

**Minutes
Committee on Research
December 2, 2008**

The Committee on Research (COR) met at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, December 2, 2008 in 307 Kerr Hall.

Present: Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, Carla Freccero, Donna Hunter, Judit Moschkovich, Sriram Shastry, Meg Wilson.

Absent with notice: Shaowei Chen, Donka Farkas. Holger Schmidt.

Guest: VCR Bruce Margon.

Minutes of November 18, 2008 were approved.

Chair's Announcements: 1) From SEC: SEC spent much of the recent meeting talking about the academic plan high level indicators. A subcommittee of SEC continues to work with the faculty salary scale and the CPEVC. 2) Two academic dean searches are nearing closure: the lead Arts choice is in negotiation with the University; and the three SOE finalists are presenting open talks to the faculty.

New Teacher Center Review Response

COR approved the revised draft response to the review of the Social Sciences New Teacher Center.

Intellectual Property Forum

The Committee reviewed the consultation with the Office of Management of Intellectual Property (OMIP) Acting Director Tollefson. The discussion at the COR meeting brought up intellectual property and copyright issues in the Arts and Humanities that had not come up (mainly due to time constraints) in the consultation. COR members pointed out that areas that have to do with copyright laws in the entertainment industry are under the purview of ITS.

It became clear through discussion that two types of fora would be appropriate to cover the broad spectrum of issues raised. The first, a general forum, could be on the rights of artists and scholars in the humanities, and on realistic access to internet materials including discussion of what would ideally constitute copyright for the 21st century. It would be a reminder of what is required by UC for legal compliance. What should UC's policy ideally be to facilitate artistic and academic freedom expected in a University setting? (legal compliance vs. faculty freedom) One member thought it would be interesting to hear from the different divisions on what intellectual property means in

their work. COR suggested that it might sponsor this forum with the Committee on Academic Freedom (and, to this effect, will invite the CAF chair to a winter COR meeting). It was also suggested that Professor Warren Sack in the Arts Division has considerable expertise in these issues, and could perhaps be invited for a consultation with COR.

A second forum, directed more to the SOE, P&BS and relevant Social Sciences fields would have to do with the “how-tos” of setting up joint study agreements, processing invention disclosures, etc., including the complexity, legal advice, and projected timelines. COR also considered whether or not this, in its more practical application, couldn’t be handled by the VCR and OMIP Director through consultations at divisional chair meetings to find out what the faculty needs really are and what clarifications are required to increase optimal efficiency and cooperation between principal investigators and the Office of Research.

Revisions to CAPM 416.220 – Joint Appointments for Senate Faculty

Committee members were asked to send any additional comments to the Chair by the end of this week. Overall, it is the sense of COR that this revision is a welcome change that will promote interdisciplinary collaborations and interactions. The Chair will draft a response to circulate to the committee for final approval. Points to be included:

- lend affirmation of support to joint appointments in general;
- protect “below-the-line” departmental affiliations;
- suggest that for minor-split joint appointments (such as a 100/0 split) faculty are given the option to waive their voting rights in the guest department;
- clarify that joint appointments are also allowed at the time of the initial hire (for senior hires at the associate professor and professor levels - assistant professors should not be eligible for joint appointments upon hire);
- simplify the M.O.U. to the extent possible, since in its current form, it appears to be somewhat cumbersome;
- suggest that information about how are the other UC campuses are handling joint appointments should be gathered before the policy is finalized.

Academic Plan – High Level Indicators

The Committee discussed CPEVC’s Measuring Our Progress, Next Steps (11/4/08) document of 11/4/08. COR members expressed concerns about the patchwork quality of the document, the extensive use of the term “culture of evidence” (which is the title of a paper by ETS that essentially advocates standardized tests for assessing postsecondary learning outcomes), and the use of exclusively quantifiable metrics in the document. The COR Chair invited additional comments by the end of the week to draft a final response. Points to be included:

- consider the inclusion of non-quantitative indicators;
- question the blanket assumption that only comparative data with “comparison institutions” are valuable;
- what metrics make sense internally, for UCSC?

- how can UCSC deal with the graduate enrollment parameter of the AAU qualifications?

Consultation with VCR Margon

In addition to the comments the VCR added to the copyright discussion recorded above, he returned to the discussion about postdocs as PIs and co-PI that begun at the last COR meeting. He confirmed that the Regents (and not the Senate) have set policy on who can be a PI. Distinguishing “co-PIs” is more complicated and differs from agency to agency. Even on campus there are different interpretations if a co-PI requires an exception. The VCR will research this. After the discussions with COR, the VCR would like to draft a set of guidelines (using the term “guidelines” to mean just that, not “policy”) that include examples of when an exception to the PI status can be approved by his office as well as circumstances likely to lead to a denial of that status.

The VCR also let COR know that he is aware of dissatisfaction in SOE regarding the process for working with OMIP on research agreements in a timely manner. If warranted he could hire another person for his office, but also the campus should consider additional UC counsel to be available especially for the needs and success of SOE.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

So attests,
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair
Committee on Research