

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)**Wednesday, October 1, 2014****3:00 – 4:30 pm****KL 324****[UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources](#)****I. Chair's Report – *David Noelle***

Provost/EVC's all-faculty forum on September 24.

II. Consent Calendar

Approval of September 17 meeting minutes.

Pg. 1-4**III. Campus Review Items****A. Economics PhD Proposal****Pg. 5-6**

COR member has submitted a revised review of this proposal.

Action requested: COR to vote on recommending approval. Deadline is October 3. Due to the proposal's length, it is not appended to this packet. *The proposal can be viewed at UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Review Items – Campus.*

B. Senate-Administration IT Advisory Council Draft Charge**Pg. 7-9**

At the last meeting, COR discussed the draft charge and recommended a position.

Action requested: COR to finalize the memo to the Senate Chair. Deadline is October 3.

C. Proposed Split of FWDAF**Pg. 10-11**

The committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom submitted a request to Division Council to split the committee into two, separate, standing committees: the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee on Diversity and Equity. All Senate committees were invited to opine.

Action requested: COR to review the request and send any comments to the Senate Chair by October 17.

- D. Compensation for General Education Subcommittee Chair **Pg. 12-13**
The General Education Subcommittee submitted a request to Division Council requesting compensation for its chair. All Senate standing committees were invited to opine.

Action requested: COR to review the request and send any comments to the Senate Chair by October 17.

- IV. **Senate Faculty Grants Program** **Pg. 14-20**
A. Long term goals
B. Practice on other UC campuses (outline notes from AY 13-14 **Pg. 21-22**
COR discussion).

Relevant background documents, including the previous awardees, proposals, and calls, as well as information from the other UC campuses, are posted at:
UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Faculty research grants

- V. **Other Business**

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
September 17, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on September 17, 2014 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David Noelle presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Noelle provided the following updates from the September 3 Division Council meeting:

--Division Council agreed that the following issues will be priorities this academic year: strategic academic focusing, faculty FTE allocation process, and space planning (including the lack of space for graduate students and the absence of adequate Senate faculty representation on current campus space committees).

--Division Council discussed the issues surrounding self-supporting graduate programs which Senate standing committees, including COR, opined on during the last academic year. COR's concern with these programs is the negative impact on faculty's multiple research foci.

--Graduate course request forms are now online.

--SACAP has been dissolved and replaced with the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) that will facilitate program review.

--Parking. Division Council will invite VC for Business and Administrative Services Michael Reese to a future meeting to discuss the parking situation's impact on faculty.

--Renewed interest in Senate standing committees drafting conflict of interest policies.

--Systemwide is currently reviewing policies on diversity and discrimination which may be sent to the campuses for review. Systemwide is also interested in evaluating the quality of UC faculty in comparison to other institutions.

Chair Noelle mentioned that the Center for Human Adaptive Systems and Environments will likely submit a proposal to establish itself as an ORU this academic year. If the proposal gets submitted, COR will review it according to the newly-approved Senate policies on the establishment and review of research units.

Chair Noelle announced, as a continuation of the discussion from the last COR meeting, that he has contacted the Institutional Review Board (IRB) staff about that unit's review and COR's input in the process. The director of Research Compliance has agreed to work with COR to submit a satisfaction survey to faculty. The office of Research Compliance is scheduled for a periodic review next year and COR is interested in providing input. VCR Traina mentioned previous surveys of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) that COR could review in advance.

ACTION: VCR Traina will circulate previous IACUC surveys to COR members and will work with the Research Compliance director on drafting questions for COR's potential survey of faculty regarding IRB.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The minutes from the September 3 COR meeting were approved as presented.

III. SNRI Five-Year Review

Prior to this meeting, COR members re-reviewed the five-year review criteria contained in the research units policies. Five-year reviews are to be launched by the Chancellor (likely the VCR as designee) with the Senate providing input on the selection of external review members. COR briefly discussed the timeline SNRI would have to follow for the review.

ACTION: VCR Traina will submit a review notification letter to SNRI leadership and will copy COR members. The appropriate program review committee will also be included in the correspondence.

IV. Campus Review Items

--Senate-Administration Advisory Council draft charge. COR members were in favor of the draft charge but suggested that the faculty membership be expanded

by one slot and include representatives from four Senate committees. The administration membership could then be expanded for balance.

ACTION: COR to draft memo to the Senate Chair stating that the faculty membership in the draft charge should be expanded to include one representative each from UGC, GC, CAPRA, and COR. To maintain balance, the administration membership should be expanded by one slot.

--SSHA's request to suspend the use of the appraisal form.

ACTION: COR will inform the Senate Chair that the committee has no comments on this issue.

--Economics PhD proposal.

Prior to this meeting, COR reviewed the draft review prepared by a committee member. COR held a lengthy discussion and narrowed down the proposal's issues to the following: space planning, appropriate library resources, the feasibility of maintaining the program with the current number of faculty, affiliate faculty's contribution to the curriculum, the need for collaboration with Health Psychology, the workload expectations of students conducting research in their second year, the need to demonstrate demand in the program's focal areas as well as the need to prove its funding potential, and whether the proposal needs to include the Bylaw 55 unit narrative.

ACTION: COR lead reviewer will circulate a revised review among the committee for further discussion. At its October 1 meeting, COR will vote on whether to recommend the proposal move forward in the approval process and will finalize its memo making recommendations concerning the proposal document.

V. Faculty Research Grants

COR members held a lengthy discussion on the future of the grants program. COR must decide the program's goals and that will dictate how to request additional resources for the program (COR sent two requests to the Provost

during the last academic year for additional funds as the funds allocated for this program have not been commensurate with the growth in faculty numbers).

COR members inquired whether these grants have been helpful in increasing faculty's success in obtaining larger grants. If faculty report back – using certain indicators of success such as papers generated or more grants obtained – that these internal grants are helpful, that could provide further justification for the need for additional funding.

COR members agreed that next steps should be: determine the “blue sky” goals for this grants program, survey previous faculty awardees on whether these grants helped them obtain larger grants or publish papers, illustrate in a graph the rate of faculty growth in relation to funding for the program, and, finally, provide all these findings to Division Council and the Provost as justification that additional funding is needed for the grants program.

ACTION: COR to gather the list of previous award winners of the past five years and their grant proposals, determine what the budget has been for the grants program for the past five years, and determine how to survey the faculty on their successes after obtaining these grants. At the October 1 COR meeting, committee members will discuss the grants program's long-term goals.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: David Noelle, COR Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

***REVISED DRAFT* COR review for Economics graduate program**

The primary motivation for establishing the proposed Economics graduate program is that the UC Merced is the only UC campus that does not offer graduate program in Economics, and the number of existing faculty with unique research emphasis will now allow UC Merced to offer unique Economics graduate program that can complement with other existing programs within UC campuses. Four major fields of economics will be focused: (1) Economic Geography and Trade, (2) Environmental and Resource Economics, (3) Health Economics, and (4) International Development. Some of these fields are offered at few other UC campuses. For example, Health Economics is not offered in any UC campuses, and Economics Geography is only offered at UC Irvine. By focusing on those underexplored fields and developing interdisciplinary research efforts within these fields and with other existing programs, such as Biology, Cognitive and Information Sciences, Environmental Systems, and Public Health, this proposed graduate program potentially offers unique interdisciplinary graduate program at UC Merced.

Establishment of a new graduate program in Economics will help the UC Merced campus grow, facilitate vibrant research, and recruit more talented graduate students on campus. As a small and newest UC campus, it is critical to expand our graduate programs to build a solid foundation as a research institute and to meet the UC standard. COR primarily evaluates the proposal based on the feasibility to successfully execute research with proposed resources. **COR unanimously supports the proposal, but below are several concerns that need to be addressed.**

1. Resources

i) Currently, 7 faculty members are fully engaged in Economics, plus the eighth member joining in Jan. 2015. They are distributed in each research emphasis: 4 (Economic Geography and Trade), 2 (Environmental and Resource Economics), 3 (Health Economics), and 3 (International Development) (some faculty members overlap more than one emphases). By the time of anticipated start date in the Fall 2016, the program is expected to have 11 faculty members to fully dedicate to this graduate program with the initial 10 anticipated graduate students (faculty/student ratio 1:0.9). The number of faculty and graduate students are expected to increase to 16 and 26, respectively by 2020 (ratio 1:1.6). COR would like to confirm that the Dean of SSHA are fully supportive on hiring additional 3 faculty members by 2016, and it is implemented in their hiring plans in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

ii) Along with the concern above, COR would like to see the consent between the program and the Dean of SSHA on FTE required for the program to successfully run. The letter from the Dean states that 8 FTE is sufficient to run the program, but in the proposal, 11 FTE are required for the program to run. If 8 faculty members are sufficient, please revise the curriculum and course delivery plan accordingly.

iii) Support letters from other graduate programs or units may be necessary to ensure the proposed interdisciplinary research and coursework for graduate students will be fully executed (this concern is also related to the concern below in 3-ii).

iv) Library resources – COR would like to see the reason why the proposal does not include a consideration of large databases that are needed in the library by many economics programs.

v) COR suggests eliding Appendix F (Bylaw55 in Economics) as being potentially distracting and confusing to CCGA, who only are interested in graduate program.

2. Program demand

i) Four major research emphasis fields in Economics are proposed, and interdisciplinary research of combination of these fields makes the program distinct from other existing programs within UC campuses. COR would like to see some forms of evidence that these emphasis fields do have increasing demand and successfully sustain the program by recruiting graduate students and attracting extramural funding. Evidence can be job opportunities in related areas or increasing funding opportunities in these areas. In particular, COR would like to confirm that there is an enough demand for Health Economics, which is not offered in any UC campuses.

3. Curriculum

i) Close interaction with faculty and development of critical thinking are described as unique features of this proposed program. However, any details how these features will be successfully delivered to students are not fully addressed in the proposal. Smaller faculty:student ratio is just one of the components, and it does not necessarily mean there will be a close interaction between students and faculty.

ii) The proposed program encourages students to take courses in other existing programs, such as Biology, Engineering, Cognitive Sciences, Public Health, etc... to develop unique interdisciplinary research in Economics (described in multiple places, such as pages 1 and 5). However, any details or realistic plans (clear explanations) of how the program facilitates/encourages students to take these courses are not discussed. Graduate courses in Science may be tough for students with minimum background of science. In addition, the sample program (section 2.11) does not seem to reflect this proposed plan.

iii) The proposed graduate program facilitates students to engage in research at early stage (year 2, section 1.5). However, this plan does not seem to be feasible because of a heavy coursework (the course requirement for Ph.D. is minimum 14 4-unit courses). Also the early research engagement is not clearly listed in the sample program (section 2.11). This needs to be well addressed.

Comment [MK1]: This can be removed. As we discussed, the research effort and demand in Economics may be completely different from those in Science (wet bench research). Therefore, heavy course load may not be a problem for them.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
DAVID C. NOELLE, CHAIR
dnoelle@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

September 18, 2014

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

From: David C. Noelle, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David C. Noelle". The signature is written in black ink on a white rectangular background.

Re: Senate-IT Advisory Council Draft Charge

COR is generally in favor of the draft charge of the IT Advisory Council. However, we suggest that the faculty membership be expanded by one slot in order to allow for individual faculty committee members advocating for undergraduate education, graduate education, research, and the wise use of limited resources. These committee members might be drawn from UGC, GC, COR, and CAPRA, respectively. The administration membership could consequently be expanded by one slot to maintain balance.

cc: COR Members
DivCo Members
Senate Office

Proposed Charge: Senate Administration IT Advisory Council

The Senate-Administration IT Advisory Council for IT Governance supports UC Merced's Information Technology functions through its advisory role to the Chief Information Officer. In executing its charge the Council informs the CIO's decision-making, and management of budget and staff resourcing, necessary to prioritizing campus-wide IT academic and administrative projects and advancing UC Merced's IT capacity and value as a resource for learning and research. The Council meets for a minimum of four times per calendar year.

Specifically, the Council is charged to

1. Adopt and disseminate standard processes and criteria for developing, submitting, reviewing, prioritizing and acting on proposed IT initiatives and recommends resolution to issues or conflicts that, if unresolved, would jeopardize the successful completion of approved IT initiatives.
2. Advise the CIO on strategic goals, tactical objectives and institutional policies in the following areas as they relate to UCM information technologies:
 - a. Security and identity management
 - b. Funding models, including resource planning
 - c. Strategic technology plans for classroom and academic needs
 - d. Research Computing
 - e. Disaster recovery planning
 - f. University-wide technology systems that support university business and communication needs
3. Develop and recommend IT policy development, review, and dissemination,
4. Reviews and understands the financial context for IT, forwarding recommendations for project funding levels to the Provost/EVC and Budget Advisory Committee in an effort to optimize investments in technology.
5. Tracks initiative progress throughout their lifecycle, and reporting on whether the stated benefits are realized.
6. Works with the CIO to communicate the status of IT initiatives to the University community.
7. On an as needed basis, establishes task forces to deal with pressing, immediate issues such as:
 - a. Protecting e- data from unauthorized access and disclosure.
 - b. Developing a plan to recover critical business services if a major IT disruption occurs.
 - c. Internal Audit actions

8. On an as needed basis, establishes task forces to inform a review of IT services or campus-wide application upgrades or migrations, such as the:
 - a. Learning Management System
 - b. Lecture Capture System
 - c. Portal Application and Strategy

Membership:

Academic Senate	Administration
1	1
2	2
3	3

The committee will be chaired by the Chief Information Officer. The Chief Information Officer does not vote.

Convening Committee:

For the committee to be convened, a minimum of two of three designated faculty seats must be filled to establish a “working representation” of faculty.

Quorum:

A vote requires a balanced representation of the Senate and the Administration. A majority of members present at the meeting constitutes a quorum. In the absence of a quorum the Council may discuss business and vote on action items electronically.

Reporting:

As a joint Senate-Administration body, the Council shall report its recommendations to the Administration (through the Provost’s Office), the Academic Senate (through Division Council), and to the Schools (through the Executive Committee representatives and Dean), and/or as indicated in the charge.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY & ACADEMIC FREEDOM
RUDY ORTIZ, CHAIR
rortiz@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

September 12, 2014

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

From: Rudy Ortiz, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rudy Ortiz".

Re: Proposed Split of FWDAF

FWDAF would like to recommend that starting in AY 2015-2016, FWDAF split into two separate standing Senate committees: the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee on Diversity and Equity. We feel a number of factors have precipitated that justify the development of this independent committee: **1)** the faculty welfare issues being discussed at the system-wide and campus-wide level are of sufficient magnitude and importance that a separate committee is warranted to provide the dedicated attention these issues deserve, **2)** the increased workload to adequately cover diversity (e.g., hiring practices) and academic freedom (e.g., online courses) combined detracts from the attention needed for faculty welfare and together the needed attention to all issues is being diluted, and **3)** the appropriate and necessary dedication of a UC Merced representative to the UCFW is becoming increasingly difficult to identify from FWDAF, which negatively impacts the Merced Division's voice at the system-wide level. Also, it should be noted that Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom are three independent committees on 7 of the 9 other UC campuses. ¹

Given these factors, we propose a new Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom committee that starts with 4 members (at least 1 member from each School) in AY 2015-2016 and increases as necessary to adequately address faculty welfare and academic freedom issues. Members of this committee would then be responsible for representing the Merced Division at the system-wide level (representative and the alternate). Because of the significant meeting schedule of this UC committee and the significance of the issues being discussed at the system-wide level, we recommend that the committee be comprised of

¹ UCI has a Council of FWDAF with three corresponding subcommittees. UCSB has a Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and a Committee on Diversity & Equity.

more senior faculty with significant UC experience. We also recommend that the initial committee members serve at least 2 academic years to provide some stability at the onset.

The existing FWDAF committee will become the Committee on Diversity and Equity, will be reduced to 3 members (1 member from each School), and will continue to represent UCM at the system-wide level (UCAAD).

Thank you for your consideration of our proposal and we look forward to working with you to produce the most impactful format to ensure that UCM's interests with respect to faculty welfare are being properly represented.

cc: FWDAF members
DivCo members
Senate office



ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
JACK VEVEA, CHAIR
jvevea@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-7930; fax (209) 228-7955

September 11, 2014

**JIAN-QIAO SUN
CHAIR, DIVISION COUNCIL**

Re: Compensation for General Education Chairmanship

Undergraduate Council discussed at its 9/10/2014 meeting a request that compensation be offered for the chairmanship of the [General Education](#) Subcommittee of UGC. It is our understanding that this request will be considered at an upcoming meeting of Divisional Council. We would like to let you know that there was unanimous agreement that UGC strongly endorses the request. The workload of the position is in many ways comparable to, and probably exceeds, the workload for a typical Faculty Assessment Officer, and FAOs do receive compensation. Hence, it seems reasonable to extend a similar consideration to the chair of the subcommittee.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jack L. Vevea".

Jack Vevea
Chair, Undergraduate Council

Cc: UGC Members
DivCo Members
Fatima Paul, Senate Assistant Director

Enclosure (1): GE Committee Chair Memo



MERRITT WRITING PROGRAM
OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

18 June 2014

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95343
(209) 228-4173

Dear Senate Chair Lopez Calvo,

I am writing to briefly describe the evolution of the General Education subcommittee, in part to inquire about how to proceed on a budgetary structure question. The evolution of the GE subcommittee is relatively recent, transitioning from a stand-alone and sometimes ad hoc structure (2003-2010) to being a subcommittee of Undergraduate Council in fall 2011. As chair of this committee, my position has been unpaid and voluntary. I am writing to inquire about a stipend for current and future Senate chairs of the GE subcommittee. To contextualize this request, the following is a summary of the associated responsibilities and workload with chairing the GE subcommittee.

The GE subcommittee is a Senate curriculum committee with advisory responsibilities for GE course approvals and GE assessment (the Senate [link to our overview and charges](#) is here). GE coursework constitutes one-third of undergraduate instruction, so this oversight is significant and ongoing. Since AY 2012, we have convened on a monthly basis with official minutes recorded by Fatima Paul (who provides Senate Analyst support at all meetings). Our committee has initiated significant assessment projects, including revision of the Banner system to include GE outcomes to track course enrollments. We work directly with Institutional Planning and Analysis on coordinating graduating senior survey questions and qualitative data about GE. Policy work has included implementing a Core 1 unit limit to ensure that this is a lower-division, foundational course. In sum, the GE subcommittee has a robust and active agenda, with significant workload associated with our charges and responsibilities. As committee chair, I coordinate all agendas, attend meetings related to GE, consult with faculty and staff to initiate projects, report to UGC, and collaborate actively with VP/Dean Whitt and ALO Martin to establish relevant and implementable projects to strengthen GE planning.

In AY 2013, our committee has been tasked with coordinating the General Education Program Review, so this committee is not only a curriculum committee but also a program review committee. Although the program review responsibilities are temporary and not associated with an ongoing Senate committee structure, it is worth noting that workload will continue to increase for this committee as we begin to implement the results of program review recommendations. The GE subcommittee now has required representation in some Senate Standing Committees; most recently this is the case with the revised plan for Academic Program Review. The current workload for chairing this committee is high, and the role of the GE subcommittee in Senate activities is only going to increase over time.

The GE subcommittee has an ongoing and significant role in the Senate. Given this context, I hope that you will consider a means for compensating a Senate faculty member who chairs the GE subcommittee. Please know that I recognize the oddity of the subcommittee piece and will understand if this is not the right time or context for this topic. Since the structure is an oddity, it seemed worth bringing to your attention for further consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Zanzucchi".

Anne Zanzucchi
Merritt Writing Program



Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants Call For Proposals

Deadline For Submission: March 14, 2014

PURPOSE

Faculty research grants are designed to support the research activities of UC Merced faculty and provide seed funds to assist in the development of extramural proposals to support research at UC Merced.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

1. Each full-time member of the UC Merced Division of the Academic Senate, including emeritus members, is eligible to submit one grant proposal in response to this call.
2. Each faculty member may request up to \$5000 in research funding. Funds may be requested for most research costs, with some exceptions. (See Allowable and Unallowable Expenses, below.)
3. Faculty members may collaborate to submit a joint proposal, in which case the collaborators may not also submit individual proposals. Each faculty member may participate in only one proposal. Joint proposals may request funding up to an amount which is a multiple of \$5000, with the multiple being the number of collaborators contributing to the proposal. Regardless of the number of participating faculty, awards may not exceed \$20000, however.
4. Faculty on sabbatical leave or leave of absence (in residence or elsewhere) may apply for research funds. Grants will not be awarded, however, without assurance that the awardee will return to UC Merced after the absence.
5. Undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers are not eligible to submit proposals, but faculty members may request funds to support student research activities under the supervision of the faculty member, provided that such activities are integral to a program of research being pursued by the

faculty member. Funds may not be applied to the support of postdoctoral researchers or of other research staff, however.

6. Non-tenured faculty members without extramural support are particularly encouraged to apply.

PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT

Each proposal must include all of the following:

1. **Cover Sheet:** This must include the name(s) of the participating faculty member(s), academic title(s), school affiliation(s), graduate group affiliation(s), electronic mail address(es), a proposal title, and a proposal abstract. The abstract must not exceed 350 words.
2. **Proposed Research:** This section should explain the research to be conducted with the requested funds, providing adequate background information and context to allow for a clear understanding of the proposal by an academic but non-expert reader. This description should be as specific and detailed as possible, given space limitations and the need to remain accessible to non-experts. This section should explain the potential impact that funding will have on the research program(s) of the proposing faculty member(s), as well as how this funding could assist in the development of research group(s) and faculty career trajectories. All requests for equipment, or other forms of infrastructure, must include an equipment management plan in this section. *The contents of this section may not exceed 3 single-spaced pages, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*
3. **Reference List:** This section should provide a bibliography of work referenced elsewhere in the proposal document. *This section may not exceed 1 single-spaced page, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*
4. **Budget:** How provided funds are to be used should be presented in a tabular format, listing the amount required for each line item.
5. **Budget Justification:** Each line item in the budget should be explained and justified, particularly with regard to constraints on allowable expenses (see below).
6. **Extramural Funding:** This section must list all pending and awarded extramural grants and contracts received by the proposing faculty member(s) for at least the last five years. For each award, the project title, funding amount, start date, and duration should be specified.
7. **Internal Funding:** This section must list all pending and awarded funds received by the proposing faculty member(s) from UC Merced sources, including Academic Senate funding programs, covering at least the last five years. For each award, the

project title, funding amount, start date, and duration should be specified. For each award granted by an Academic Senate program, a single-paragraph report on the results of the award should be included.

8. **Alternative Funding:** A brief justification of the proposed request for funding when alternative sources of extramural funding for the budgeted items are currently available to the proposing faculty member(s) should be provided in this section. If no such alternative sources of extramural funding are available, that fact should be clearly stated and justified. *This section may not exceed 1 single-spaced page, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*
9. **Seed Funding:** If the requested funds will support the preparation of one or more proposals for extramural funding, details concerning the extramural funding programs to which such proposals are to be submitted should be provided in this section. If recent attempts to secure extramural funding for the proposed budget items have been made, details concerning those submissions should be itemized. If the requested funds are not to be used as seed funding to assist in the preparation of extramural funding proposals, then that fact should be clearly stated. If extramural funds have not and will not be pursued for the proposed work due to the lack of an appropriate existing extramural funding program, this section should provide evidence that no such programs exist, describing efforts that have been made to identify possible funding sources.
10. **Human Subjects Approval:** If the proposal involves research on human subjects, information concerning institutional ethical review and approval of the proposed work should be presented in this section.
11. **Animal Subjects Approval:** If the proposal involves research on non-human animals, information concerning institutional ethical review and approval of the proposed work should be presented in this section.
12. **Curriculum Vitae:** This section must contain a CV for each faculty member participating in the proposal.

These sections should be assembled into a single document file in Adobe's *Portable Document Format* (PDF). While sections should appear in the order shown above, each section does *not* need to begin on a fresh page, but each section must be clearly labeled. The proposal file should have a name that begins with "COR_2014", followed by the last names of all participating faculty, separated by underscore characters. For example, a proposal submitted by faculty members Smith and Jones should be named "COR_2014_Smith_Jones.pdf".

ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of allowable expenses include the following:

- **Research Assistance:** Proposals requesting support for assistants must include a statement of each assistant's exact duties, budgeted hours of labor, and rate of pay. For graduate student support, the student to be supported must be identified. This information is to be included in the Budget Justification section of the proposal document.
- **Supplies and Equipment:** Awarded funds may be used to purchase research equipment and supplies. The purchase of such items is subject to the policies outlined in *UC Business and Finance Bulletin BUS 29*. Equipment purchased with awarded funds will be the property of the University of California. Books, reports, journals, video or audio recordings, and similar research materials may be purchased with awarded funds, but these should be itemized and their purchase justified in the Budget Justification section of the proposal. Similarly, budget line items for computer equipment or computer software are allowed, but they should be explicitly justified as essential for the research activities proposed, providing capabilities not present in the computer equipment currently available to the proposing faculty member(s). Miscellaneous supply and service costs (e.g., telephone, fax, copying, postage) must be justified as essential for the proposed work.
- **Recharge Fees:** Awarded funds may be applied to recharge fees associated with the use of core research facilities or other shared or institutional research resources. The Budget Justification section should explain how each requested recharge payment is required by the proposed work.
- **Travel for Research Purposes:** Expenses incurred for investigative travel and field work may be allowed if such travel is important for the proposed research. For example, such travel may be necessary to collect data or to inspect materials that cannot be procured by other means. Travel expenses for both the participating faculty member(s) and supervised graduate students may be budgeted. The Budget Justification section should explain the need for the proposed travel, and the Budget should break down such expenses into standard travel categories (e.g., flight costs, ground travel costs, housing costs, food costs, etc.).
- **Dissemination of Research Findings:** Expenses incurred for travel to academic conferences or other meetings to present research results arising from the proposed work are allowed. Travel expenses for both the participating faculty member(s) and supervised graduate students may be budgeted. The Budget Justification section should specify and describe intended forums for presenting research findings, and the Budget should break down such expenses into standard travel categories (e.g., flight costs, ground travel costs, housing costs, food costs, etc.). Research findings may also be disseminated through publication, and reasonable required publication fees may also be included in the Budget section.

Other kinds of expenses may be considered, but they will require special justification in the proposal document.

UNALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of expenses that are *not* allowed to be covered by awarded funds include:

- **Research Assistance:** Awarded funds may *not* be used for faculty salary support, salary support for postdoctoral fellows, or salary support for other research staff. These funds may *not* be used to support curricular, administrative, or teaching aids.
- **Supplies and Equipment:** In general, awarded funds may *not* be used to purchase equipment that serves routine productivity purposes (e.g., printers, scanners, mobile telephones, mobile telephone service, calculators). Similarly excluded are standard office and computer supplies (e.g., paper, pens, pencils, flash drives), office furniture, and costs associated with the maintenance, operation, or repair of standard office equipment. Individual subscriptions to periodicals and professional society dues are also considered inappropriate budget items.
- **Travel:** If a participating faculty member will be on sabbatical leave or a leave of absence during the period of an award, then, except under special circumstances, awarded funds may *not* be used for travel between the Merced campus and the locale of leave. Also, subsistence during the period of leave is not fundable.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL SUBJECTS

- **Human Subjects:** Proposed research involving the use of human subjects must be approved by the Institutional Review Board before funds will be allocated. A copy of the approval or protocol number and applicable dates must be provided prior to the awarding of funds.
- **Animal Subjects:** Proposed research involving the use of non-human animals must be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. A copy of the approval or protocol number and applicable dates must be provided prior to the awarding of funds.

USE OF FUNDS

- **Budget Adaptation Post-Award:** Each line item in the proposal Budget must be justified in terms of the specific research activities being proposed. Expenditures of awarded funds are expected to generally conform to budgeted allocations by category and purpose. Faculty who receive awards must request approval from the Committee on Research (COR) prior to any change in the use for which funds were allocated. Reasonable requests within the scope of the proposed research activities will typically be granted.

- **Award Period:** Grants awarded by this program have a period of a single year. All award monies must be spent before June 1, 2015. Funds will not be provided for expenses incurred prior to the date upon which a grant is awarded. Faculty awardees are responsible for the administration of their grants, including the covering of overdrafts. Faculty awardees are expected to promptly return any funds that will not be spent before their grants expire. Any unexpended funds remaining on the grant expiration date will automatically revert to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for redistribution.
- **Equipment:** Any equipment purchased with awarded funds will be the property of the University of California, and possession is retained by the University of California beyond the completion of the period of the grant.
- **Compliance:** All expenditures are subject to applicable University of California regulations.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by the Committee on Research (COR) of the Academic Senate. Proposals that are incomplete or do not meet minimum conformance standards to the requirements outlined in this document will not undergo further review. The remaining proposals will be ranked according to the following criteria, in the specified order:

1. *Evidence of funding need:* Proposals that demonstrate a lack of alternative available extramural funds for the proposed research activities will be preferred over those for which other extramural funds are available.
2. *The existence of past efforts to secure extramural funding for the proposed research activities:* Proposals for which any such past efforts exist will be preferred over requests for funds that have not been previously sought from some extramural source. Proposals that make a convincing case that no appropriate extramural funding programs exist will be ranked highly, along with those for which previous extramural proposals have been submitted.
3. *Time since the receipt of a research award from the Academic Senate:* Faculty members who have not recently received support through this program (or its predecessor) will be ranked above those who have recently received such support. For proposals involving multiple faculty members, the time since last award will be ascertained for each faculty member, and the largest value across participants will be used to rank the proposal. In this way, recent award recipients benefit by teaming with faculty members who have not previously received an award, or have not received an award in a while.
4. *Targeted extramural funding programs:* Proposals that request seed funds to support the preparation of one or more proposals to explicitly specified extramural

funding programs will be preferred over proposals for which no specific plan for the pursuit of extramural funds is provided.

5. *Juniority:* All other factors being equal, junior tenure track faculty will be preferred over more senior tenure track faculty, and tenure track faculty will be preferred over other members of the Academic Senate. For proposals involving multiple faculty members, the rank of the most junior participant will be used to assess the joint proposal.

While many of these criteria can be determined in a fairly objective manner, assessments requiring judgment will be resolved by majority vote of the COR membership.

It is anticipated that available funds will be insufficient to fully fund all ranked proposals. In general, funds will be allocated to proposals in the order in which they have been ranked, according to the above criteria, until available funds are exhausted. In some situations, however, COR may, based on a majority vote, reduce the size of some awards below requested amounts so as to increase the number of awards granted. Also, in an effort to produce an award portfolio that reflects the range of research being conducted at UC Merced, COR reserves the right to adjust rankings, using an approach that is regularly employed by federal funding agencies.

The proposal rankings and award recommendations produced by COR will be communicated to the Academic Senate Divisional Council, and they will be provided to the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Executive Vice Chancellor to guide the administration in the delivery of award funds. Once an award is made, funds will become immediately available to the participating faculty member(s).

APPLICATION PROCESS

Each proposal must consist of a single PDF file, formatted and named according to the instructions provided above. Completed proposal documents should be delivered to the Academic Senate Office c/o Simrin Takhar: stakhar@ucmerced.edu. Proposals must be received by the end of the day (i.e., before midnight) on March 14, 2014.

If an award is made, funds will become available immediately. All award monies must be spent before June 1st, 2015.

Research Grant Discussion Notes

Outline of AY 13-14 COR discussion

1. What are these grants for?

1.1. UCM History

1.1.1. Research Assistance, Supplies and Equipment, Travel for Research Purposes, Recharge Fees, Dissemination of Research Findings

1.1.2. \$5000 per faculty member

1.1.3. particular encouragement to junior faculty

1.1.4. Criteria: Quality of Proposal, Recent Research Productivity, Evidence of Need (or Potential to Secure Extramural Funding)

1.1.5. history of difficulty with reviewing, difficulty comparing proposals across areas, efforts to balance funds across schools

1.1.6. no empirical criteria for evaluating success of the program

1.2. Criteria Used at Other UC Campuses

1.2.1. Entirely Need Based (UCB REG, UCLA REG)

1.2.2. Competitive, Based on Proposal Quality (UCB FRG, UCR RTA, UCSD Research Grants, UCSB Research Grants, UCSC FRG, UCSC SRG)

1.2.3. New Research Initiatives (UCD large)

1.2.4. Interdisciplinary Research Grants (UCD large, UCI Multi-Investigator Grant)

1.2.5. Ongoing Project Funding - Funding Gap Relief (UCD large, UCSD Bridge Grants)

1.2.6. Juniority or Other Rank-Based Criteria (UCD small, UCR Fellowships, UCR RFF, UCR FDA, UCSF Travel Grants)

1.2.7. Funds Earmarked for Travel to Present Work (UCD travel, UCLA Travel Grants, UCR TSM, UCSD Travel Grants, UCSF Travel Grants, UCSB Travel Grants, UCSC Travel Grants)

1.2.8. Funds Earmarked for Travel to Conduct Research (UCI Research and Travel Grants)

- 1.2.9. Strategic Area Specific Grants (UCI Cultural Diversity Studies Grants)
- 1.2.10. Support of Projects Supporting Mentoring (UCI Multi-Investigator Grant)
- 1.2.11. Pilot Projects Expected to Lead to Extramural Funding (UCI Research and Travel Grants)
- 1.2.12. Exploratory Work by Senior Faculty (UCI Single Investigator Innovation Grants, UCR Fellowships)
- 1.2.13. Specific Support for Areas that Rarely Receive External Funding (UCI Single Investigator Innovation Grants)
- 1.2.14. Collaborations Across UC Campuses (UCSD Intercampus Exchange Program)
- 1.2.15. Funds Earmarked for Shared Equipment (UCSF Equipment Grants)
- 1.3. What criteria can COR accurately assess?
 - 1.3.1. Need
 - 1.3.2. Rank-Based Criteria
 - 1.3.3. Earmarking (e.g., Travel, Equipment, etc.)
 - 1.3.4. Number of (Interdisciplinary) Collaborators
 - 1.3.5. Field or Discipline of Research

2. What can be done to address reviewing problems?

- 2.1. Try to get proposal writers to self-select so as to limit the number of proposals.
- 2.2. Outsource quality-based reviewing to the schools or the graduate groups.