

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY

Minutes of Meeting**June 11, 2012****I. Chair's Announcements***John Crawford, UCORP Chair*

Update: Chair Crawford reported on items of interest from the May Academic Council meeting: 1) The Council voted in favor of the dissolution of the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC); the item next goes to the Academic Assembly; 2) The pilot online education program is undergoing leadership changes at a time when renewed scrutiny is being focused on its academic and business models.

II. Compendium Revision

Issue: Chair Crawford summarized the recent Compendium revision process, noting that the multi-campus research unit (MRU) section was deemed in need of significant revision and was assigned to UCORP. The committee is tasked to ensure alignment between administration and programmatic changes on the one hand, and Senate and academic oversight requirements on the other. Of particular concern is language surrounding funding flexibility.

Discussion: The committee reached consensus on the following areas:

- An MRU should involve a minimum of three campuses;
- Annual Reports should be used in academic evaluations;
- APM 241, which covers the appointment of MRU directors, will need examined to ensure parallel language, and to ensure appointment authority can be delegable up or down, as appropriate;
- Subsection V.B.1. will need revision once the PPA recommendations are enacted;
- A transition plan for extant entities that must undergo structural or other changes should be developed.

Action: Chair Crawford will circulate a revised draft electronically for approval.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Information Technology Services*David Ernst, Chief Information Officer*

Issue: CIO Ernst summarized the work his office oversees, including systemwide research computing needs assessments, data storage and security, and collaboration technologies. Familiar obstacles hinder systemwide efforts: degree of cost and utilization socialization, interaction with private industry, rapid change in technology and practices, and inertia of legacy systems.

Discussion: Members encouraged CIO Ernst to involve faculty earlier and more often in planning exercises. Members asked how the system was being leveraged to expand information technology options for teaching and research, and CIO Ernst reported that local needs and differential historical practices make system initiatives difficult to launch due to lack of initial support.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Research and Graduate Studies*Steve Beckwith, Vice President***1. University of California Observatories Advisory Board**

Discussion: Members inquired how the Board membership would be selected and apportioned. Vice President Beckwith indicated that he would solicit nominations from the relevant stakeholder groups; final selections will be made by the Provost and the Vice President. Terms

of service are envisioned to be 3 years, with staggered start dates to ensure continuity. Members asked who would chair the group, how ties would be broken, and what scope of operations would constitute the Board's bailiwick. Vice President Beckwith responded that the Board would advise on all UC astronomy and astrophysics programs, to produce a global and synthesized business model and operational standards. Members then asked how the current advisory committee differed from the proposed Board. Vice President Beckwith noted that the current committee offers only scientific advice and reports to the UCO director; the new Board will report to the Vice President. Members sought additional explanation as to how budget authority could be considered separately from hiring authority and academic quality. Vice President Beckwith indicated that a user committee is standard practice in the broader astronomy and astrophysics community, and also that the management Board would be able to overrule recommendations from the scientific advisors.

2. Portfolio Review Group

Discussion: Members noted that the language and structures to be recommended should be in parallel with that used in other systemwide research governance documents (see Item II above and Item V below). Members also noted that membership guidelines should allow for Senate processes as well as a diversity of opinions.\

Action: Draft language will be circulated electronically.

V. Task Force on Principles, Processes, and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments

Discussion: The committee continued its discussion of the guidelines and requirements to be included in the PPA report. Real-time revisions were made as the committee worked to specify membership, chair selection, linguistic continuity, and the nature and amount of materials to be submitted for academic reviews and funding applications.

Action: A revised draft will be circulated electronically.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

1. Report and Recommendation of the Committee on Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS)

Issue: Chair Crawford outlined the report's scope and the committee's history before summarizing the committee's [findings](#).

Discussion: Members noted that the recommendations were not strictly revenue neutral, and Chair Crawford suggested that they represented thoughtful best practices based on a wide survey. Members also noted that some of the recommendations could result in significant programmatic changes to admissions. Members also observed that the recommendations seemed more reactive than strategic, as well as some surprising findings, such as that post-doc researchers are less expensive than graduate student tuition plus stipend.

Action: The committee endorsed the recommendations unanimously.

VII. Campus Updates

Note: Item not addressed.

VIII. New Business

Note: This item occurred in executive session; other than action items, no notes were taken.

Adjournment 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Policy Analyst

Attest: John Crawford, UCORP Chair