

Committee on Research (COR)
Wednesday, November 2, 2016
11:00-12:00 PM KL 362
Documents available at [UCM BOX](#)

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 11:05 AM on November 2, 2016 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David Noelle presiding.

I. Chair's Report – David Noelle

a. Division Council Meeting – October 20, 2016 (Member Saha representing COR)

Among the topics discussed, the following highlights were provided:

- DivCo members informally supported the idea of having all Deans go through an intermediate review.
- 14 new staff positions were identified through the workforce planning process. 7 were assigned to the Provost: The Division of Research and Economic Development received 2 positions, the Division of Student Affairs received 2, and 3 positions went to the Division of Business and Administrative Services.
- At a lunch with Regent Pérez, the Regent expressed his observation that the CSU system is doing a better job of teaching students in California than the UC is, due to its emphasis on teaching rather than research. The UC has repeatedly attempted to clearly communicate the value of research activities to stakeholders, including the Regents. Chair Amussen also noted the importance of emphasizing the value of a research university education.
- Design review process for the 2020 project: Chair Amussen reported that the review process for building 2A is in process.
- Three priorities were outlined by the Provost during his consultation with DivCo:
 - On-schedule completion of the buildings for the 2020 Project
 - Continuation of the working group on restructuring the administration at the School and Bylaw Unit levels
 - Having an agreed-upon hiring plan for AY 2017-18 in place by early next Spring
 - The upcoming Academic Leadership Retreat scheduled for November 6-8, which will focus on budget structure, policy, and practice in light of the constraints imposed by the State, UCOP, and the campus.

The Provost also highlighted his interest in open, frank, and productive conversations that honor the diverse perspectives held by faculty and administrators to address common concerns and challenges. He expressed that this would be essential to successfully navigate the next 4-10 years, meeting the needs for the 2020 Project and allocation of resources.

- The topic of PROC membership was discussed, where the Vice Chair for the Division, as co-Chair of PROC and a member of CAPRA, would represent both DivCo and CAPRA on PROC. This would reduce the number of Senate representatives needed for PROC by one individual. DivCo is expected to endorse the proposal.
- COR will be getting a new member from SSHA, although the name has not yet been officially provided.

- b. 2020 Project Meeting (Building 2A review) – October 19, 20 and 27, 2016
Member Scheibner represented COR at these meetings and provided the following:

Of the three meetings scheduled, the first two were intended to familiarize/re-familiarize participants with the developer plans. There were a few changes due to the proposals coming in over budget, and the changes were made to minimize the effect to research facilities. These changes included the removal of a mid-building stair case, moving Unit 18 lecturers from a hallway and into a regular room by shifting door locations, moving the location of dark labs onto concrete slabs to minimize vibration, and autoclaves being moved out of the basement and into a larger room for access.

Concerns about access control to labs and equipment were shared. Questions about emergency power outlets and related topics were identified as requiring attention when renderings of the spaces are made available at a future meeting. The arrangement and assignment of lab space is being done with an emphasis on functionality and in the context of needs for power, water, air flow, etc.

The completion of the 2A building is being rushed to meet its delivery date, and 2A will be considered a test for the larger 3A building. The 2B building has been designed for computational research, with 2A housing class labs and a maker space.

A COR member voiced a concern about the aspect ratio inside the classrooms, where students are not able to see or hear the instructor clearly due to how the layout of the room has been structured. This member found a drop in teaching evaluations, with comments from students related to viewing angles and acoustics. Chair Noelle acknowledged these concerns, citing other cases in which architects asserted expertise in classroom design while comments from instructors were neglected. The committee shared their experiences with classroom space layouts, with a particular focus on the new [TEAL rooms](#), which are suited for 90 students despite the fact that no current class sizes match that number. Two additional TEAL rooms are planned for the 2020 Project, with one being divided to produce a 45 student capacity, more closely matching current class sizes.

A member asked if COR should have more input into room development, with Chair Noelle expressing his willingness to advocate for this. Member Scheibner will provide the COR Analyst with additional information and input as more meetings are scheduled and attended, which will then be shared with COR.

II. Consent Calendar

- a. The October 19, 2016 Minutes were approved.
- b. The November 2, 2016 Agenda was approved.

III. Export Control Regulations – VC-ORED Traina

- a. Chair Noelle has requested additional information from VC-ORED Traina concerning plans to explain export control issues to the faculty. He was told that such communications are currently in preparation. Chair Noelle will request that COR be given the opportunity to review this communication before it is distributed.

IV. Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI) ORU Review Committee

- a. The SNRI review process is still awaiting a response regarding the identification of review committee representatives from the schools. At the next DivCo meeting, member Saha will ask COC Chair Dale if there is any update. COR members have not had any success in soliciting assistance from their colleagues in their respective schools. A question was asked about who normally would make up this review committee. Chair Noelle stated that if COR was fully populated, there would be enough members to allocate to such a review committee. Due to the low number of COR members this year, additional help is being sought from the COC.

V. Survey of Faculty Concerning Staff Support for Extramural Funding Efforts

- a. The survey has been distributed, with a deadline for completion for the end of day, November 13th. A preliminary sample of responses was provided to Chair Noelle for his review. A reminder to the faculty requesting participation in the survey will be sent using Qualtrics. The COR Analyst has received a few questions about technical difficulties with accessing the survey, which were resolved by noting the specific limitations of particular web browsers and devices.

VI. Recommendations Regarding Faculty Start-Up and Incidental Expense Funds

- a. The Senate Chair has requested that COR review and comment on the memos distributed by Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom from a research perspective. Chair Noelle suggested highlighting the importance of Deans to negotiate with Executive Committees, different fields will depend on sources of funding to a different degree so a uniform policy covering the whole campus would be considered unreasonable. He added that cutting roll-over is unreasonable without other sources of discretionary funds for faculty to use, as these funds are being held due to faculty planning for contingencies that the campus would not otherwise be able to assist with.

If it were not the case that faculty start-up funds were being viewed as unallocated in the accounting process (e.g. being viewed as slush-funds), there would be no rational argument for constraining the use of start-up funds. A member suggested the generation of a list of factors that the Deans and Executive Committees should take into account when addressing this matter.

Member Saha noted that, at the last DivCo meeting, the Provost expressed the perspective that taking the start-up funds back supports future faculty. He is open to suggestions on setting up “rainy day” funds, but money that is unused does no one any good. There was agreement among the members that there are not one or two simple rules that would fit all faculty on campus. Instead, the use of a list of criteria would more fairly address this subject.

This topic will be discussed via email, and will be added to the next COR agenda. The COR Analyst will poll analysts from the other UCs and provide a summary of responses to Chair Noelle.

- VII. ORU Proposal Initiation Issues**
 - a. The discussion of revising the ORU policy document will be moved to a future COR agenda.
- VIII. Purchasing and Research – Ramen Saha**
- IX. Identify AY 2016-2017 High Priority Issues for COR**
- X. Systemwide Review Items**
 - a. [Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 - UCIE](#)
 - i. This item will be moved to the November 30th COR agenda.
- XI. Upcoming Business**
- XII. Other Business**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 PM.

Attest:

David Noelle, COR Chair