

**Minutes of Meeting
June 11, 2007**

I. Consent Calendar

The Consent Calendar was approved as noticed.

II. Chair's Announcements

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

- Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL) meeting of May 21:

ACSCONL was informed of a previously unknown aspect of the management contracts for both the Los Alamos and Livermore National Labs: The 7-year renewable contract can be renewed each year up to 20 years, rather than each 7 years as previously thought. Further, the renewal option is unilaterally in the hands of the government, which may withdraw from the contract at any time, while neither UC nor its partners can. ACSCONL members reacted to this news strongly, and some questioned the value of having a faculty committee continuing to work with lab management on these issues.

Additionally, ACSCONL members are concerned that UC may be forced to undertake objectionable practices, such as pit production, since it cannot withdraw from the contracts. They were reassured that if UC found itself in an untenable position, there would be political options that could be brought into play.

ACSCONL continues to receive inconsistent information regarding UC's governors' appointment and reporting processes.

ACSCONL will officially dissolve over the summer, and its successor, the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI), will be inaugurated once its membership is codified.

- Academic Council meeting of May 23:

The Council approved a Faculty Welfare request to establish a task force to evaluate comprehensive compensation issues. This is a result of misunderstandings in the Mercer consulting group's report on remuneration.

The Office of the President has hired an outside consultant to evaluate its organizational structure and practices. Some members of the Council raised the concern that UC relies too heavily on outside consultants and neglects the expertise of its own faculty.

Finally, concerns were raised about the interactions between some of the Senate's standing committees and their consultants: It is feared that consultants believe that they receive the Senate's official position from standing committees, rather than that committee's (or those individual faculty members') opinions.

III. Academic Council's Proposed Fiscal Impact Statement

ISSUE: UCORP is asked to comment on a draft document indicating that various entities within UC should be mindful of passing “unfunded mandates” on to the campuses. To redress this concern, the draft calls for the submission of fiscal impact statements to accompany proposals and projects before they are approved and enacted.

DISCUSSION: Members appreciated the goal of the proposed statement, and found it to be workable in scope. Nonetheless, members thought greater clarity would enhance the proposal. More specificity should be provided regarding the degree of the problem, the impact of creating impact statements, the consequences of providing a poor impact statement, the procedure for resolving disputed impact statements, and the relevance of the sample. Members also noted that the requirement of creating impact statements is an unfunded mandate itself.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will draft a letter to Council expressing the committee’s views.

IV. CalIT2 Review

ISSUE: The first of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CalISIs) to be reviewed, the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2) has undergone a periodic 5-year review (see Distribution 2). UCORP is asked to comment on the findings of the review.

DISCUSSION: Much discussion focused on the level of integration between CalIT2 and its host campuses, Irvine and San Diego. Many faculty are unaware of the extent and type of research being conducted by CalIT2, and some attribute this to its composition (neither an MRU or an ORU) and to its industrial ties, which add further uniqueness to the enterprise. The committee agreed that it should focus its comments on the process of the review, leadership, and planning. Because the request for comment did not come from the Academic Council, the committee will delay its response pending clarification of charge and time frame.

ACTION: Chair Max will inquire of the Academic Council as to the specific time and focus of the review response.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

Ellen Auriti, Executive Director, Research Policy and Legislation

- **Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies:** The Regents approved this position, and it is now posted on the human resources website. Because graduate studies are not currently located within the Office of the President (OP), the full implications to personnel and protocols are not known.
- **The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) and state earmarking:** The process by which a recent contract from the PUC to UCB was awarded was discussed.
- **Conflict of interest conference at UCI:** The Discovery Grant program sponsored this conference designed to clarify troubling topics implicated by conflict of interest rules, such as faculty service, institutional conflicts of interest, and royalties. UC is especially concerned with the appearance of conflicts, and has initiated online training. Some faculty object to the training as duplicative with other trainings that they have been required to participate in.
- **National Science Advisory Board on Biosecurity:** The Council on Governmental Relations (COGR) established the Board in 2004 to provide oversight for federally funded dual-use biological research. It has recently issued draft

recommendations (<http://www.biosecurityboard.gov/meetings/asp>). It is expected that more finalized recommendations will be issued in the fall, along with a request for formal comment.

- “Troublesome clauses”: COGR and the Association of American Universities (AAU) are protesting new requirements from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). COGR and AAU believe the new regulations involve unfairly intrusive background checks for people seeking access to federal information systems. Concerns have also been raised by some agencies’ requests for the right to review and approve data prior to publication.
- Hazardous chemicals: DHS has issued new rules for and an expanded list of chemicals, the use of which requires federal review and oversight.
- National Institutes of Health (NIH) funded research: Some legislators are pushing to make online publishing mandatory. This revisits the issues discussed in reference to the proposed Open Access Policy discussed by UCORP previously.

VI. Indirect Cost Recovery

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

Andy Fisher, UCSC Representative

ISSUE: The committee will discuss the interim report and plan next steps.

DISCUSSION: The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) has agreed to partner with UCORP in researching this issue more fully in the next academic year. Members noted potential obstacles, such as securing OP buy-in, disaggregated data, and data presented in conflicting formats. Members thought that involving campus costing policy officials would facilitate the investigation. Members expressed concern that this effort might not yield tangible results, as has happened previously.

ACTION: Analyst Feer will send the current draft as an MSWord document for easier editing by members.

ACTION: Member Fisher will collate edits and submit the final version to Chair Max for transmittal to the Academic Council.

VII. California Institute for Energy and Environment (CIEE)

Carl Blumstein, Director, CIEE

Severin Borenstein, Director, University of California Energy Institute (UCEI)

Director Blumstein presented an overview of the workings of CIEE and how it relates to UCEI (see Distribution 3), noting that CIEE supports, rather than conducts, research.

The directors try to emphasize research that the private sector may be reluctant to pursue.

VIII. New Business and Planning

Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

- The committee elected not to opine on the proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 636.
- Prof. Carey (UCD) asked for and received informal feedback on other campuses’ travel grant totals and award procedures.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35.

Distributions:

1. Pacific Rim Research Program update letter and brochure
2. Five-Year Academic Review of the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2), November 2006, Final Report
3. CIEE (PowerPoint slides)
4. UC Technology Transfer Program FY 2006 Annual Report

Attest: Wendy Max, UCORP Chair

Prepared by: Kenneth Feer, Committee Analyst