

**Minutes of Meeting
February 11, 2008**

I. Chair's Announcements

Jose Wudka, UCORP Chair

Chair Wudka announced that Item III had been canceled and that the joint work group on Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) with the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) would commence its work this month.

- Academic Council meeting of January 23, 2008: The draft undergraduate mission statement was referred back to the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP) for revision. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the body which accredits the University, recently issued a report critical of operations in the Office of the President (OP), singling out the relationship between the President's immediate office and the Regents as especially problematic; the Council response is available online [here](#). President Dynes discussed with the Council potential budget cuts and the restructuring effort underway at OP. It was also noted that Harvard and Yale Universities are capping tuition. A revitalized office of state governmental relations is preparing new advocacy initiatives in Sacramento to secure better funding for the University. Finally, Council was informed that the management contract for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is different from the other Department of Energy (DOE) lab management contracts to which UC is a party due to the absence of classified work at LBNL.
- Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) meeting of January 25, 2008: Dr. Susan Shirk, Director of the Institute on Global Cooperation and Conflict (IGCC), presented an overview of her Institute's work and declining financial situation. Other topics covered during this meeting are discussed under Item II below.
- Academic Assembly meeting of January 30, 2008: The Assembly amended and adopted a resolution limiting UC's involvement in the production of nuclear weapons (online [here](#)). Assembly members also agreed that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) should revisit the issue of non-resident tuition annually until the situation is resolved satisfactorily.

II. ACSCOLI Update

Jose Wudka, UCORP Chair

ISSUE: Chair Wudka presented a slideshow outlining the history and evolution of UC's collaboration in managing the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL).

Current issues facing both labs include declining federal budgetary support, which has led to staff reduction efforts such as a voluntary separation program at LANL. However, the lab was unable to retain some of its best employees, and morale overall is low. This situation is expected to continue to decline since the National Nuclear Security

Administration (NNSA) budget is expected to decline 2% per annum over the next ten years.

Both the NNSA and lab personnel maintain that increasing “pit” production will not adversely affect the scientific mission of the labs.

UC agreed to pay \$2.8M in fines for a security breach at LANL; this figure was arrived at during negotiations with DOE and is less than separate fines and penalties would have totaled.

DISCUSSION: Members questioned again whether it remains in the University’s best interest to continue managing the labs, especially given the issues surrounding the management contracts that have recently arisen. Chair Wudka noted that partly UC has a proprietary interest in the technology developed at the labs during their management tenure and that partly UC seems to serve as a moral arbiter in lab efforts. UC also gets access to unique research opportunities involving rare and volatile substances. Members queried, though, as to how many UC researchers actually utilize the labs and whether they could do so if another university had won the management contracts. In short, members wondered, aside from management fees, what benefit accrues to UC for its participation in the DOE labs?

Members also inquired as to the source of the funds to be used for paying fines levied against UC. Chair Wudka indicated that part of the fines will be garnished from UC’s portion of the management fees and part will come from a contingency fund established by the Regents.

Members thanked Chair Wudka for sharing this hard-to-come-by information. Chair Wudka mentioned that doing so was part of the impetus for the Assembly resolution on “pit” production—to inform the faculty at large of the goings-on at the labs.

ACTION: Members will report back to their campus counterpart committees and generate metrics that might illuminate the value-added to UC by its involvement in the labs. Chair Wudka will then convey the request to ACSCOLI and the Academic Council.

III. Lab Issues Consultation

John Birely, Associate Vice President for Lab Programs (via teleconference)

ACTION: Item canceled.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director for Research Legislation and Policy

Executive Director Auriti updated the committee on several issues:

- **RE-89:** Implementation guidelines have been sent to the chancellors. Only new proposals are subject to the new review procedure.
- **IRBs:** Davis recently hosted a forum on IRBs and best practices. It is hoped that this will become an annual event and expand to include faculty, not just staff.
- **DOD NSSEF Fellowships:** The Department of Defense (DOD) recently announced a National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship (NSSEF Fellowship). This program requires the award recipient to have secret security clearances—which in itself would exclude non-citizen faculty and other faculty who do not qualify for security clearances. Excluding faculty from participating under these conditions seems to be contrary to UC policy. Further, the principal investigator must be a distinguished faculty within 25 years of

receiving her PhD. Another complicating factor is that while the Fellow must receive security clearances, she can in no way use the classified research to which she is to be given access—a condition which causes many to question the need for the clearances at all.

V. Health Sciences Research Issues

Jeff Hall, Director of Legislation Policy for Health Sciences and Services

ISSUE: Director Hall presented an overview of the Office of Health Sciences, its history, and its responsibilities. He stated that the role of OP in the Health Sciences is to identify potential extramural funding sources and to facilitate applications; they also work with enrollment planning, developing school proposals, and statewide planning for all health professions. This last responsibility has yielded a growth plan which was endorsed by the Regents and has two phases: Phase 1 is to expand the five current medical schools' enrollment by 10% each through the "Prime" program in which each school will add a fifth-year masters degree to complement the student's MD, with each school targeting one underserved community, such as the Latino population. Phase 2 is to proceed with the development of the medical schools at Riverside and Merced. The office is also expected to work closely on the telehealth initiatives approved by California voters; current foci include securing long-term funding and negotiating conflicting and unclear billing practices and regulations. Finally, the OP office is seeking grants to better educate CSU and CCC counselors regarding health science admission criteria. See also Distributions 2-4.

DISCUSSION: Members noted that communication between medical schools and their host campuses could be improved. Director Hall indicated that communication between health sciences schools could also be improved, *e.g.* between nursing and pharmacy schools. Members also observed that part of the sense of isolation could be attributable to the divergent pay scales and funding sources. Members inquired as to which emerging health sciences fields UC has targeted, citing genomics, stem cells, and aging as just three examples in which UC could become a leader. Director Hall responded that the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine has been very cooperative with UC, but that medical research on aging lags everywhere due to a lack of models, leadership, and interest.

VI. Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources

Rick Standiford, Associate Vice President, DANR

ISSUE: AVP Standiford presented an overview of the Division, its scope, roles, and responsibilities (see Distribution 5).

DISCUSSION: Members inquired whether the other segments had similar entities. AVP Standiford indicated that CSU had an agriculture program, but that its faculty still teach full-time. AVP Standiford also indicated that DANR's organizational chart is currently in flux due to personnel changes. California is one of only three states whose cooperative extension (CE) specialists are not eligible for senate membership, with Texas and Mississippi being the others; it was also noted that CE specialists function similarly to those in clinical series who are eligible for senate membership. Members also asked about the status of long-range planning in the Division. This process is also evolving, although DANR has recently increased the number of hires with PhDs. Members queried

as to the stakeholders active in DANR. AVP Standiford noted that DANR tries to remain impartial in its relations with the state, industry, and smaller interests, such as local farmers, migrant laborers, and homeowners. Nevertheless, the Division must respond to directives from the state, and many research projects are jointly funded by industry concerns. Members asked why DANR retains nutrition education programs, rather than asking the public health schools to administer them. AVP Standiford observed that while there is a place for the public health schools in nutrition education programs, DANR has a better delivery capacity at the local level; still, better cooperation should be pursued.

VII. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of Meeting of January 14, 2008
ACTION: The minutes were approved as noticed.
- DANR Review Protocol and Panel Membership Response
DISCUSSION: Members questioned the retention by DANR of some programs, such as 4H, without impugning the value of such programs. Members stressed the need for the review to contain quantified data. Members also discussed options for membership and the leadership structure of the review panel.
ACTION: Vice Chair Carey will revise the response to reflect these concerns and circulate it for committee review prior to submission to the Academic Council.
- IRB Accreditation Letter of Concern
ACTION: Item postponed.
- Regents' Task Forces on Diversity Reports Response
ACTION: Chair Wudka will circulate his draft response to the committee via email for review prior to submission to the Academic Council.

VIII. Systemwide Review Item

- Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG)
DISCUSSION: Members were unclear on the impetus for the proposed regulations.
ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

IX. New Business and Planning

Chair Wudka mentioned that the March meeting will include updates on the California Digital Library, new audit and compliance procedures, and international strategy development.

Adjournment: 3:55

Distributions:

1. DRAFT DANR Review Protocol and Panel Membership Response
2. UC and the National Institutes of Health
3. Expanding the Horizon: Growing UC Nursing Programs
4. Preparing for Change: The University of California Medical Education Programs
5. DANR powerpoint slides

Appendix:

UCORP 2007-08 Attendance Record

Minutes prepared by: Kenneth Feer, Senior Analyst
Attest: Jose Wudka, UCORP Chair