

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
October 28, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 11:00 am on October 28, 2013, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Ruth Mostern presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Mostern updated COR members on the October 14 meeting of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP):

--Library Open Access policy updates.

-- Composite Benefits Rate. The UC is moving toward a centralized payroll system which involves the simplification of different types of payroll statuses. However, UCORP was concerned last year – and wrote a strong memo to this effect – that the issue of calculating summer salary for faculty and post docs on research grants was unresolved. This issue will likely be addressed again on the ten campuses at the direction of the systemwide Senate.

--Steven Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, updated UCORP on the rebudgeting of the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI). The budgets have been significantly reduced and the approval process has been suspended. There is also no bridge funding nor a competition schedule. This issue will be likely be discussed on the ten campuses at the direction of the systemwide Senate.

--Lab safety. There was a discussion of mock OSHA inspections being held to prepare campuses for real inspections.

II. Consent Calendar

Today's agenda and the October 9 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. Senate-Administration Library Working Group

The Working Group held its first meeting on October 8. The members received a memo from co-chairs Mostern and Donald Barclay to get feedback from their various constituencies on the Library's external review report's recommendations and the list of five overarching questions contained in the Working Group's charge. Members were asked to bring comments to the next Working Group meeting on November 13.

Chair Mostern asked COR members to comment on the recommendations contained in Appendix A of the Library external review report. The goal of COR's input is to assist the Library in obtaining resources so it can serve the campus's research mission. COR can help shed light on the fact that the Library is severely under-resourced. Under the Educational Effectiveness heading in the report, COR members acknowledged that the Library is inadequate to facilitate the work needed for PhD students to conduct their comprehensive exams. For example, the reading list for Humanities students can include several hundred books and the Library does not have that capacity. SSHA previously proposed a cost-sharing proposal to the Library that included the creation of one position in the Library that would carry out three roles: digital Humanities researcher, library science instructor, and bibliographer. That proposal was not accepted. The number of print volumes that the Library should contain will vary based on our needs, but generally, the Library needs a core collection of about 20,000 books. While digital resources are important, some disciplines also need a robust print collection.

Under the Discovery heading of the report, COR discussed the network strength in terms of bandwidth for digital resources. To ensure the success of this endeavor, this issue will have to include not just the Library but IT and other campus units. The issue of network strength also ties in to the infrastructure planning for Project 2020. VCR Traina pointed out that many campus units will be relocated to off-campus sites and the Kolligian Library West Wing will largely be free for the storage of printed volumes. This is what was intended when the campus was built.

Another issue is data management and this is important for funders who expect to see a data management plan. The external reviewers for the Library's review noted that the Library recognizes the importance of this issue but it lacks the staff, storage, or capacity to establish it. COR can assist the Library in reinforcing that data storage/curation are central; indeed, it is a core role of a contemporary library. For this to be a success, the Library must partner with IT.

Under the Collection heading of the report, COR members pointed out that the challenges are greater than just book acquisition. As the campus grows its graduate programs, students, and faculty, and adds fields in which journals are expensive, the Library needs an increase in its budget. For example, Public Health journal subscriptions are very expensive. The Open Access policy may somewhat alleviate this.

Under the Space heading, COR members discussed the Library's interest in providing additional quiet study hall space but that is not a core concern. COR strongly believes this should not be a priority. But, the committee can advise the Library on how to use the Kolligian Library West Wing for space for printed volumes. COR members briefly discussed the debate between physical volumes versus online publications and the preference for either option varies by disciplines

Under the Management heading, COR members agreed that the search for a permanent Head Librarian is needed as soon as possible. Provost Peterson has stated that the search will launch once the current campus searches are concluded. The Head Librarian is a voting member of the Academic Senate; furthermore, this is a critical time for our campus as we are undergoing Project 2020 and Strategic Focusing. It is imperative that we have a functional and thriving consultative structure with the Library.

Other Library issues that COR members discussed were those of data curation and the wide-range of faculty-developed scholarship from GIS to art demonstrative projects/exhibits. While the Library is service-oriented and

helpful on a case-by-case basis, the faculty need a systematic process in place to help them develop digital versions of their work.

ACTION: COR analyst will contact Interim Head Librarian Donald Barclay to inquire about a Library Strategic Plan and a Project 2020 space plan. Today's comments about the Library from COR members will be compiled into a memo and transmitted by the COR analyst to the Library Working Group members.

IV. Systemwide Review Items

--CITRIS 2010 report. COR members discussed the issues surrounding CITRIS and the status of funding. It was mentioned that an advisory committee will be formulated on campus to address this and other issues on campus. While CITRIS issues will return to COR's agenda later in the academic year, the specific systemwide review item involved the review of the 2010 report. CITRIS was reviewed by the campuses and UCOP in 2010. Former UCM Chancellor Steve Kang submitted comments on behalf of UCM in March 2011. However, Academic Council has recently discovered it did not opine on this item. It is now re-opening the review period for the ten campuses.

ACTION: COR analyst will transmit a memo to the Senate Chair stating that COR has no comments on the 2010 report but wishes to reaffirm its support and enthusiasm for CITRIS.

--APM 600 Final Review.

ACTION: COR analyst will transmit a memo to the Senate Chair stating that COR has no comments on the final review of APM 600.

--Senate Bylaw 55.

ACTION: COR analyst will transmit a memo to the Senate Chair stating that COR has no comments on the review of Senate Bylaw 55.

V. Conflict of Interest Statements

In spring 2013, Senate Committee on Rules & Elections chair Rick Dale suggested that Senate standing committees establish brief conflict of interest policies based on those at UC Riverside.

COR briefly discussed the circumstances under which recusal is necessary and when it is harmful. This issue will be more relevant in spring semester when the committee decides to whom to award funds for the annual Senate faculty research/travel/shared equipment grants. Considering COR's small numbers, it is not feasible for committee members to leave the room when their research areas are under discussion as the committee will lose that expertise for the discussion. However, committee members obviously cannot review their own grant proposals. The committee members agreed with the policy of recusing in cases of personal financial gain and in cases of spousal and immediate family issues.

ACTION: COR analyst will draft a Conflict of Interest statement for COR outlining the recusal policy in cases of personal financial gain and in cases of spousal and immediate family issues. The draft statement will be circulated among the committee for review and approval.

VI. ORU Policy Revision

Vice Chair Marcia, who is taking the lead on revising the current UCM ORU policy, summarized the discussion at the last COR meeting of October 9. The committee clarified the difference between ORU and CRU. The one-page policy that was drafted by GRC in 2011 is not comprehensive. The more detailed CRU policy from GRC in 2009 – partially inspired by the systemwide ORU policy – did not receive approval from Division Council that year and was therefore never implemented. Vice Chair Marcia also pointed out that some UC campuses do not have a local ORU policy – they use the systemwide ORU policy. Vice Chair Marcia also summarized his review of the systemwide Compendium.

The Compendium outlines the procedures for the appointment of a Director. The Chancellor approves Directors but in conjunction with CoC input and in parallel to other campus approval procedures. The Chancellor may delegate this authority. The Dean is involved in approving an ORU Director if the ORU is campus-specific and reports to the Dean. A reading of the various policies has revealed the following: 1) it is possible to establish an ORU within a School 2) if campus money is used to fund the ORU then the Academic Senate must approve its establishment and 3) if the ORU is funded by a Dean within a School, then the approval process occurs at the School level. ORU directors have authority to authorize grants (same fiscal authority as Dean for grants submittal). By signing PASS forms, Deans are taking responsibility for the proposed grants.

There are additional policies contained in the UCOP Contracts & Grants Manual.

COR members decided to draft only one ORU review procedure that contains designations about the different budgetary authority for the various entities (ORU, CRU, MRU). The procedure needs to include succinct definitions of all entities. A committee member suggested starting the process by constructing a simple table that designates the names of entities, their definitions, and how they differ from each other.

ACTION: COR analyst will distribute a link to the UCOP Contracts & Grants Manual to the committee for review. Vice Chair Marcia will draft a table with the various entities, their definitions, their differences, and their budgetary authorities. This table will be circulated among the committee and discussed at the November 20 COR meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm.

Attest: Ruth Mostern, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst