

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
October 15, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on October 15, 2014 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Noelle updated COR members on the following:

--CAPRA meeting on October 8:

The Provost/EVC met with CAPRA to discuss space and resource issues. His slide presentation from the September 24 all-faculty forum has now been widely distributed. The Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that the five thematic research areas are broad and he requested input from the faculty on narrowing them down. The CAPRA chair asked for a clarification of the role of CAPRA in the strategic academic focusing process and this will be an ongoing discussion.

When asked about the space issues now and until 2020, the Provost/EVC pointed out that that space is tied to enrollment and there is no plan to establish more space after the next building is finished. The Provost/EVC asked whether there is an imminent crisis with graduate student space. He has tasked the school deans with determining the space in their buildings in an effort to find more space on campus for research needs. Lastly, the Provost/EVC related that he is optimistic about the public/private partnerships.

--Division Council meeting on October 8:

The Senate Chair and Vice Chair held a meeting with the Provost/EVC and topics included opportunity hires, a task force on medical education at Merced, and a debriefing on the systemwide Senate chairs' retreat which included a discussion on building relationships with the national laboratories and establishing additional research stations.

Division Council approved the draft charge of the proposed Senate-IT Advisory Council as well SSHA's request to suspend the use of the appraisal form.

Standing committee reports included a statement from the CRE chair about possibly producing a standardized conflict of interest statement for the Division, a debrief from the CAPRA chair about the earlier meeting with the Provost/EVC, updates from the GC chair on revising the graduate advisor's handbook and drafting policies and procedures for graduate groups, and a statement from the FWDAF chair that his committee is working on diversity in recruitment, faculty salary equity reports, and is collaborating with the Academic Personnel office on the monthly, junior faculty professional development workshops.

Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Michael Reese attended at the request of Division Council and stated that some of the problems with the renewal of parking permits this semester occurred because of the unknown status of the construction sites and whether planned works would take place on established parking lots. Division Council members expressed their concerns with the lack of communication. VC Reese requested additional faculty members on the TAPS advisory committee.

--UCORP meeting on October 13:

Some campuses are over-enrolling non-resident tuition students. It was mentioned that UCOP might place a cap on the percentage of these students but it is unknown whether UCOP would specify a cap on the number of these students or if each campus would institute its own cap.

Former Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP Steven Beckwith previously expressed concern about multicampus research units' (MRU) funding needs. Later, through the multicampus research programs and initiatives (MRPI) program, proposals were placed in a peer-review

funding competition. The Portfolio Review Group (PRG), the committee comprised of representatives from across the system and tasked with reviewing the funding for MRPIs, came to an agreement last year on what should be cut from these programs. UCORP was concerned as the money that was cut was not redistributed to research projects. The systemwide Senate chair sent a letter to UCOP, explaining the extent to which MRPI budgets were cut and advocated for a promise from President Napolitano that a fixed fraction of the systemwide research budget be allocated to faculty-driven initiatives, namely, the MRPI program. The \$2.61 million in additional funds given to MRPI was only intended to fulfill current obligations. There was discussion at UCORP about whether MRPI should be included in the systemwide compendium; previously, UCORP was against this idea because MRPI should remain flexible.

President Napolitano has introduced a focus on innovation and has formed an innovation council to formulate ideas on how the UC can benefit. Some members of UCORP expressed concern about the commercialization of research and pointed out the considerations of intellectual property issues. Moreover, there are already tech transfer policies and procedures in place and some faculty do not advocate creating a new mechanism. The President's innovation council contains no faculty or administrators - they are primarily venture capitalists and other business-related individuals. (The systemwide Senate chair is now allowed to observe the council meetings but cannot take action.) The Regents approved \$250 million for "UC Ventures" to be used on startups that originate from UC research projects. There are issues about open access with the tech transfer individuals.

A request for proposals will be submitted in spring 2015 for \$14 million in awards for research involving national laboratories. Funds will be allocated for graduate students who do their dissertation with a lab.

President Napolitano will distribute \$10 million to programs on sustainability, food, community (equity) research, and health care.

UCORP would like a permanent replacement for former VP Beckwith. However, UCOP is currently undergoing a review and wants to delay hiring a replacement. President Napolitano expressed her interest in replacing VP Beckwith with a director of innovation but this was met with concern that faculty-driven research may suffer. The systemwide Senate plans to send a communication about the proposal to establish this new position.

VCR Traina informed COR members that MRPI review will occur at the end of this month. The two-stage process involves an external review group representing five programmatic areas that will rank the proposals for technical excellence. In early November, a portfolio review will examine the final proposals and make recommendations to the systemwide Provost based on the previously-stated goals of the PRG.

Other topics of interest at the October 13 UCORP meeting include a systemwide inventory cataloging of chemicals and ongoing concerns about animal rights activists. UCOP is deciding how it can best protect animal researchers.

II. Consent Calendar

The October 1 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. SNRI Five Year Review

In a previous meeting, VCR Traina planned on submitting a notification letter to SNRI. In today's meeting, Traina informed COR that the newly-created program review and oversight committee (PROC) wants to discuss the review process further before SNRI is notified of the five-year review. VCR Traina expects that SNRI's self-study will be completed this year, but external review will likely occur in fall 2015.

IV. ORU Proposal

A unit on campus has asked for COR's preliminary input on the proposal it submitted through the campus strategic academic focusing process. The unit intends to transform the proposal into a formal ORU proposal and has requested COR's review in advance. After a brief discussion, COR members

agreed to review the proposal as long as it is made clear to the unit that COR's feedback is informal and does not represent Senate approval.

ACTION: At the next meeting, COR will review the proposal and draft comments. The comments will be transmitted to the unit in addition to copies of the previously-approved SNRI and HSRI ORU proposals as an example of successful ORU proposals.

V. Limited Submission Proposals

In a previous meeting, COR agreed that faculty would like increased transparency in the campus limited submission proposal process. VCR Traina, to whom the request for transparency would be submitted, summarized the review process: each school is asked to nominate the maximum number of proposals allowed for the campus (recommendations come from the school deals), an ad hoc faculty review team is then assembled for each proposal, and finally, the team makes recommendations to VCR Traina. Traina then informs the authors of the winning proposals. VCR Traina mentioned that his office will be acquiring software that would make the proposal reviewing process more efficient. The winning proposals will also be posted on his website.

ACTION: VCR Traina will send COR a statement summarizing the limited submission proposal process. COR will review and make recommendations.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

Senate standing committees were asked to review the proposed revisions to APM 133, 210, 220, and 760. Significant changes include additional reasons to stop the eight-year tenure clock, and, an increased importance of contributions to diversity in the personnel review process.

ACTION: The Senate Chair will be informed that COR has no comments.

VII. Faculty Research Grants Program

COR members continued their discussion on the future of the faculty research grants program. A three-step process was agreed upon: 1) decide what the ideal future for this program would be, 2) submit a letter to the Provost/EVC to convey that the program was not well funded in the past, but an investment is greatly needed, and lastly, 3) determine the criteria for the AY 14-15 process (a call for proposals should be submitted in early spring).

COR members continued to debate the goals of the grants program and agreed that funding could be allocated to various tiers of eligibility. The priorities that the COR wants to focus on are “juniority” of PI, evidence of need, new research initiatives, potential for attracting extramural funding, and travel for the dissemination of research.

ACTION: COR members to use the PRG principles as a guide for drafting the memo to the Provost/EVC. COR analyst to determine the amount of funding other campuses allocate for their annual faculty grants program. This discussion will continue at the November 5 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