1. Introduction by the chair and adoption of the agenda
2. Updates on Alaska’s INBRE and EPSCoR programs (led by Peter Schweitzer):
   A. Jocelyn Krebs presented on Alaska INBRE (see overview sheet for details).
      Questions were raised by Mead Treadwell, about behavioral health; and by
      Steve Smith, about infrastructural challenges.
   B. Denise Thorsen presented on Alaska NASA EPSCoR (see overview sheet for
      details). Comments were made by Treadwell on the state – NASA agreement
      and the importance of the aerospace industry for the state.
   C. Katherine Keith presented on Alaska DOE EPSCoR (see overview sheet for
      details) and introduced a Danish guest researcher.
   D. Schweitzer presented on Alaska NSF EPSCoR (see update sheet for details).
   E. Mark Myers presented a summary of the aforementioned programs, focused
      on integration and synergy. This was followed by questions:
      a. Treadwell asked whether Alaska is eligible for any other EPSCoR
         programs. Myers and Schweitzer said they would determine that
         during a forthcoming trip to Washington, D.C.
      b. Daniel Julius inquired as to what roles the Alaska Sea Grant (and Land
         Grant) programs could play in the context of capacity building.
   F. Lil Alessa presented an update on changes at the National Science
      Foundation in regards to merit review criteria.
3. Discussion of drafting a Statewide Plan on Research and Economic Development
   (led by Mead Treadwell):
   A. Treadwell provided comments on the role of the state in regards to research,
      both today (under Gov. Parnell) as in the past (e.g., under Gov. Murkowski).
      He noted that at present the NSF is asking for more alignment of state and
      university research needs. Treadwell also suggested tax credits as a potential
      instrument to attract research investments.
   B. Treadwell identified a 3-legged initiative based on research capacity,
      business capacity, and state/federal capacity. He asked what research does
      for the Alaskan economy, and noted that the lieutenant governor can play an
      important role of communicating between the state and the university.
   C. Treadwell’s presentation was followed by comments and discussion:
      a. Myers noted that the sustainability of the research enterprise is
         important and that investment models are needed.
      b. Susan Henrichs noted that individual researchers need to tailor their
         research to federal priorities, as that is the source of their funding.
c. Dan White noted that the Alaska Center for Energy and Power caters to state needs.
d. Julius stressed the need to look more at international opportunities for research at UA.
e. Michael Driscoll stated that SCoR needs to attend to state, federal and international levels, and noted the importance of the public image of what UA does as a university. He made several suggestions for additional SCoR members.
f. Myers suggested research might help the state permitting process.
g. James Johnsen noted that the state Department of Natural Resources alone has a backlog of 2,300 permit applications.
h. Julius stated that SCoR would need to redo the state Research & Development plan created under Senate Joint Resolution 44, and noted that new SCoR members can be added with a simple majority vote. He asked who would do the work on updating the state R&D plan.
i. Treadwell agreed that the state needs to rewrite the SJR 44 plan, and suggested hiring a science writer for the task.
j. Schweitzer noted that NSF EPSCoR requires an updated state R&D plan, which demonstrates the alignment of state and EPSCoR goals.
k. Jocelyn Krebs proposed combining SCoR and the UA biomedical committee. She will follow up with a written request.
l. Myers noted that the size of SCoR is an issue, and asked about the time horizon (5 years, 10 years, etc.) of the new research plan.
m. Treadwell suggested a decadal plan with a 5-year update.

4. Summary and Action Items (led by Daniel Julius):
   A. It was resolved that EPSCoR and INBRE programs should coordinate more often, and the combination of some committees should be explored.
   B. It was resolved that the state R&D created by SJR44 should be redone by the end of 2011. It was proposed the committee explore two potential planning workshops plan within 2011, perhaps in May and September.
   C. It was resolved that new SCoR members will be added in the near future.

5. Adjournment