

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)**Wednesday, December 4, 2013****10:00 – 11:30 am****KL 324**

Documents found at [UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources](#) and
[UCMCROPS/LibraryW.Group1314/Resources](#)

AGENDA

- I. Chair's Report**
A. Update from December 3 Division Council meeting
- II. Consent Calendar**
A. Approval of the agenda
B. Approval of the November 20 meeting minutes **Pg. 1**
- III. ORU Policy – Chair Mostern** **Pg. 4**
Prior to this meeting, Vice Chair Marcia drafted a table of ORU, CRU, and MRU definitions to serve as the foundation for a first draft of the revised ORU policy.
Action requested: COR members will review and discuss the table. A revised ORU policy will be drafted before the end of fall semester.
- IV. Senate Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment Grants Criteria – David Noelle**
COR member Noelle will lead the discussion on potential changes needed to the grants criteria. **Pg. 7**
The current criteria and that of other UC campuses are available at:
UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources/Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment grants
- V. Start Up Funds Memo** **Pg. 11**
Prior to this meeting, a draft memo was circulated among the committee regarding the Provost's statement at the November 19 Meeting of the Division on sweeping start up funds.
Action requested: Discuss and finalize memo. Memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

VI. Course Buyout Policy**Pg. 12**

Provost Peterson responded to the Senate's concerns regarding the previous version of the course buyout policy.

Action requested: Review Provost's memo and revised policy. COR's comments will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of December 13.

VII. Mechanical Engineering CCGA Proposal

Action requested: Discuss the COR review and vote on proposal. Deadline for comments to Senate Chair is December 9.

Proposal available at: *UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources/Review Items - Campus*

VIII. Conflict of Interest Statement for COR**Pg. 27**

Prior to this meeting, a draft conflict of interest statement was drafted for COR in response to Division Council's suggestion that each standing Senate committee have such a policy on record.

Action requested: Review and approve COR's conflict of interest policy. The policy will be transmitted to the Senate Chair.

IX. Systemwide Review Items

A. APM 35 – pertaining to sexual harassment. CAP is the lead reviewer.

Action requested: Review proposed revisions to APM 35. COR's comments will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of January 10.

Supporting documents are available at

UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources/Review Items - Systemwide

B. Self-supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDP). GC and CAPRA are the lead reviewers.

Action requested: Review proposed revisions to the SSGPDP. COR's comments will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of January 13.

Supporting documents are available at

UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources/Review Items - Systemwide

X. Other Business

Last meeting of fall 2013 is on Wednesday, December 18

Ongoing Business

Lab Safety – *Jason Hein*

ORU Policy – *Roummel Marcia*

Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment Grants – *David Noelle*

Indirect Cost Return – *YangQuan Chen*

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
November 20, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 10:00 am on November 20, 2013, in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Ruth Mostern presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Mostern reported on the following items:

--Joint DivCo/CAPRA meeting with Provost Peterson on November 7. As last year's FTE requests process had many challenges, this year's CAPRA is drafting a new process after eliciting input from the School Executive committees and Deans. The new process will allow for broader consultation of FTE requests. Provost Peterson expressed his support for cluster hires and CAPRA's FTE request process will reflect this. Meeting attendees also discussed with the Provost how to align the CAPRA FTE request process with the strategic academic focusing initiative so as not to force the faculty to create and submit two separate plans.

--Senate-Administration Library Working Group meeting on November 13. The Working Group members elicited feedback on the various Library strategic plans from their constituencies and this provided the basis for the discussion at the meeting. The Library Working Group is an ad hoc committee that is charged with identifying challenges and making recommendations to the Senate Chair and Provost; the Group is not authorized to make decisions. The Working Group's final meeting in December will be devoted to reviewing the final report, drafted by the co-chairs, that will be transmitted to the Senate Chair and Provost. The Working Group's main recommendation will be to advise on a permanent structure for a future Library advisory committee, staffed in perpetuity, similar to those that other UC campuses already have established.

--UCORP meeting on November 18. The Portfolio Review Group provided an update on their findings. There was discussion on the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI), specifically, the significant budget cuts. The Office of Research has suspended this year's review and there are currently no calls for proposals. The Office of Research is debating on what

the new call should entail and it intends to write a report and make an announcement about the MRPI hiatus. Systemwide Senate Chair Bill Jacob provided an update on composite benefits rates and this issue will be distributed to the ten campuses soon. The crux of the issue is that the myriad plans that OP has suggested propose too few salary bands that do not align with the reality of faculty members' situations with summer funds paid from different sources as well as post doc and graduate student issues. A COR member mentioned that Chair Jacob announced at yesterday's Meeting of the Merced Division that Academic Council intends to ask OP to cease proposing more plans and instead conduct new analysis and new modeling.

II. Start Up Funds

In yesterday's Meeting of the Division, Provost Peterson explained his intention to tighten the parameters around start up funds and their extension. The Provost pointed out it is difficult for him and the Chancellor to request money from UCOP when there is a significant amount of unused money on campus in the form of start up funds. In addition, the Provost is concerned about the lack of start up money for future hires.

However, the faculty use their start up funds as discretionary money in the absence of departmental and extramural funds. The extension of start up funds is something the faculty have always counted on to pay for items they could otherwise not afford, including graduate student salaries.

Furthermore, faculty believe that start up funds should be viewed by the Administration and OP as encumbered, not as extraneous money.

Provost Peterson mentioned in yesterday's meeting that start up funds will not be swept until there are alternative funding sources in place for faculty. The faculty remain deeply concerned. COR members discussed the possibility of start up funds being transferred into a separate pot of money to be managed by the Academic Senate and reallocated to faculty as discretionary funds.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo to Division Council with the following points: COR is aware and concerned with the start up funds issue and offers its support to the Provost, but emphasizes that sweeping start up funds before establishing an alternative funding source will be very damaging to faculty and the campus's research mission. In addition, COR hopes that the Senate will be provided with a plan detailing where the start up funds will go and what the alternative funding source is, as the campus's core research mission cannot be fulfilled without adequate faculty research support. Memo will be circulated among COR members for review and approval before transmission to Division Council.

III. ORU Policy

Prior to this meeting, Vice Chair Marcia drafted a table of ORU, CRU, and MRU definitions that will serve as the basis for the first draft of a revised ORU policy. In Vice Chair Marcia's absence at today's meeting, Chair Mostern presented the table to committee members.

The key component in these definitions is the budgetary line. ORUs have a core budget line that is guaranteed for five years and the campus pays for the unit's administrative support and Director's stipend. After five years, the ORU undergoes review. ORU proposals are sent to the Chancellor for final approval. CRU proposals work in a similar manner but approval goes only as high as the Provost (after the VCR).

Quorum was lost near the end of the meeting, so all remaining pending business will be conducted via email.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 am.

Attest: Ruth Mostern, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

	CRU	ORU	MRU
DESIGNATIONS	Institute, Laboratory, Center, Station	Institute, Laboratory, Center, Station	Institute, Laboratory, Center, Station
LINES OF RESPONSIBILITY	CRU responsible to Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) for administration, budget, space, personnel, and scholarship	ORU responsible to Chancellor or Chancellor's Designee (CD) for administration, budget, space, personnel, and scholarship	MRU responsible to the President and report through Chancellor or CD at host campus
ADMINISTRATION	Headed by Director who is a faculty member. Aided by Advisory Committee appointed by VCR.	Headed by Director who is a tenured faculty member. Aided by Advisory Committee Appointed by Chancellor or CD.	Headed by Director who is a tenured faculty member, aided by Associate Director on each campus at which unit is active. Aided by Advisory Committee appointed by President or President designee.
BUDGETARY SUPPORT	Partial funding by Office of Research based on merit review	"[P]rovision is made in the campus budget for the unit's core administration support, Director's stipend, . . ."	Administrative support from campus or from Office of the President
PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT	Faculty members submit a proposal stating unit's goals and objectives; describing added values and capabilities; explaining how mission extends beyond interests or needs of a single group, department, or school; and making clear how the unit will foster new intellectual collaborations, stimulate new funding, etc. [NB: CRU Policies include Review Criteria]	Faculty members submit a proposal stating unit's goals and objectives; describing added values and capabilities; explaining why goals cannot be achieved by existing campus structure; and making clear how the unit will foster new intellectual collaborations, stimulate new funding, etc.	Faculty members submit a proposal stating unit's goals and objectives; describing added values and capabilities; explaining why goals cannot be achieved by existing campus structure; and making clear how the unit will foster new intellectual collaborations, stimulate new funding, etc.
PROCEDURE	Proposal submitted to VCR in Sept. of academic year. Proposal distributed to GRC (now GC and CoR), CAPRA, UGC (if proposal impacts undergrad instruction), UC Merced Budget Committee, and to any Dean directly affected by proposal's impact on personnel, space, and equipment. Based on comments from these committees and Deans, VCR makes recommendation to Executive Vice Chancellor, who retains final authority for CRU approval.	Proposal submitted by Dean directly affected by proposed unit's personnel, space, and equipment, to Chancellor or CD, who seeks advice from appropriate divisional Academic Senate committees. Chancellor retains final authority for approving ORUs. Chancellor or CD informs the Vice Provost for Research of the establishment of ORU.	Proposal originates at host campus and is submitted to the VCR, who seeks advice from all appropriate divisional Academic Senate Committees and administrative committees. After campus review, proposal is submitted to Vice Provost for Research by Chancellor or CD of host campus. The Vice Provost for Research reviews proposal and refers it to the Chancellor for comment. The Vice Provost for Research also refers the proposal to the Chair of Academic Council for comment by University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), and CCGA. Vice Provost for Research retains final authority for recommending establishment of MRU to Provost and President. After Presidential approval, Provost informs Chancellors and Chair of Academic Council of the action.

	CRU	ORU	MRU
DIRECTOR	Appointed by VCR after a nomination procedure on which VCR and GRC agree. For new Director for an existing unit, nominates are solicited from Advisory Committee.	Appointed by Chancellor or CD after a nomination procedure on which the Chancellor and the Academic Senate agree. For new Director for an existing unit, nominates are solicited from Advisory Committee.	Appointed by the Provost after consultation with appropriate Chancellors and with advice of Search Committee appointed by Vice Provost for Research.
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW	VCR initiates 5-year reviews. VCR in consultation with GRC should assure 5-year reviews are conducted at proper intervals. VCR appoints review committee from a slate nominated by CoR. Review committee's report should be provided to the Director for comment. Justification for continuation must be documented by review committee. The report is reviewed by appropriate Academic Senate committees. VCR decides on continuation and any changes in CRU, upon consideration of the ad hoc and Senate committee's recommendations. Disestablishment of CRU requires Provost's approval. To maintain portfolio campus CRUs, VCR transmits annual report to Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Academic Senate the establishments and disestablishments and a summary of 5-year reviews of CRUs.	Chancellor initiates 5-year reviews. VCR in consultation with appropriate Senate Committee should assure 5-year reviews are conducted at proper intervals. The Chancellor or CD appoints review committee from a slate nominated by divisional Academic Senate. Review committee's report should be provided to the Director for comment. Justification for continuation must be documented by review committee. The report is reviewed by appropriate Academic Senate committees. The Chancellor or CD decides on continuation and any changes in ORU, upon consideration of the ad hoc and Senate committee's recommendations. Disestablishment of CRU requires Chancellor's approval. To maintain portfolio campus CRUs, the Chancellor or CD transmits annual report to the Vice Provost for Research listing ORU establishments and disestablishments and a summary of 5-year reviews of ORUs.	The Vice Provost for Research should assure that 5-year reviews are conducted at proper intervals. VCR appoints <i>ad hoc</i> review committee from a slate nominated by Chair of the Academic Council and the Chancellor or CD. Review committee's report should be provided to the Director for information. Justification for continuation must be documented by review committee. The 5-Year Review report is submitted to the Vice Provost for Research, who distributes it to the Vice Chancellors for campus comment and the Chair of the Academic Council for comment by UCORP, UCPB, and CCGA. Based on 5-Year Review Report and comments, the Vice Provost for Research approves continuation of unit, implements changes, or recommends disestablishment of unit to President.
PROCEDURE FOR DISESTABLISHMENT	Following a 5-year review, Executive Vice Chancellor approves request for disestablishment and informs the Chancellor, VCR, and Academic Senate of action.	Following a 5-year review, the Chancellor approves request for disestablishment and the Chancellor or CD informs the Vice Provost for Research of action.	Following a 5-year review, the Chancellor or CD submits request for disestablishment to Vice Provost of Research after appropriate campus administrative and Senate consultation and consultation with Advisory Committee. The request is referred by Vice Provost for Research to the Chancellors for comment. The Provost recommends disestablishment to the President. After Presidential approval, Provost informs Chancellors and Chair of the Academic Council of action.
PHASE-OUT PERIOD	At most one full year after the end of the academic year.	At most one full year after the end of the academic year.	At most one full year after the end of the academic year.

	CRU	ORU	MRU
PROCEDURE FOR NAME CHANGE	Director prepares a proposal to VCR describing rationale. After review by GRC, CAPRA, and appropriate campus administrators, Provost approves and informs Chancellor, VCR, and Academic Senate of action.	Director prepares a proposal describing rationale. After review by Senate and appropriate campus administrators, the Chancellor or CD approves and informs Vice Provost for Research of action.	Director prepares a proposal describing rationale. MRU Advisory Committee endorses requested name change. After review by appropriate host campus administrators and Senate committees of other participating campus, Director submits proposal package to Vice Provost for Research. After consultation with UCORP and favorable review at host campus and participating campuses, the host Chancellor approves name change and submits full documentation to Vice Provost for Research, who notifies other campus and the Chair of the Academic Council of change in name.
ANNUAL REPORT	Unit should submit a report to VCR and GRC containing specific information.	Unit should submit a report to VCR and GRC containing specific information.	Unit should submit a report to VCR and GRC containing specific information.



GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL (GRC)
ACADEMIC SENATE DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

CALL FOR FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

Deadline for Submission: April 30, 2013

PURPOSE

Faculty research grants are designed to support specific research activities of UC Merced faculty, and provide seed funds for developing and submitting extramural proposals to support research and education at UC Merced.

GRANT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

1. Each full-time member of the Academic Senate, including emeritus members, is eligible to submit one grant proposal.
2. Each faculty member may request up to \$5000 in research funds. Funds may be requested for most research costs (see Allowable and Unallowable Expenses), with some exceptions (i.e. excluding faculty salaries, most notably).
3. Faculty members may collaborate to submit a joint proposal, in which case the collaborators may NOT submit individual proposals, because each faculty member may submit only one proposal. Each joint proposal may request a multiple of \$5000 in funds equal to the number of collaborators.
4. Faculty on sabbatical leave, or leave of absence (in residence or elsewhere), may apply for research funds. Except under special circumstances, requests for travel funds from (to) the Merced campus to (from) the sabbatical locale will not be funded. Research expenses, including travel connected with research and/or associated with research at the sabbatical locale, are fundable. Subsistence is not fundable. Grants will not be awarded without assurance that the faculty awardee will return to UC Merced after the leave of absence.
5. Graduate students are not eligible to submit proposals, but faculty members may request funds to support graduate research activities, provided that such activities are part of the faculty member's research program.
6. Newly-appointed faculty members, and non-tenured faculty members with no extramural support, are particularly encouraged to apply.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND GUIDELINES

Proposals must include all of the following:

1. Cover Sheet: Must include name, title, school, email address, proposal title, and abstract (350 word maximum).
2. Project Description (3 page maximum, 1 inch margins, 11 point font, single-spaced): Should include background and context helpful for an academic but non-expert reader,

and may include figures and tables as needed. Descriptions should also include as many project specifics as possible, given space limitations and the reader's presumed lack of expertise in the proposer's specific area of research. Descriptions should explain the potential impact they will have on the faculty research program(s), group(s), and career(s). If the funds are for equipment or other infrastructure, as opposed to a specific research project, then the description must include an equipment management plan.

3. Reference list (1 page maximum).
4. Human Subjects and/or Animal Use approval information.
5. Budget and justification for each line item. Most line items need only name the expense and amount, but some items require more information (see Allowable Expenses).
6. Pending and awarded grants during the last five years, including the date, amount, and title of each grant. For any prior GRC faculty research awards, include a one-paragraph report on the results of the award.
7. A statement noting whether funds will be used in lieu of available support, and/or whether funds will be used as seed money to pursue external funding. If the latter, include a list recent or ongoing attempts to secure external funding in the last three years (do not submit copies of external grant proposals or cover sheets).
8. CV listing publications, presentations, exhibits, or performances over the last three years, as well as earlier most important works (2 pages maximum).

CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed by GRC on the basis of the following three criteria:

1. Quality of the proposal and research project to be funded.
2. Evidence of recent research productivity in terms of quantity and quality of publications, presentations, exhibitions, and performances.
3. Evidence of funding need, and/or efforts and potential to secure external funding from government, private, or foundation sources.

At least two GRC members will rate each proposal on each of the three criteria (written reviews will not be included). Ratings will be averaged and weighted equally, and proposals will be ranked by averaged rating. Rankings will be given to DivCo and the VCR and EVC, and the administration will make awards. Special consideration will be given to proposals from newly-appointed faculty, and non-tenured faculty with no external funding. It is anticipated that available funds will be insufficient to fully fund all recommended proposals. Budgets may be reduced in order to fund as many recommended proposals as possible.

ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of allowable expenses are as follows (note that some require additional information in the budget justification):

Research Assistance

Proposals requesting support for assistants must contain a statement of their exact duties, number of hours, and rate of pay. For graduate student support, identification of the graduate student is required. Salary support for postdoctoral fellows or other appointments in academic series is not fundable.

Supplies and Equipment

Funds may be used to purchase research equipment and supplies. Equipment/items requested are subject to the policies outlined in [UC Business and Finance Bulletin BUS 29](#). Equipment purchased with Faculty Research Grant funds becomes the property of the University. Books, journals, videos, recordings, and similar research materials may be purchased if they are listed by title and specifically justified in the application for research funding.

Computer equipment/software is an allowable expense provided that it is an essential element of the research project. Applicants must indicate what kind of computer equipment they currently use. Funding is not justified for equipment used for routine duties (e.g., printers) or for general productivity purposes (e.g., cell phones/cell phone service, PDAs, or calculators). Miscellaneous costs such as phone, copying, fax, or postage must be justified and project-specific.

Travel for Research Purposes

Faculty's use of research funds for field and travel expenses may be allowed when appropriate, as in the collection of research data or inspection of materials that cannot be procured through email, loans, microfilms, or photocopies. Such requests for travel must be justified in the application. Funding for graduate student travel is allowable in the service of the project to be funded.

Recharge Fees

Research funds may be used to pay for recharge fees associated with using core research facilities or another institution's research equipment or facilities. The recharge payment for the use of the equipment or facilities must be project-specific.

Dissemination of Research Findings

Grant funds may be used to present research findings at meetings or conferences of academic societies and organized conferences where important research results are presented and discussed. The meeting may be either in the United States or abroad. Attending a meeting without presenting research findings will not justify funding. A faculty member may apply for funds to send undergraduate or graduate students to present research that is part of the faculty member's research portfolio. Grants may be awarded for travel to present works of art or to present other forms of creative expression, but only for the initial presentation of such work. Grants may be used to pay publication costs associated with disseminating one's research findings to the academic community.

UNALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Funds cannot be used for: faculty salary support; curricular, administrative, and teaching aids; individual subscriptions or periodicals; professional society dues; reprints; office furniture; minor office and computer supplies (e.g., paper, pens, pencils, flash drives); maintenance and repair of equipment; preparation of textbooks; expenses associated with editorial duties; equipment maintenance and operation.

USE OF FUNDS

1. Justification of each item requested in the budget is essential. Funds support specific research projects, not researchers. Expenditures of research grant funds should in general conform to budgeted allocations by category and purpose. However, the grantee may

request the GRC's approval prior to a change in the use for which funds were allocated. Reasonable requests within the scope of the specific research project will typically be granted.

2. Funds will not be provided for expenses incurred prior to the submission deadline date. The grantee is responsible for the administration of the grant, including overdrafts, and must review the budget and promptly return any funds that will not be spent before the grant expires.
3. Any unexpended funds remaining on the expiration date will automatically revert to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for redistribution.
4. Any equipment purchased with funds from a research grant becomes the property of the University upon acquisition and is retained by the University upon completion of the project for which the funds were awarded.
5. All expenditures are subject to applicable University of California regulations.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL SUBJECTS

1. Research involving the use of human subjects must be approved by the Institutional Review Board before funds can be allocated. A copy of the approval or protocol number and date must be provided to the GRC prior to award. Application forms are available in the Sponsored Programs Office.
2. Research involving the use of animals must be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. A copy of the approval or protocol number and date must be provided to the GRC prior to award. Animal Use Protocol forms are available from the Sponsored Programs Office.

HOW TO APPLY

All grant applications should be submitted electronically in pdf format. Label your pdf submission "GRC_last name.pdf." Email completed document to the Academic Senate Office c/o Mayra Chavez: mchavez@ucmerced.edu. The deadline for submitting grants is **April 30, 2013**, and submissions must include all of the components required herein. The document can be continuous (i.e., a new page is not needed for each section), but each section should be clearly labeled.

If an award is made, funds will be immediately available.

All award monies are to be spent before June 1st, 2014.

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
RUTH MOSTERN, CHAIR
rmostern@ucmerced.edu

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

November 21, 2013

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Division Council

From: Ruth Mostern, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ruth Mostern", is written over the "From:" line.

Re: COR's Comments on Faculty Start Up Funds

At its November 20 meeting, COR discussed the issue of faculty start up funds, in particular, the Provost's intentions - which he announced at the November 19 Meeting of the Division - to tighten the parameters surrounding the use of start up funds. This includes reducing the amount of years the faculty will be allowed to extend their start up funds.

COR understands the Provost's dilemma of asking UCOP for financial support when there is seemingly "unspent" money already on campus in the form of start up funds. However, COR points out that these funds should be viewed as encumbered as faculty members routinely count on their start up funds to pay for a range of items (and salaries) in the absence of departmental and extramural funding.

COR offers its support to the Provost but emphasizes that sweeping start up funds before establishing an alternative funding source will be cause irreparable damage to the faculty and the campus's research mission. COR hopes that the Senate will be provided with a plan detailing where the start up funds will go and what the alternative funding source is, as the campus's core research mission cannot be fulfilled without adequate faculty research support.

cc: COR Members
DivCo Members
Senate Office



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4439

November 8, 2013

TO: Ignacio Lopez-Calvo, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Thomas W. Peterson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas W. Peterson".

RE: Course Buyout Policy

The attached course buyout policy has been revised and vetted by the deans. We would like to thank DivCo for their comments on the earlier version of the proposed course buyout policy. In response to your comments, we have revised the policy to address several of your concerns. Specifically, we have addressed the following points:

1. The price of the buyout is consistent with the policy that 6 equivalent courses per year is a 100% teaching load for a lecturer.
2. As UC Merced does not currently have departments, it was felt that the money would be returned to the schools through the Deans. At their discretion, some portion of that money may be negotiated to either the individual faculty member or the relevant unit
3. The exception for special awards is handled under the Exceptions section, where it states that they may be approved by the Chair, Dean, and EVC.
4. This point is also addressed as in (2) above in the section, "Use of salary savings from external course buyouts", at the discretion of the Dean, some fraction of the released salary funds may be returned to the PI.

To address the last 3 points raised by DivCo under the Program perspective, additional language was inserted to ensure that the Chairs and Deans consult with the graduate group chairs to assure that the graduate curriculum is not adversely affected. In addition, the section "Policy: Minimum Teaching requirements" now explicitly states that Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.

As we stated in our September 6 memo, we will put this policy in place for five years, with a re-evaluation of the policy at that time.

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time (via course buyout) and funds available for research and scholarship. It also sanctions sponsors covering legitimate costs of faculty effort in research during the academic year thereby freeing up university research funds to invest in other forms of scholarly activity.
Course Buyout: Maximum # courses	1 annually. Also restricted to no more than 3 courses over a 5 year period. Particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Course Buyout: Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only). This is consistent with 6 equivalent courses per year being a 100% teaching load.
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Course buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in a normal portfolio of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts. Course reduction normally occurs in actual semester of buyout, but regardless the research effort must be contributed and certified during the semester that the sponsor funds are used.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Minimum Teaching requirements	After consultation with the unit chair and graduate group chair, the Dean should ensure that the faculty member teach at least one course that significantly contributes to the program (e.g., required or undergraduate course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses). Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	In the case that the faculty member chooses to reduce teaching load, 100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout will be retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs. Conversely if teaching release is not taken, then at the discretion of the Dean, some fraction of the released salary funds may be reinvested in appropriate research and scholarship expenses of the faculty.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

October 1, 2013

Provost/EVC Thomas W. Peterson

RE: Course Buyout Policy

Dear Provost/EVC Peterson,

The Academic Senate completed its review of the Course Buyout Policy and Division Council discussed the policy at its September 24, 2013 meeting. Division Council is not in favor of the policy as it does not address the comments provided in a memo dated June 8, 2012 to then EVC/Provost Keith Alley by AY 2011-12 Senate Chair Susan Amussen.

Attached please find AY 2011-12 Senate Chair Amussen's memo to EVC/Provost Alley, and AY 2013-14 Senate committee comments.

Sincerely,

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair
Division Council

cc: Division Council
Senate Office

Provost EVC <provostevc@ucmerced.edu>

September 6, 2013 4:08 PM

To: Senate Chair <ucmsenatechair@gmail.com>

Cc: Tom Peterson <tpeterson4@ucmerced.edu>, Mark Aldenderfer <malderfer@ucmerced.edu>, Dan Hirleman <dhirleman@ucmerced.edu>, Juan Meza <jcmeza@ucmerced.edu>, Fatima Paul <fpaul@ucmerced.edu>, Ruth Brisco <rbrisco@ucmerced.edu>

Course Buyout Policy

1 Attachment, 11 KB

**IGNACIO LOPEZ-CALVO
CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL**

Dear Ignacio,

On behalf of Provost Peterson I am forwarding the most recent version of the Course Buyout Policy that has been developed and vetted with the Deans of all three Schools. The Provost and Deans are seeking approval of the policy for five years, with a re-evaluation of the policy to take place after that. We are requesting that the relevant committees of the Academic Senate review the policy and provide feedback to the Provost by October 1, 2013. Thank you.

Best,
Susan

Dr. Susan Sims
Special Assistant and Chief of Staff
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
University of California, Merced
209.228.4657
ssims3@ucmerced.edu



[UCM Course...xlsx \(11 KB\)](#)

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholarly work
Maximum # courses	1 annually. Also restricted to no more than 3 courses over a 5 year period. Particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC. The Deans and Chairs will also consult with the Program leads.
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
[samussen@ucmerced.edu](mailto:samusen@ucmerced.edu)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

June 8, 2012

EVC/PROVOST KEITH ALLEY

RE: COURSE BUYOUT POLICY

Thank you for soliciting DivCo's comments on the draft policy for course buyouts. We assume this was at least in part a response to the proposal made by the SSHA faculty, which built on a GRC memo based on extensive research into the practices of other UC campuses on this topic. DivCo was pleased to see that a draft policy exists, but we have questions about its operation both from the perspective of faculty who seek to buy out a course, and from the perspective of undergraduate and graduate program leads.

From the faculty perspective, the policy appears to discourage, rather than encourage, faculty to obtain grants that buy out their teaching, at least compared to other UC campuses. We do not think this is wise for a fledgling campus trying to encourage extramural funding.

1. Price of the buyout: According to the research undertaken by the faculty, 17% is the highest amount charged in the UC system. For example, Riverside asks only for 10% of salary for a one course buyout, and 25% for two courses.
2. What happens to the money? At other campuses, the money is either given to the Department/Academic Unit, or split between the Department and the Dean. Unlike every other UC campus, the proposed policy gives all the money to the Deans, and none of the money to the unit. The policy should specify that some portion of the funds obtained through a course buyout should be used for teaching needs in the academic program, and that some portion be given to the academic unit as is done at all other UC campuses. On many campuses, those units can also use some portion of the funds to augment the faculty member's research funds. Some such flexibility gives faculty more incentive to include such funds in their grant proposals.
3. While we understand the general restriction to buying out no more than one course a year, the policy needs to contain an explicit proviso which allows flexibility when faculty members receive awards with particular requirements: for instance, Spencer Foundation grants, or NIH Career awards, would require a complete release from most

or all teaching obligations. This might be phrased as “Exceptions to this policy can be made, in consultation with the Dean and Program leads, for awards (such as NIH Career Awards) that require more release time than this.”

4. The policy provides no incentive to request AY funds in a grant proposal without taking a teaching reduction. On some campuses, at least some portion of such funds would come back to the faculty’s research funds as an incentive to bring more extramural funding to the university. The exclusion of this possibility is short-sighted, as both the campus and the faculty member can benefit from additional extramural funds.

From the Program perspective, we need to be sure that the deans consult not just with “chairs” (which usually means, in our context, Academic Unit chairs) but also the leads of graduate and undergraduate programs with which a person is affiliated.

1. If a faculty member is teaching a required course, or an elective course that impacts students' progress towards degree, there needs to be a provision ensuring that either the course is being taught by someone else, or that it is not necessary that semester, such that there is no negative impact on students.
2. Teaching requirements: The teaching requirements specified in the policy seem more appropriate to SSHA than to the other Schools, where faculty who have bought out one course will only teach one course that AY. In that case, it makes sense for the Dean and relevant program leads (graduate and undergraduate) to determine where a faculty member’s teaching is most important. The provision that the faculty member must teach an undergraduate course fails to recognize that a graduate program may be adversely impacted by a faculty not teaching a course, and graduate courses may be more difficult to cover than undergraduate ones. Particularly given our small size, it is possible that it will be more important that a faculty member teach a graduate course than an undergraduate one. This is an area where flexibility will be important.
3. The policy should note that particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies than those specified in the campus policy.

Sincerely,



Susan Amussen
Chair

cc: Divisional Council
Senate Executive Director Susan Sims



Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
POST OFFICE BOX 2039
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
(209) 228-4439
FAX: (209) 228-4423

MEMORANDUM

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Keith Alley, EVC/Provost 

Subj.: UC Merced Course Buyout Policy

Date: May 25, 2012

Attached is a draft Course Buyout Policy that has recently been developed in conjunction with the Deans of all three Schools. We request that the Divisional Council review this policy and provide feedback to the EVC regarding the policy and any concerns regarding its implementation.

Thank you.

Cc: David Ojcius, VPAP
Nancy Ochsner, AVP
Mark Aldenderfer, SSHA
Juan Meza, SNS
Dan Hirleman, SOE
Susan Sims, Exec Director

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholarly work
Maximum # courses	1 annually
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

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
RUTH MOSTERN, CHAIR
rmostern@ucmerced.edu

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

September 18, 2013

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Division Council

From: Ruth Mostern, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ruth Mostern", is written over the "From:" line.

Re: Draft Course Buyout Policy

Per Division Council's request on September 6, the COR reviewed the attached draft course buyout policy as well as the 2012 memo from former Division Council Chair Susan Amussen to former EVC/Provost Keith Alley.

COR believes the points made in the 2012 Division Council memo were reasonable and requests that Division Council seeks clarification on why these points were not incorporated into the draft course buyout policy.

COR declines to make a recommendation at this time but looks forward to receiving more information on the rationale used in drafting the course buyout policy.

cc: COR members
DivCo members
Senate office



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
[samussen@ucmerced.edu](mailto:samusen@ucmerced.edu)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

June 8, 2012

EVC/PROVOST KEITH ALLEY

RE: COURSE BUYOUT POLICY

Thank you for soliciting DivCo's comments on the draft policy for course buyouts. We assume this was at least in part a response to the proposal made by the SSHA faculty, which built on a GRC memo based on extensive research into the practices of other UC campuses on this topic. DivCo was pleased to see that a draft policy exists, but we have questions about its operation both from the perspective of faculty who seek to buy out a course, and from the perspective of undergraduate and graduate program leads.

From the faculty perspective, the policy appears to discourage, rather than encourage, faculty to obtain grants that buy out their teaching, at least compared to other UC campuses. We do not think this is wise for a fledgling campus trying to encourage extramural funding.

1. Price of the buyout: According to the research undertaken by the faculty, 17% is the highest amount charged in the UC system. For example, Riverside asks only for 10% of salary for a one course buyout, and 25% for two courses.
2. What happens to the money? At other campuses, the money is either given to the Department/Academic Unit, or split between the Department and the Dean. Unlike every other UC campus, the proposed policy gives all the money to the Deans, and none of the money to the unit. The policy should specify that some portion of the funds obtained through a course buyout should be used for teaching needs in the academic program, and that some portion be given to the academic unit as is done at all other UC campuses. On many campuses, those units can also use some portion of the funds to augment the faculty member's research funds. Some such flexibility gives faculty more incentive to include such funds in their grant proposals.
3. While we understand the general restriction to buying out no more than one course a year, the policy needs to contain an explicit proviso which allows flexibility when faculty members receive awards with particular requirements: for instance, Spencer Foundation grants, or NIH Career awards, would require a complete release from most

or all teaching obligations. This might be phrased as “Exceptions to this policy can be made, in consultation with the Dean and Program leads, for awards (such as NIH Career Awards) that require more release time than this.”

4. The policy provides no incentive to request AY funds in a grant proposal without taking a teaching reduction. On some campuses, at least some portion of such funds would come back to the faculty’s research funds as an incentive to bring more extramural funding to the university. The exclusion of this possibility is short-sighted, as both the campus and the faculty member can benefit from additional extramural funds.

From the Program perspective, we need to be sure that the deans consult not just with “chairs” (which usually means, in our context, Academic Unit chairs) but also the leads of graduate and undergraduate programs with which a person is affiliated.

1. If a faculty member is teaching a required course, or an elective course that impacts students' progress towards degree, there needs to be a provision ensuring that either the course is being taught by someone else, or that it is not necessary that semester, such that there is no negative impact on students.
2. Teaching requirements: The teaching requirements specified in the policy seem more appropriate to SSHA than to the other Schools, where faculty who have bought out one course will only teach one course that AY. In that case, it makes sense for the Dean and relevant program leads (graduate and undergraduate) to determine where a faculty member’s teaching is most important. The provision that the faculty member must teach an undergraduate course fails to recognize that a graduate program may be adversely impacted by a faculty not teaching a course, and graduate courses may be more difficult to cover than undergraduate ones. Particularly given our small size, it is possible that it will be more important that a faculty member teach a graduate course than an undergraduate one. This is an area where flexibility will be important.
3. The policy should note that particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies than those specified in the campus policy.

Sincerely,



Susan Amussen
Chair

cc: Divisional Council
Senate Executive Director Susan Sims



Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
POST OFFICE BOX 2039
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
(209) 228-4439
FAX: (209) 228-4423

MEMORANDUM

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Keith Alley, EVC/Provost 

Subj.: UC Merced Course Buyout Policy

Date: May 25, 2012

Attached is a draft Course Buyout Policy that has recently been developed in conjunction with the Deans of all three Schools. We request that the Divisional Council review this policy and provide feedback to the EVC regarding the policy and any concerns regarding its implementation.

Thank you.

Cc: David Ojcius, VPAP
Nancy Ochsner, AVP
Mark Aldenderfer, SSHA
Juan Meza, SNS
Dan Hirleman, SOE
Susan Sims, Exec Director

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholarly work
Maximum # courses	1 annually
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholarly work
Maximum # courses	1 annually. Also restricted to no more than 3 courses over a 5 year period. Particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC. The Deans and Chairs will also consult with the Program leads.
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

UC Merced Committee on Research members should consider recusal in the following circumstances:

- 1) If a member of the committee submits an application for funds from this committee, he/she will not participate in the evaluation discussion or decision concerning that particular application.
- 2) If a member of the committee has a current family relationship that could reasonably be construed to compromise the committee member's objectivity.
- 3) If the member of the committee has a personal interest, financial or otherwise, in the matter under deliberation.

Members of the committee with a conflict or apparent conflict may have knowledge about the issue under consideration in which case the committee should not be deprived of that individual's expertise. A minimum level of recusal consistent with avoiding conflicts or apparent conflicts is preferred.

If any member of this committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict of interest to the attention of the committee chair. The committee chair, exercising discretion and flexibility, will decide if the committee member should recuse.

This document was patterned after the UC Berkeley and UC Riverside Committee on Research Conflict of Interest Statements.