



*Chair, Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9303*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: [John.Oakley@ucop.edu](mailto:John.Oakley@ucop.edu)*

*Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

July 10, 2006

**WYATT R. HUME**  
**PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**RE: California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CAL ISI), Additional Review Recommendation**

Dear Rory,

I would like briefly to update you on the Academic Council's actions at its June 21, 2006, meeting relating to the review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs).

First, Council sees no present need to modify the body of the Review Protocol that was adopted last December and which will now be put into practice in the upcoming review of Cal IT2. The word "proposed" should, though, be deleted from the document title.

Second, Council endorsed a joint letter from the University Committee on Research Policy and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (enclosed), suggesting two additional considerations in reviewing the Cal ISIs: 1) The report of the earlier ISI 'mid-launch' review should be brought to the attention of the Cal IT2 review panel; and 2) guidelines for a standardized Director's Report should be developed as part of the process evaluation that will ensue after the Cal IT2 review is completed.

Lastly, we are very pleased that the Cal IT2 review has been initiated and wish to express our support of the planned review structure as well as the appointment of panel members. The Academic Council will be following the review with interest and looks forward to working with you on possible further refinements of the review process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "JO", written over a light blue horizontal line.

John Oakley, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council  
María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director

Encl.: 1



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)  
George Sensabaugh, Chair [sensaba@berkeley.edu](mailto:sensaba@berkeley.edu)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)  
Stanton Glantz, Chair [glantz@medicine.ucsf.edu](mailto:glantz@medicine.ucsf.edu)

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9466  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 12, 2006

**JOHN OAKLEY**  
**CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: California Institutes for Science and Innovation, Additional Review Recommendation**

Dear John,

At its June 5, 2006 meeting, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) again considered the review protocol for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). On June 6, 2006, the University Committee on Planning and Budget also considered the protocol. We see no need to modify the protocol previously approved by Council as part of the consent calendar (revised agenda) at its December 14, 2005 meeting. We are pleased to see that the review process for Cal-IT2 is going forward and think the appointed review committee is outstanding.

In a previous memo to you (May 23, 2006), UCORP observed that the ISI Review Panel chaired by Richard Lerner pointed out several issues it thought important to the continuation of the Cal ISI enterprise. Since these points are the product of a previous review, we believe they should be brought to the attention of the Cal-IT2 review panel for consideration. These points are implicitly covered in the existing review protocol and require no modification of that protocol.

Finally, as a point for future reference, it was noted in UCORP's discussion that the MRU review process includes both guidelines specifying the content of the MRU Director's Report and guidelines for the Review Committee itself, *i.e.*, the Review Protocol. The ISI Review Protocol was based on the latter but made no recommendation regarding the content of a Director's report. We recommend that next year's evaluation of the ISI review process exemplified by the Cal-IT2 review include consideration of the need for a standardized format to guide the preparation of the director's report. This format would be expected to include the standardized and quantified metrics needed to assess the prospects for future success of each ISI.

We ask that the Academic Council endorse this proposal and communicate this recommendation to Provost Hume.

Sincerely,

George Sensabaugh, Chair  
UCORP

Stanton Glantz, Chair  
UCPB

cc: UCORP  
UCPB  
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate