

Minutes of Meeting
April 14, 2008

I. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The minutes of the March 10, 2008, meeting were approved as amended.

ACTION: The committee's response to the Proposed Revisions to the Health Sciences Code of Conduct was approved as noticed.

II. Chair/Vice Chair's Announcements

Jose Wudka, UCORP Chair

James Carey, UCORP Vice Chair

Chair Wudka updated the committee on several issues:

- There is an upcoming symposium at UCLA, "A New Generation of University Students: Understanding the Student Experience and Seeking Opportunities to Translate Analysis into Practice." For more information, see: <http://csh.berkeley.edu/events/serusymposium2008/>
- The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) is developing a book subvention proposal for first-time publishers in the humanities and social sciences. Chair Wudka spoke with UCOLASC Chair Crow and indicated that the proposal currently did not include adequate Senate oversight.
- The ACSCOLI resolution on limiting UC's involvement in the DOE national labs has been sent to the Regents for discussion. See Item VIII below. The resolution may be viewed online: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/jan2008/assembly.rsltn.PITS.0208.pdf>

Vice Chair Carey attended the March 26 Academic Council meeting in Chair Wudka's stead. He updated the committee on that meeting:

- Proposals for a School of Public Health at the Davis campus and for a systemwide Global School of Public Health have been referred back to their sponsors for further development of enrollment planning and budgetary projections.
- Gayle Binion and Larry Pitts have been named the 2008 recipients of the [Oliver Johnson Award](#) for distinguished Senate service.
- The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) have raised concerns over apparent plans to "outsource" administration of the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP); namely, the current effort seems to be a solution in the absence of a problem. The committees recommend including in the RFP a caveat that no decline in quality will be acquiesced in this, another cost-saving measure.
- The University leadership remains committed to funding fully the faculty salary increases, but the May California budget revision is rumored to be even darker yet.

III. Systemwide Review Items

- [ITGC Report "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure"](#)

DISCUSSION: Members were concerned about the lack of specificity regarding funding. Members also noted that the clusters mentioned in the report were both inadequate to the computing needs of high-level simulations in the physical sciences and overkill for the computing needs of most humanities and social sciences researchers. It was felt that for the computing needs of the humanities and social sciences to be met most appropriately in the short term, education in large-scale competitive grant writing (e.g., NSF) and improved basic IT support were more necessary. Finally, members queried how the initiatives outlined in the report meshed with other statewide efforts, such as Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC).

ACTION: Members will submit additional questions/concerns via email to Chair Wudka, who will then draft the committee's response.

- Amendment to Senate Bylaw 337

ACTION: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

IV. UC, CDFA, DANR, and Apple Moths

James Carey, UCORP Vice Chair

ISSUE: The Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) has infested northern California and the Bay Area. For-profit farms are concerned about the impact of LBAM on their crops, and they are lobbying the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) to declare the infestation an emergency in order to secure state funding to back an attempt to eradicate LBAM via aerial pheromone spraying over affected areas. The University and its agricultural research arm, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) have been passive in the discussion, and individual UC researchers have been reluctant to speak out due to concerns over jeopardizing industry-sponsored research. What can/should UC/UCORP do in this and similar situations?

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that UC, as the research arm of the state, should play a more active role in this and other emergent areas, either at the state's request or at the University's initiative. Beyond issue-specific concerns of invasive species theory, pheromone-based eradication efforts and their consequences, and potential stakeholder retribution, members sought clarification of the University's role and policies in initiating, mediating, and evaluating research in the public sphere, especially regarding politically charged issues.

ACTION: The committee will address these questions to Vice Presidents Beckwith (Research and Graduate Studies) and Dooley (DANR).

V. Graduate Student Funding and Research Update

Bruce Schumm, Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), via phone

ISSUE: CCGA is developing a new proposal to address UC's declining support for graduate students and the broader implications to UC competitiveness. In part, this is a follow-up to recommendations made in 2006 by the ad hoc Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC) workgroup (their report can be viewed at the [committee's webpage](#)). Chair Schumm presented an overview of the current situation (corresponding slides also available on the committee's webpage).

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether UC was behind comparison schools in graduate student enrollment. Chair Schumm indicated that UC lags in Masters' enrollments, but

not in PhD enrollments; he further indicated that the crux of the problem is not enrollment per se, but rather financial support for students to aid in recruitment and retention. To that end, Chair Schumm suggested that funding for graduate financial aid packages be recast as part of the University's larger graduate and research portfolios, not merely as "keeping up with the Joneses" or admissions data. Members suggested that such framing could be facilitated by knowing how each division/department/sub-unit reports its graduate student support.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

Steve Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

Dante Noto, Director of Arts, Humanities, and Social Science Research

David Robinson, Office of General Counsel

Office of Research and Graduate Studies Organization and Priorities

ISSUE: Vice President Beckwith updated the committee on his continuing efforts to streamline his office (see slides on the committee's website). VP Beckwith indicated that there are two aspects to the reorganization: OP/internal structures and policies and external/systemwide priorities. Internally, he is using the "Klein Report" as a basis for self-evaluation, strategic planning, etc. As a point of comparison, administration costs in comparable research entities, such as NSF and NIH range from 4-6% of their overall budgets; at UC, that figure is around 19%. Externally, the office must be responsive to legislative research priorities as well as emergent priorities that arise from the campuses. In terms of legislative research priorities, while UC is the research arm of the state, administering those projects should not yield self-perpetuating bureaucracies within the University. The DOE national labs are also expected to be subsumed under this office's umbrella in time.

DISCUSSION: Members asked how the office plans to better secure (more) research and graduate student funding. VP Beckwith noted that more needs to be done to educate both the legislature and the public of the value of and opportunities in University research; the particulars of that campaign will be addressed during strategic planning efforts. Members also queried how emergent research trends in the humanities and social sciences could be tracked and captured within the Office's programs and new structure. Director Noto indicated that national and international trends can serve to underscore the viability of faculty-proposed humanities and social science research, and he cited the UC Initiative in Human Rights as an example of such an MRU. Director Noto also pointed out that new programs must demonstrate clearly the value they will add to the field and to UC as well as how they will facilitate synergistic coalitions systemwide.

Honest Leadership and Open Government Act (HLOGA)

ISSUE: HLOGA was enacted in the fall of 2007 as a follow-up to the Lobbying Disclosure Act and governs two aspects of interaction with federal employees: (1) lobbying and (2) gift giving. The first of these categories is the more problematic: Previously, the University was required only to submit spending reports for activities undertaken on its behalf by registered lobbyists; under HLOGA, the definition of lobbying activity may now include unofficial lobbyists, such as faculty who contact their congresswoman or grants administrators—activities that were formerly business, not advocacy, may need to be recorded and reported. Additionally, HLOGA requires

quarterly, rather than semi-annual, reports. For this quarter, the University is limiting implementation to its registered lobbyists and senior management group; next quarter, the threshold will lower to include other administration officials and faculty, and OGC is working to define who must report what kinds of interactions and in what manner those reports must be made. Regarding gifts, HLOGA has eliminated the \$50 minimum; that is, buying meals and even coffee for “covered officials” (as defined by HLOGA) is now taboo since the gift-giver is also legally liable under HLOGA, not just a non-reporting recipient.

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether HLOGA also governed soft-money and clinical faculty. Mr. Robinson indicated that his office was still working to clarify that and certain other aspects of the Act. Members encouraged OGC to be as specific as possible in defining the types of communications that must now be reported as “compliance creep” seems to be disrupting work. Mr. Robinson also noted that campus governmental relations offices should be a useful resource in answering these questions.

VII. Follow-up Discussion: Honest Leadership and Open Government Act (HLOGA)

NOTE: Item not addressed.

VIII. Update on Lab Issues

Mary Croughan, Academic Council Vice Chair and ACSCOLI Chair

Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

ISSUE: Changes in the function of the Department of Energy (DOE) national labs and recently identified changes in the management contracts to which UC is a party has led to concern among the faculty regarding the University’s continued involvement with the labs. The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) drafted a resolution calling for the reassessment of the University’s role in managing the labs should they be directed to manufacture new or replacement warheads for nuclear weapons; the resolution was then endorsed by the Academic Council and sent via President Dynes to the Regents, who subsequently discussed it at their March meeting. That discussion marked the first time lab issues were discussed on the first day of the Regents’ meeting and elicited calls among the Regents to obtain “Q” clearances so they could receive classified briefings on the labs. Additionally, Professor Croughan recently visited the Los Alamos National Lab (LANL), and Professor Brown recently visited the Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL).

DISCUSSION: Members asked whether there had been any broad calls for the University to cease and desist its role in the LLCs which now manage the labs. Professor Croughan indicated that no such calls had been issued, but that various exit strategies were under investigation. Historically, UC has been involved in the design and science involved in nuclear fission and fusion, not the manufacture of nuclear weapons, but the new contracts blur this line even further, a fact exacerbated by their multi-party make-up. Members inquired as to the ancillary benefits to UC from the new contract structure. Professor Croughan indicated that Associate Vice President for Laboratory Programs John Birely would be better able to answer that question.

Members also inquired how the resolution’s call for reporting on pit production could be effected, given the classified nature of pit manufacture. Professor Brown noted

that if the data are not forthcoming, then that fact alone should spark concern; if the data are presented, they should be readily verifiable. The reporting should be facilitated by the relocation of all plutonium manufacturing operations to the LANL site, which may require the construction of new facilities there—an option which is being explored, but not yet funded.

Members then asked about the future of the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) which scientists at LLNL developed using computer modeling. Professor Brown indicated that RRWs present an interesting dilemma: their development using computer modeling violated no test ban treaties, but their construction and deployment absent physical testing may generate effectiveness concerns even though certain safety and security concerns with the current arsenal would be ameliorated. Further, the future of the RRW is uncertain due to the complex decision-making apparatus in place: UC is constitutionally independent from the state of California, but contractually obligated to cooperate with its LLC partners, whose realm of authority is limited by the Department of Energy. UC's position is further complicated by the fact that this contract is the first in UC's long-standing stewardship of the labs that UC had to compete for the privilege; previously, the University was asked by the government to oversee the labs.

Members outlined the dilemma the University faces: UC cannot afford to leave the contracts, given the financial and political toll likely to be incurred, and UC cannot afford to stay in the contracts, given its historical role as scientific arbiter and watchman—a role which is perceived to be eroding rapidly.

IX. New Business and Planning

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that the Senate must speak clearly and pointedly regarding the Office of Research and Graduate Studies' administrative reorganization and the protection of faculty interests. Members also wondered how to sunset politically motivated state research directives.

Adjournment: 3:50 p.m.

Appendix: UCORP 2007-08 Attendance Record

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Analyst

Attest: Jose Wudka, UCORP Chair