



Robert L. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: Robert.powell@ucop.edu

*Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate
Faculty Representative to the Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200
August 16, 2013*

**SUSAN CARLSON
VICE PROVOST, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL**

Re: APM 241 and Approval of MRU Directors

Dear Susan:

At its July 24 meeting, the Academic Council discussed in detail the language proposed by your office for bringing APM 241-24 into compliance with Regental policy regarding the appointment of MRU directors. The Council notes that the proposed new language appears to exclude the lead campus's Senate and/or administration from the appointment process, and members found this problematic. While the Council was not able to agree on a definite counterproposal, members voted to forward possible alternative language for further consideration. There was strong consensus that the appointment process needed to be more collaborative. Several members appreciated both the tone surrounding and the specificity of the Senate's role in guidelines for Cal ISI reviews, and suggested that it could serve as a model for additional language in subsection 24-c. I enclose the pertinent sections of the Cal ISI review guidelines for your reference.

The Council's goal in making these suggestions is to ensure that wide consultation occurs before key appointments are made. We understand that changes to the proposed APM language may require further revision of other documents that also govern this type of entity, and the Senate is ready to assist as needed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "R.L. Powell".

Robert L. Powell

Encl (2)

Cc: Academic Council
Steven Beckwith, Vice President, Research and Graduate Studies
Aimée Dorr, Provost
Executive Director Winnacker

Enclosure 1

Language proposed by Academic Personnel in Systemwide Review

c. The Director of a Multi-campus Research Unit (MRU) is appointed by the President Chancellor or his/her designee after consultation with the ~~appropriate Division~~ Academic Senate and with the advice of a Search Committee appointed by the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Chancellor of Research or his/her equivalent. Nominations for membership on the Search Committee are solicited by the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies Chancellor of Research or his/her equivalent from the Chair of the Academic Division Senate and the Chancellors. Normally, at least one member of the MRU Advisory or Executive Committee serves on the Search Committee.

Alternate Language on MRU Directors Proposed for APM 241 Recommended for consideration but not endorsed by Academic Council

241-24c (reflects/accepts the original proposed revisions to 241-24c; additional modifications are noted)

The Director of a Multi-campus Research Unit (MRU) is appointed by the President or his/her designee after consultation with the Academic Senate and with the advice of a Search Committee appointed by the ~~Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies~~ President or his/her designee. Nominations for membership on the Search Committee are solicited by the ~~Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies~~ President or his/her designee from the Chair of the Academic Senate and the Chancellors. The Search Committee members will be selected from this list. The Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies President or his/her designee can request additional nominees as needed to ensure that the makeup of the committee will result in a fair and balanced process. ~~Normally,~~ At least one member of the MRU Advisory or Executive Committee of an existing MRU seeking a new Director serves on the Search Committee.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE

Convening the Review Panel

1. The Provost requests nominations for the Review Panel from the Chancellors, the Academic Senate, and the Institute Director.
2. The Provost appoints a Review Panel from the slate of names submitted. Membership includes experts of international stature from both the academic and the private sector, and excludes anyone with an affiliation to the Institute being evaluated or employee or officer of a private business collaborating with the Institute. The host campus divisional senate selects a senior representative to serve as a member of the Review Panel.
3. The Provost convenes and formally charges the Review Panel. The process is managed from the Office of the President by the Provost and Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

The Review Protocol and Institute Report

1. During the preparation of the review protocol and report guidelines, institute-specific and campus-specific concerns are solicited from the Chancellors, Divisional and Systemwide Senate Chairs, Institute Directors, and Panel Members.
2. The Chancellors are responsible for submitting a single integrated Institute report to the Provost, which is forwarded to the Review Panel.
3. Other relevant background materials provided to the Review Panel include: The original Institute Proposal and the 2006 Academic Review Report.

Responsibilities of the Review Panel

1. Meets as necessary via conference call to review Institute materials, prepare for the site visit and complete their written report to the Provost. Staff support is provided by Innovation Alliances and Services.
2. The Calit2 site visit is scheduled for October 12-14, 2011.
 - The visit will begin at UC San Diego on Wednesday night October 12, with a Chancellors' dinner in Atkinson Hall.
 - October 13, the Panel visits Calit2 at UC San Diego.
 - October 14, the Panel visits Calit2 at UC Irvine.
 - A summary review session with Institute Directors and staff concludes the site visit.
3. The Review Panel submits their report to the Provost by December 1.
4. The Panel Chair meets (by telephone) with the President, the Chancellors, the Provost and the Institute Directors to discuss the recommendations in the report.

The Report Review Process

1. The Provost forwards the Review Panel's report to the Chancellors.
2. The Chancellors, in coordination with the Institute Directors, prepare a unified response to the Panel's report.
3. The Chancellors submit the unified response to their respective Senate Divisions for comment, after which the response and Senate Divisions' comments are forwarded to the Provost.
4. The Provost solicits formal comments from the Systemwide Senate and the President's Board on Science and Innovation based on all review materials including responses from the four Senate Divisions and the Systemwide Senate.

Final Recommendations and Follow-Up

1. The Provost sends the Chancellors his recommendations based on all aspects of the review process.
2. The Chancellors submit a follow-up report to the Provost and the Systemwide Senate describing their plan of action for addressing the recommendations.

TIMELINE SUMMARY

June 2011: Review Panel appointed and charged
August 2011: Institute report submitted to the Office of the Provost
September 2011: Materials sent to the Review Panel
October 2011: Site visit
November 2011: Panel submits report to the Office of the Provost
Jan-May 2012: Report sent for review and comment
December 2012: Review completed and follow-up plan in place

STAFF CONTACT INFORMATION

Xia Teng, Ph.D.
Manager, Innovation Alliances and Services
Office of Research and Graduate Studies
University of California Office of the President

1111 Franklin St. 5th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 587- 6055
xia.teng@ucop.edu