COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
Wednesday, February 11, 2015
3:00 – 4:30 pm
KL 362
UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources

I. **Chair's Report**
  A. Updates from February 5 Joint Meeting of CAPRA, Division Council, **Pg. 1-5**
   and Provost/EVC Peterson.
  B. Updates from February 9 UCORP meeting

II. **Consent Calendar**   **Pg. 6-10**
  Action requested: Approval of January 28 meeting minutes.

III. **February 12 Joint Meeting with Division Council and VCPB Feitelberg**
  Informational: On February 12, CAPRA and Division Council will meet with Vice
  Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dan Feitelberg to discuss Project 2020. Three short-
  listed developer teams for the 2020 Project want to meet with campus stakeholders,
  including representative faculty, between now and the issuance of the draft Request for
  Proposals (RFP) this spring. VC Feitelberg will discuss the pre-RFP consultations at the
  February 12 meeting to understand the expectations of faculty for these visits.

IV. **Review of UCM Bylaws**   **Pg. 11-14**
  Division Council has asked all Senate standing committees to review the relevant sections
  of the UCM bylaws and submit any revisions for consideration. Revisions would be
  subjected to a faculty vote this semester. COR recently submitted a memo to the
  Committee on Rules & Elections regarding the review of proposed bylaw changes
  affecting COR in anticipation of the formation of a Library & Scholarly Communication
  committee.

  Action requested: COR members to review the COR section of the UCM bylaws and
  determine any additional revisions.

V. **Senate Faculty Grants Program**   **Pg. 15-21**

  Action requested: COR members to continue the discussion on drafting the AY 14-15 Call
  for Proposals.

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*

VI.   Other Business

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), Division Council (DivCo), and Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson
Minutes of Meeting
February 5, 2015

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation and Division Council met with Provost/EVC Peterson at 2:00 pm on February 5, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, CAPRA Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

CAPRA Chair Kelley summarized the intention of this meeting, which was to follow up on CAPRA's requests to the Provost on releasing a subset of foundational FTE lines independent of the strategic academic focusing process.

Provost/EVC Peterson updated DivCo and CAPRA members on the following two items:

--The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget Dan Feitelberg participated in the February 3 meeting of the University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB) to discuss UC Merced's Project 2020.   Provost Peterson related that he was quite encouraged by the committee members' responses; Chair Kelley (the CAPRA representative to UCPB) agreed that the committee was positive about Merced's future planning.   The same day, the Provost, VC Feitelberg, Chancellor Leland, and VC for Business and Administrative Services Michael Reese met with President Napolitano to present an information item regarding Project 2020 to the Regents. President Napolitano is supportive of UC Merced's efforts.

--The strategic academic focusing working group met on February 2 and Provost Peterson stated that the process is ready to move forward to the implementation stage. After input from the faculty, it was decided that the focus area Research for Societal Benefit will be split into two groups: health and social justice/humanities. Much work still remains, but the process of identifying the names of the focus areas is completed.

Provost Peterson then stated the main factors that will influence FTE allocations: 1) how much money the campus has for the continuing costs of salaries and benefits and the one-time cost of start-up packages, and 2) how much space is available. Provost Peterson tasked the school deans last summer with providing quantitative data on all

space: laboratories, offices, graduate students, etc. Once these two items are confirmed, the Provost then has to determine 1) how to determine the proportion of FTE lines between foundational and focus areas; 2) how to allocate FTE lines across the six focus areas; 3) how to allocate FTE lines within the individual focus areas, and 4) how to allocate FTEs to the foundational areas and bylaw 55 units.

The Provost stated that his goal is to translate strategic academic focusing into 3-5 year rolling plans. While faculty members will plan for each year, the expectation is that faculty will think strategically about the out years. Instituting a long-range plan will also give faculty assurance that if their own area is not identified for an FTE lines in one year, their area will receive one in a later year.   Lastly, the advantage of a long-range plan is that it encourages accountability, that is to say, faculty members must provide a solid argument for why any deviation from the plan must occur.

The Provost emphasized that there will not be a uniform allocation across the foundational areas over the years; rather, he will have a strategy for investing in any given area. Any change to that investment will involve faculty input.

Provost Peterson assured the faculty in attendance that he has given much thought to how best to engage the faculty, schools, and CAPRA with regard to FTE allocation. He intends to follow the traditional process of seeking FTE requests from the schools, and asking CAPRA to review them and provide him with recommendations. The final decisions, as usual, will reside in the Provost's office.

The Provost then shared his thoughts on how he envisions the process:

How to allocate FTE positions within the focus areas? The Provost announced he will rely on initial input from the faculty members who were heavily engaged in the strategic academic focusing process in terms of submitting proposals.   He will also seek advice from those faculty members on which bylaw 55 units those positions should be allocated.   If one focus area is allocated three FTE lines, then the Provost expects all affected bylaw 55 units to be engaged in the negotiation and conversations. Once FTE requests are decided at this level, the requests will be vetted through CAPRA.

When FTE allocations span more than one focus area, then the initial recommendation on how to proceed will originate from the Provost. However, he will seek input from

the schools and CAPRA. Final decisions will always originate from the Provost, but the key is what stage in the process the Provost will seek faculty and Senate input.

The Provost announced that he will release FTE lines as soon as he is apprised of the budget and space situation. He acknowledged that while he believes he can implement an FTE process for both foundational and focus hires simultaneously next year, some focus areas are more prepared than others, which means he has to invest resources sequentially. And, this is why a 3-5 year plan is crucial: focus areas that do not receive FTE lines next year can plan to receive them in the out years.

In response to a DivCo member's question, the Provost stated that in the first year, he will allocate a larger fraction of resources to the foundational areas than the focus areas in later years. However, the majority of resources must eventually be made into the focus areas, otherwise, the strategic academic focusing initiative would have been wasted. Focus FTE lines will still be assigned to bylaw 55 units; the strategic academic focusing process is just a means to prioritize how to place FTE lines in those units.

A DivCo member pointed out that many faculty members are not in favor of 3-5 year strategic plans, because in the past, after completing them, plans changed and negated the effort made into formulating those plans. He asked the Provost whether he has a reliable idea of how much funding is available in order for faculty to generate robust 3-5 year plans. The Provost responded that while he does not yet have concrete funding numbers, he would not invest in an area unless he knows in advance that that area's hiring trajectory will be positive.

A DivCo member mentioned that there appears to be no institutional body to facilitate the conversations and negotiations between focus areas. It is concerning that if a focus area spans two schools, and FTE positions could potentially be assigned to multiple bylaw 55 units, there is no conduit through which to convey this to the Provost. The Provost replied that in the past, FTE requests have originated from the bylaw 55 units, with the exception of one year, when requests were submitted by graduate groups.

A CAPRA member pointed out that graduate groups have well-defined memberships. Under the strategic focusing process, the membership of faculty is unclear: theoretically, faculty members could join any group they wish.   The Provost responded that the same

faculty members that expressed interest in proposing the focus areas are expected to take the lead to propose where to allocate the FTE lines.

A DivCo member asked the Provost whether his office could help the faculty caucus to give the faculty members some guidance. To begin the process, the Provost could convene the lead writers of the focus area proposals.   Another DivCo member stated that faculty members are worried that not all the relevant parties will be at the table. The Provost assured him that he will not exclude faculty who did not participate in the strategic academic focusing process but he also wants to recognize those who provided leadership in this area.

A CAPRA member inquired whether the Provost has a final description of the six focus areas so faculty members can better determine where they fit in. The Provost replied that the members of the strategic academic focusing working group are working with faculty members who proposed the focus areas to finalize one-page descriptions of each area. The descriptions will include the academic description of each area and a description intended for external audiences for development purposes.   The Provost also asked faculty to speak to him if they think any part of this process is exclusionary.

The Provost agreed that CAPRA does not need to know the exact number of FTE lines for allocation in order to begin the FTE requests process with the schools. However, he stated that the proportionality between foundational and focus areas would change depending on the number of positions the campus has. If the number of positions were limited, a higher percentage would go to the foundational areas. CAPRA can begin the requests process now.

The Provost emphasized the need for FTE requests to be quantitative about growth: number of students, external funding sources, and other outcome-based metrics.

A CAPRA member suggested the need to conduct a retrospective study, five years from now, to assess whether the strategic planning we complete this year materialized. We need a formal repository of information. This would require the appropriate archival data and documentation from the Provost to CAPRA and DivCo. CAPRA has not received such information in the past. The Provost agreed and asked for suggestions on what data CAPRA would require, and which units could generate it, including IRDS and the Provost's office. The Provost also mentioned that he is investing in Academic

Analytics which should show him, among other indicators, how our campus compares nationally and internationally to other institutions.

A CAPRA member expressed concern over faculty fatigue with regard to formulating 3-5 year plans. Are we asking faculty to generate multi-year plans now at the same time we are asking them to request FTE lines? Or, will we ask for multi-year plans next year? The Provost responded that he already has a rich source of information in the focus area proposals and strategic plans the faculty have already proposed. He has taken them all into serious consideration and will not call for new bylaw 55 units strategic plans.

The discussion then turned to faculty members' concerns over space and the uncertainty surrounding who is assigned to which lab space. There are also continuing challenges with moving faculty from Castle to S&E 2. The Provost acknowledged the ongoing problems and reiterated that he is relying on the school deans to accurately assess the space they have available. If needed, the Provost will step in and take a role in identifying available space.

A CAPRA member inquired about the role of ORUs in the strategic academic focusing process. Since the focus areas are interdisciplinary and FTE lines will involve multiple schools and bylaw 55 units, identifying the appropriate individuals to work together is crucial. An ORU could fill that role. In addition, though, there appears to be no defined way for ORUs to grow in the 2020 plan, either in terms of space or positions. The Provost responded that he is aware of the importance of ORUs in the strategic academic focusing process and has been working with VCR Traina on space considerations for ORUs as we build towards 2020.

The Provost ended by emphasizing his desire for faculty input throughout the process and encouraged faculty to contact him with any concerns.

Minutes taken by: Simrin Takhar, Academic Senate office.

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
January 28, 2015

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on January 28, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I.   Chair's Report

Chair Noelle provided the following updates from the January 21 Division Council meeting:

--Medical Education Task Force charge. The major point of contention was the restriction of the number of HSRI faculty to serve on the task force. This was resolved by removing the HSRI restriction.

--COR's proposed bylaws for the future Library and Scholarly Communication committee were acknowledged, and COR was requested to send them to CRE for review.

--CAPRA and Division Council's joint meeting with Provost/EVC Peterson will be held on February 5. The item of discussion will be CAPRA's request for the Provost/EVC to release a subset of disciplinary hires independent of the strategic academic focusing FTE allocations.

--UGC is considering implementing a "dead week": week between the end of instruction and the beginning of finals. The feasibility of this is uncertain, as UC Merced is aligned with UC Berkeley, who does not have a dead week.

--Systemwide discussion on the proposed 3% increase of faculty salaries. The issue is how to distribute this increase. Also, if the system were to receive additional funds, campuses are opining on whether to apply the funds toward retention packages, total salaries, or salary scales. The goal is to close the funding gap between the UC and the comparison institutions included in the remuneration study. Systemwide wants a consensus from the campuses.

A COR member inquired if the 3% increase includes faculty on soft money, such as Project Scientists and Professional Researchers.   COR analyst will inquire into this matter with VPF Camfield.

II.   Consent Calendar

        ACTION: The January 14 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III.   Campus Review Items

--Graduate Council's GC proposed revisions to procedures for submitting graduate proposals.

COR members discussed and approved the response memo that was drafted at the January 14 meeting.

ACTION: COR will transmit the memo to the Senate Chair.

--Establishment of Centers.

At the January 14 meeting, COR members discussed the policy recently drafted by the Provost/EVC on the establishment of centers. COR was concerned that the document does not recognize that Centers are CRUs, which fall under the Senate's previously approved policies, created in conjunction with administrative consultation, during the last academic year. COR requested that the Provost/EVC suggest revisions to these previously approved policies so that the Senate and Administration can establish one comprehensive policy, rather than two.

COR members reviewed and approved the response memo that was drafted at the January 14 meeting.

ACTION: COR will transmit the memo to the Senate Chair.

--ORU Review

VCR Traina – an ex-officio COR member – recently drafted procedures for ORU review and Senate committees were asked to opine. COR members reviewed the procedures and concluded that they did not contradict the policies on the establishment and review of research units drafted by COR and approved by the Senate in the last academic year. COR members offered

a few suggestions for clarification, specifically, in the sections pertaining to the review process and ORU closures. VCR Traina agreed with the suggested changes.

ACTION: COR analyst to draft the response memo, circulate for committee approval, then transmit to the Senate Chair.

--Campus Climate Action Plan

Chancellor Leland recently proposed an action plan in response to the campus climate survey results of March 2014. Senate committees were invited to comment.

COR members discussed the need for the plan to include action items focused on research support and infrastructure, as the lack thereof is one of the main reasons for faculty attrition. COR members also called for clarity on which individuals or organizations would be responsible for implementing the various components of the plan.

ACTION: COR analyst to draft the response memo, circulate for committee approval, then transmit to the Senate Chair.

IV.   Faculty Research Grants

Prior to this meeting, the committee analyst compiled the responses received from prior faculty awardees of GRC/COR grants and the funding levels of other UC campuses for their Senate grants. Based on this information, a COR member drafted a graph to illustrate the declining trend of funding for Merced Senate faculty grants in relation to our growth in faculty numbers. This data is included in the draft memo from COR to Provost/EVC Peterson to illustrate the importance of increased funding of the Senate faulty grants program.

Pursuant to the action item from the January 14 meeting, the memo was revised further. COR members reviewed and discussed the new draft.

ACTION: COR analyst to revise memo to fix typographical errors and include a revised funding trend graph. The COR chair will review the memo before it is transmitted to the Provost/EVC.

COR members then turned their attention to drafting the criteria for this year's call for proposals. The COR chair provided a brief overview of the past discussions in the former Graduate & Research Council and COR. Past committee members made significant attempts to review proposals on content, sometimes using ad hoc reviewers. Proposals were ranked and funding decisions were made based on rankings and taking into account a fair distribution across schools. Invariably, this proved to be difficult and many reviewers had conflict of interest issues. Other reviewers found it difficult to compare requests for travel funding against requests for equipment or new research projects.

Last year, COR included objectively verifiable numbers in its criteria, including whether the PI had applied for the Senate grant in the past, whether the PI can identity an extramural grant program that the Senate grant would help him/her pursue, the last time the PI received funding from Senate grants program, and whether there is a junior faculty member as one of the PIs or co-PIs. Proposals were then ranked according to this data. However, the committee soon found that it was unclear how to weight these objective measures.

COR members then discussed how to draft the criteria this year. The COR chair pointed out the suggestions from last year's COR in its AY 13-14 annual report: 1) generate a form which all PIs are required to fill with the objective information that COR needs to make the objective components of the assessment more clear, 2) carefully consider how to weigh each criterion, especially that of PIs' previous funding, 3) during the fall semester, ask each School executive committee to develop criteria for quality reviews and send these criteria to COR for comment, and 4) encourage faculty to submit joint proposals.

Current COR members suggesting drafting criteria and submitting it to the schools, asking the schools to conduct an initial review of proposals using the provided criteria. COR would then review the short lists provided by the schools, rank the proposals, and award the proposals. This is similar to the campus limited submission process. COR members debated whether the proposals should be evaluated by school executive committees or by graduate groups. Another issue under consideration is whether the grants program should be broken into categories with separate pots of money for travel, equipment, and research projects. COR members inquired into how the quality of proposals would fit in with this scheme. Another committee member suggested adopting the extramural funding agencies' model, whereby, those who submit proposals must also review them.

ACTION: This discussion will be continued at the February 11 meeting.

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

Attest: David C. Noelle, COR Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

UC Merced Bylaw Part II.III.7

7. Research

A. Membership: This Committee consists of at least five members of the Merced Division. The Vice Chancellor of Research serves as ex officio.

B. Duties

1. Makes recommendations to the Division on the award of prizes to faculty for research.
2. Advises the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, the Division, and the Chancellor on planning, management, and budgetary issues related to research, and library needs.
3. Formulates a Senate position on all matters pertaining to research in the Division and acts for the Division in oversight of the Office of Research; makes recommendations to the Chancellor concerning applications by members of the Division for research grants and for travel expenses to attend meetings of learned societies; advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee in matters relating to research policy; and determines policy pertaining to research funds allocated to the Committee.
4. Represents the Division in all matters relating to the review of Organized and Centralized Research Units, centers and institutes, including proposals for and reviews of such units.
5. Acts for the Division in all matters of Library policy and administration, and advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and the Division accordingly.
6. Acts for the Division in all matter of Research Safety policy and administration, and advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and the Division accordingly.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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

January 16, 2015

To: Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair, Division Council

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

Re: Proposed Bylaw Modifications for a Senate Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

---

COR's memo to Division Council of November 24, 2014 (attached) encouraged the prompt creation of a standing committee on Library and Scholarly Communication. In response, Division Council requested that COR draft a formal proposal for the establishment of such a standing committee, addressing the committee's proposed charge and membership, as well as resource issues surrounding the staffing of the new committee. Such a proposal has been generated, taking the form of an itemized list of changes to the UCM Bylaws that would be necessary and appropriate for the establishment of a Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (attached).

Specifications of standing committees in the UCM Bylaws do not regularly specify constraints on the number of meetings held by the committees during a given academic year, so no such requirements have been included in this proposal. It is worth noting, however, that COR does not expect this committee to meet more than about once per semester. This is consistent with the recommendation of the Academic Senate-Administration Library Working Group (LWG), as made in their Spring 2014 report (attached).

Also note that the membership of the proposed committee draws on expertise from existing standing committees, allowing input from the perspective of resource allocation, support for research, support for graduate education, and support for undergraduate education. This design of the membership is intended to minimize the need for additional recruitment of faculty to provide service to the Division.

cc: COR members
        Division Council members
        Senate Office

Modifications to the UCM Bylaws Proposed to Introduce a UCM Division Committee On Library And Scholarly Communication (COLASC)

- **Add this committee to the list of Committees on Educational Affairs:**

  Part II; Title II; 3; B; 1; d: Library and Scholarly Communication

- **Modify correspondence to Assembly committees:**

  Part II; Title II; 4; A: Academic Personnel, Committees, Library and Scholarly Communication, and Privilege and Tenure correspond to the Assembly committees of the same names.

  Part II; Title II; 4; G: Research corresponds to the Assembly committee on Research Policy.

- **Remove library responsibilities from charge of Committee on Research:**

  Remove Part II; Title III; 7; B; 5.

- **Add COLASC Description:**

  Add Part II; Title IV; 4.

    4 Library And Scholarly Communication
    - **A** Membership: This committee consists of at least four members of the Merced Division and two student members. Representation includes four individuals who are contemporarily members of the Committee on Research, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Graduate Council, and Undergraduate Council, respectively. The committee also includes one graduate student member and one undergraduate student member. The University Librarian and the Chief Information Officer serve as *ex officio*.
    - **B** Duties
        - **1** Advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and the Division regarding the administration of the University Library, in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents.
        - **2** Makes recommendations to the Division on matters concerning the role of the University Library in the acquisition, storage, and provision of scholarly materials, as well as other resources for scholarly communication. These matters include, but are not

restricted to, the formulation of University Library policies, the management of the University Library, the University Library budget, the apportionment of related funds, and the allocation of associated space.

3   Maintains liaison with the administration of the University Library on behalf of the Division.

4   Prepares and submits to the Division an annual report on the status of the University Library, as well as related resources for scholarly communication.

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 Vitea:** 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".

3

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

6

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.