

Committee on Research (COR)**Tuesday, January 30, 2018****10:30 am – 12:00 pm, KL 360**

Pursuant to the call, the Committee on Research met at 10:30 am on Tuesday, January 30, 2018 in Room 360 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

- I. Chair's Report
 - a. Chair Noelle updated COR members on the January 17, 2018 meeting of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP).
 - i. Most of the meeting was devoted to producing questions for the Directors of the Institute for Transportation Studies (ITS), a multicampus research unit (MRU) with branches on four UC campuses. The ITS is undergoing its five-year review and its directors will be attending the February UCORP meeting. Members of UCORP will likely focus their inquiry on why the ITS operates as a four-campus MRU instead of a collection of ORUs.
 - ii. UCORP heard an update from Academic Senate leadership on the report from Huron Consulting Group Inc. that provided information on the questionable behavior of the Office of the President with regards to the State audit. Some members of the Academic Council are concerned that such reports have weakened the UC President's reputation to the degree that she may not be in the strongest position to negotiate with the Governor or the Legislature in support of UC interests.
 - b. Chair Noelle updated COR members on the January 23, 2018 Division Council meeting:
 - i. Division Council discussed CRE's revised guidelines for voting on faculty personnel cases. These guidelines will be submitted for Academic Senate committee review. Division Council approved the pilot incentive plan for revenue-generating Master's programs, and it approved the joint memo from COR and CAPRA regarding discretionary research funding. The joint memo will be transmitted to the Co-Chairs of the Budget Working Group.
- II. Vice Chair's Report
 - a. Vice Chair Marcia updated COR members on the January 30, 2018 PROC meeting.
 - i. The Provost announced that he will hold another meeting with the VCORED to determine next steps for the periodic review of the Center for the Humanities. It is unclear whether the review should be managed by the Senate/COR, the relevant school Dean, or by the VCORED.
- III. Campus Budget Working Group Updates
 - a. COR member Scheibner updated the Committee on the January 9, 2018 meeting of the Budget Working Group.
 - i. The Working Group has nearly finalized its proposed carry forward policy for faculty incidentals funds. The proposal suggests a \$9,000 cap on total accumulated incidentals funds. This amount was determined as a result of

inquiries about how much funding faculty members across campus have accumulated over multiple years. The Working Group is still discussing a potential carry forward policy for other funds, such as start-up accounts. The next meeting is scheduled for February 8, 2018.

IV. Consent Calendar

- a. **Action:** The January 30, 2018 Agenda and the January 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

V. Senate Awards for Distinction in Research and Early Career Research

- a. The Academic Senate issues annual awards for distinction in research, teaching, Senate service, public service, and faculty mentorship. COR is responsible for reviewing nominations and selecting winners for the awards for Distinction in Research (tenured faculty) and Early Career Research (untenured faculty). Traditionally, the Committee forms two subcommittees for the review of nominations for each award. This year's Call for Nominations will be issued by the Senate Office on February 5, nominations are due to the Senate Office on March 9, and COR must select winners for the two awards by March 23. The winners' names will be announced at the April 16 Meeting of the Division.
- i. COR members reviewed both Calls for Nominations and agreed on two modifications: 1) specify that the names of awardees are transmitted from the subcommittees to the COR membership as a whole before being submitted to the Academic Senate office, and 2) delete the sentence concerning the ability of finalists to being nominated the following year. The committee also formed two subcommittees, with three members on each, to review the nominations.
- ii. **Action:** COR's suggested modifications to the Calls for Nominations will be forwarded to the Academic Senate office.

VI. Modification to the Senate Policy for the Establishment and Review of Centers

- a. Prior to this meeting, the practices with regard to Centers of other UC campuses was brought to the attention of the COR chair. In general, there is a sense that the campus Academic Senate divisions do not participate in Center review. The Academic Senate on one campus does not participate in the periodic review of the campus' Centers, but it does play a role in their establishment. COR members discussed whether to amend the 2014 Academic Senate policy on research units to reflect the same practice, or just augment the current language about Centers and Core Facilities, or stipulate that COR should be consulted on the periodic review of Centers but that the lead School is to have responsibility for managing the review. Some COR members agreed that Schools are in the best position to assess their Centers, and COR may not be adding value to such a review. In the end, COR members decided to amend the policy to state that COR should determine at the time of a given centers' establishment whether COR is to participate in future five-year reviews of the center. Three COR members volunteered to review the Senate policy and suggest revisions, first to the section on Core Facilities, then Centers, and finally, the section on ORUs.

- b. **Action:** the COR analyst will provide the three volunteering committee members with access to all relevant documents, including draft policies from the VCORED and Provost, and policies from other UC campuses. These members will share their suggestions with COR at a future meeting.

VII. Campus Review Item

- a. Proposed revisions to Section Part II, Section 4 of the Division Regulations addressing Honors.
 - i. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in a major. These revisions were requested by Divisional Council, following its April 24, 2017 endorsement of UGC's approval of The Proposal for an English Honors Program. At that time, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the Division's Regulations.
 - ii. **Action:** COR voted unanimously to endorse the proposed revisions. The committee's endorsement will be transmitted to the Academic Senate Chair.

VIII. Systemwide Review Item

- a. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128
 - i. A new section has been added which would govern conflicts of interest on Academic Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces. COR members agreed to decline to comment.
 - ii. **Action:** The Senate Chair will be informed that COR has declined to comment on this item.

IX. Research Computing Support

- a. COR members continued the discussion that they began in the Fall semester about the lack of resources for faculty research computing. It was previously suggested that COR issue a memo to the Budget Working Group to recommend that a portion of indirect cost return be used for research computing. Also, it was proposed that COR submit a memo to the School Reorganization Working Group with an inquiry into how staff should be allocated so as to support faculty research computing.

In this meeting, COR members suggested consulting with VCORED Traina on his response to COR's memo on indirect cost return, as these funds could potentially be used for research computing support. COR members emphasized the need for transparency in how indirect cost return funds are allocated. Despite the fact that indirect cost returns on extramural grants are generally expected to cover infrastructure costs, faculty members, specifically those in disciplines that involve computer-intensive work, are not receiving the support that they need. COR members discussed the possibility of gathering anecdotes from faculty members on how the lack of an adequate research infrastructure is impacting their work, and providing the collection of anecdotes to the Budget Working Group, IT, Deans, and Provost as evidence of a

systemic problem. A COR member suggested consulting with IRDS, perhaps having them survey faculty, but the value of this approach was questioned, as COR would have to spend a significant amount of time determining the appropriate metrics for IRDS to use, as well as the appropriate questions for IRDS to ask faculty.

- b. **Action:** As this item warrants further discussion, it was tabled for a future COR meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Attest: David C. Noelle, COR Chair