

Minutes of Meeting
Monday November 8, 2004
Teleconference

I. Academic Council Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources.

Updates from UCORP Chair Neiman and Council Chair Blumenthal

At its October meeting, Council decided to send the Resolution out for general review by the standing committees and the divisions in response to procedural and substantive concerns raised by the anti-tobacco group. Chair Blumenthal has been in discussions with Professor Stan Glantz, the spokesperson for the group, about how to represent their position in the review request. Chair Blumenthal invited Professor Glantz. to submit a one-page summary of the group's position. That position statement was drafted and then discussed among the Council Chair, the Chair of UCPB and Chair Neiman late last week. This statement criticizes the UCORP report on funding restrictions and the process followed in developing the report, but does not address the resolution per se. Chair Neiman noted that the position includes a new argument: that accepting funding from the tobacco industry violates existing UC policy, because to do so is not consistent with the University's mission to support appropriate research activity. The group has also recommended amending the report by eliminating all references specific to tobacco funding. The request for review of the Resolution has not been sent out yet from the Council Chair . UCORP may wish to respond directly to the anti-tobacco group's criticisms, or decide to revisit the report and the resolution in light of those criticisms, or submit a formal response as part of the upcoming general review. Council Chair Blumenthal went over the background of Professor Glantz's letter, and noted that he will be sending out a letter to Council members that will include his short summary of the pros and cons surrounding the issue, and links to the report on restrictive clauses and to the AAUP Report of Committee A: *Rejection of Research Funds from Tobacco Corporations*. Responses will be requested by February so that, if the issue is taken to the Assembly, it can be ready for the March Assembly meeting.

Discussion points

On the question of UC policy:

- UC policy is being cited in support of arguments on both sides.
- The anti-tobacco group's argument is based on a section of University Regulation #4 "Special Services to Individuals and Organizations," which protects against the university's name being commercially exploited.
- Chair Blumenthal suggested that a more profitable discussion would not be a debate of what university policy is, but rather a discussion of what policy should be.
- It was noted that the anti-tobacco group wants to establish policy that would disallow tobacco funding on a moral basis.

Considerations for UCORP's response:

- Chair Neiman saw the matter as dividing into: 1) legislative or procedural concerns relating to the authority of a vote of a sub-unit of the university. and 2) the academic freedom issue addressed in the resolution.
- It is not clear why the statement of the anti-tobacco group focused on the report and not the resolution.

- It was suggested that Professor Glantz be invited to discuss the issue with UCORP. After deliberation, it was felt that the committee could decide at a later time whether such a consultation would be of benefit.
- It was clarified that in the upcoming review, campus CORs would be responding through their respective divisional senate structure.
- A member stressed the importance of including in the review, some materials covering the “slippery slope” argument (i.e., that if tobacco money is banned, then other bans will follow with no clear cut off).

Action: The committee agreed to wait and participate in the general review, once the request is forwarded from Council. UCORP may append to its response the “counterpoints” memo as a means of describing the process followed in the development of the report and the resolution.

II. The Influence of Corporate Funding on Research - UCAF Request for Study - Update from Chair Neiman

Issue: Last year, UCAF’s response to the UCORP report on funding restrictions also included the request that UCORP lead an investigation into the possible corruption of university research because of corporate sponsors. This in an effort to address what UCAF termed “the tension between academic freedom and corporate funding.”

Update: Chair Neiman contacted UCAF Chair Patrick Fox to let him know that UCORP would be pleased to work with UCAF on issues raised by the “strings” report, assuming what UCAF is concerned about are influences other than explicit strings or restrictions. UCAF Chair Fox will report back to UCORP as to what that committee’s current interest and expectations are after the issue is discussed at their November meeting.

Attest: Max Neiman, Chair
UCORP

Minutes prepared by Brenda Foust,
Policy Analyst