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DRAFT NOTES
The following people were present for all or a portion of the meeting.

PACUR Members
Greg Hakim, University of Washington, Chair
Simona Bordoni, Caltech
John Braun, UCP
Rich Clark, Millersville University, UCAR Trustee Liaison to PACUR
Bob Hart, Florida State University
Yvette Richardson, Pennsylvania State University
Elizabeth Ritchie, University of Arizona
Roger Samelson, Oregon State University
Bob Street, Stanford University
Jeff Trapp, Purdue University
Geoff Vallis, Princeton University
Mike Wiltberger, NCAR

UCAR, NCAR UCP
Tom Bogdan, UCAR President
Rana Brasher – Alleva, NCAR Budget & Planning
Eron Brennan, IT
Chris Davis, ASP Director
Aneka Finley, UCAR Governance Office
Brant Foote, RAL Director
Michelle Flores, UCAR Governance Office
Susan Friberg, UCAR Governance Office
Vanda Grubisic, EOL Director
Maura Hagan, NCAR Deputy Director
Kay Howe, NSDL
Matt Hirschland, Communications Director
Valerie Koch, NCAR Budget & Planning
Rich Loft, CISL
Hanne Mauriello, UCP Interim Director
Meg McClellan, UCAR General Council
Mohan Ramamurthy, Unidata Director
Sue Schauffler, EOL
Cindy Schmidt, University Relations
Roger Wakimoto, NCAR Director

National Science Foundation
Michael Morgan, AGS Director
Sarah Ruth via phone
Bernard Grant via phone
Prior to the start of the PACUR meeting, a joint session with PACUR, and NCAR/UCP PIs was held at Foothills Lab Auditorium. The session was chaired by PACUR chair, Greg Hakim and included remarks from Michael Morgan, Director of AGS/NSF, Bob Street chair of the PACUR non-core proposal review sub-committee, and Matthias Steiner from the NCAR Scientists’ Assembly (NSA).

1. The PACUR meeting convened and everyone introduced themselves. Tom Bogdan thanked everyone for attending and expressed how important he thinks PACUR is and how he hopes it will assume a larger role in giving him input from the University community.

2. PACUR Chair, Greg Hakim presented the meeting notes from the October 2011 PACUR meeting. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the meeting notes without change.

3. Bob Street, chair of the non-core proposal review sub-committee, presented the sub-committee report. Bob reported that, for this cycle, there were ninety-one proposals submitted, and the sub-committee looked at thirty-three of them. The sub-committee found that none of the proposals were in violation of the criteria. A question was raised about student involvement in NCAR proposals not being part of the criteria, but that it is often a consideration in the subcommittee’s examination of the process. Subcommittee member, Bob Hart, responded that student involvement can actually be part of “meaningful collaboration” but that it is not a part of the official criteria. A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the sub-committee report.

4. Tom Bogdan, UCAR President, presented his 6 Point Plan as a road map for the next five years of his presidency. Part of the plan includes strengthening university relations, and a first step in that process has been to create an internal committee to examine the current relationships between UCAR and the universities and make recommendations. This committee is chaired by Vanda Grubisic, NCAR/EOL Director. She later gave an overview of that committee and talked about a constituent survey to be conducted later in the year that will gather data on the nature of the relationship between UCAR and its stakeholders.

Tom also reported that the Board of Trustees has created a committee to examine UCAR’s governance practices and rules for currency, and make recommendations. He reported on the University visits he has been making since he became President and said that all the visits have been valuable to him. Each university had its topics to discuss, and parts of UCAR they interacted with, but all seemed to agree that the NCAR’s visitor programs are very important. Discussion centered on NCAR visits to universities, and the potential value to both NCAR and the universities that those might bring. Rich Clark said a serious effort is needed to build an effective visitor program that would make it attractive for NCAR scientific staff to visit universities. Discussion also touched on governance topics like relevancy of PACUR, conducting the proposal process review in a different way, term limits for Member Reps and a survey of stakeholders.

5. During the morning session with the NCAR and UCP PIs, there was a question asked about why the non-core proposal subcommittee reviews UCP proposals since they are not generally core-funded but are on soft money. Bernard Grant, AGS, said that he thought UCP participation in
the non-core review was up to UCAR and UCP since the current cooperative agreement pertains only to NCAR and not other UCAR activities like UCP.

6. Roger Wakimoto, NCAR Director, announced plans to update the NCAR Strategic plan. Roger explained that for the new plan he would like to engage the UCAR members at the start of the planning by holding two separate break-out sessions at the upcoming Annual Member’s Meeting to talk about where the Members feel NCAR should focus its resources. Work on the strategic plan will begin this fall and is expected to be completed by 2013. Roger asked for volunteers from PACUR to help out with the break-out groups: Bob Street, Simona Bordoni, Yvette Richardson, and Rich Clark all volunteered.

7. Chris Davis, Director of NCAR’s Advanced Study Program, discussed the ASP post-doc selection process with the PACUR. He specifically addressed a comment that “more daylight” is needed on the selection process. Chris said he will look at ways to make it more transparent.

8. Michael Morgan, AGS/GEO Director, gave the NSF report. Michael also commented on how helpful he found the morning session with the scientists to be. Michael briefly talked about the President’s budget which calls for a 4.8% increase to NSF, a 2.1% increase to AGS but that NCAR would be down 6.4%. The NCAR budget number is a difficult issue, he said, and efforts are underway to bring the number up. Michael also said that he was looking forward to the upcoming Member’s Meeting and would make sure that staff and section heads would be available to participate.

9. As a member of the Board of Trustees’ Governance Task Group (GTG), Greg Hakim gave an overview of the GTG’s charge which includes examining current practices and bylaws and making recommendations. The GTG will address such questions as: What kind of organization should be a member? Should there be just one membership level? Should there be a membership opportunity for the private sector? Community and/or tribal colleges? Should there be one or two Member Reps from each university? The GTG will work over the next year. There will be a report to the Members at the Annual Meeting in October.

10. Greg Hakim and Tom Bogdan lead a discussion about the future of PACUR and what its role should be. There was general consensus that the non-core proposal review should stay within the committee; the proposal review serves to reassure the universities that there is no unfair competition with them from NCAR, and this is a clear PACUR concern. Some comments from the committee: PACUR would like to be more involved and be given specific tasks to complete. Roger Wakimoto said that he would like to see more PACUR members serving on NCAR advisory panels. He also asked for volunteers to take a look at streamlining the NCAR internal non-core proposal review process: Jeff Trapp agreed to co-chair this committee along with Mike Wiltberger. Simona Bordoni, Bob Street and John Braun also volunteered. Mike and John will gather four or five scientists from NCAR and UCP to serve on the committee too.

A suggestion was made for PACUR to host an “executive session” during the Member’s Meeting so university reps could talk freely without and staff from UCAR or NCAR present. It was agreed that time would be made for this on the Member’s Meeting agenda.

PACUR agreed that coming to Boulder for future spring meetings was a good choice since it’s central.
11. Unstructured discussion included issues concerning merging the two separate membership levels into one, which would allow Academic Affiliates to vote. A comment was made that if Affiliates were to be full Members of UCAR it might change the research nature of the organization. However, the point was made that some Affiliates are engaged in research, many have Masters programs, and about 50% of students from Affiliates go on to get their PhDs.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.

End of Meeting Notes