses. The conferences, workshops, etc. serve such a function in bringing researchers together physically, which helps them to figure out who is doing what and how they could potentially collaborate.

Committee members made suggestions for additional questions, and clarification of existing questions.

Chair Habicht Mauche compared the grant awards to the UC MEXUS stated goals and found great diversity in dissertation awards as well as consistency with the UC MEXUS mission and goals.

The "independent expert" reviews come from a select group of people knowledgeable about UC MEXUS who agree in advance to provide a review. They are meant to provide additional input to the Academic Senate's review.

February meeting

For the February meeting, Director Ezcurra will be provided with questions in advance (on January 25). He will be asked to make a 30-45 minute presentation, which should be fairly open-ended, but he can address the questions in the course of the presentation. He will be asked to highlight the successes and challenges of UC MEXUS, and what changes he anticipates moving forward. Committee members also proposed that Director Ezcurra provide written answers to the questions. The written answers can be provided as late as the morning of the meeting, and he will have the opportunity to amend the answers after the meeting.

The director and committee might want to think about whether there are assessment criteria that would be helpful for the next (5yr) review.

Action: Work on questions on Google Docs. **Deadline: January 18.** Chair Habicht Mauche will circulate the draft questions to other committee chairs, and will then send to Director Ezcurra for preparation for February.

Meeting adjourned at 11:39

Notes prepared by: Joanne Miller

Attest: Judith Habicht Mauche