

**Committee on Research (COR)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**November 19, 2014**

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on November 19, 2014 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Noelle updated the COR members on the following:

UCORP met on November 10 and discussed the following issues:

--UCORP members were asked to submit their campuses' policies on the establishment and review of research units. Chair Noelle will submit COR's newly-approved policies.

--the decision to increase tuition was made without appropriate Senate consultation

--UCORP remains concerned about the commercialization of research in light of President Napolitano's focus on innovation. The President has recently appointed, on a one-year basis, a Special Advisor on Innovation. Senate leadership met with the new appointee and found that he was sensitive to the faculty members' concerns in the debate over commercialization and the UC's research mission.

--The President's Innovation Council met with Senate leadership and expressed concern over tech transfer. UCORP members were asked to provide tech transfer updates from each of their campuses.

**ACTION:** COR will invite AVC for Research and Economic Development Peter Schuerman to the December 3 COR meeting to provide an overview of UCM's tech transfer policies.

--UC PATH continues to be a challenge that systemwide staff are still addressing.

--The Portfolio Review Group (PRG)'s recommendations for funding MRPIs will be announced on December 15. These recommendations will have significant implications for the AY 15-16 budget. The PRG indicated that they

were pleased to receive so many meritorious proposals that contained remarkably robust research.

--UCORP continued its conversation about proposals for conducting research at national laboratories, including the establishment of a graduate fellowship program to support graduate students who conduct research at a national laboratory.

--UCORP members discussed a new policy about openness in the reporting of research and there are concerns about exemptions. One of the suggested proposals is to expand the policy to include a national security exemption whereby a campus will accept proposals that involve working with individuals who have access to classified material but will not require the PIs to reveal the classified materials in order to publish results.

--The heads of the national reserve systems provided a lengthy presentation to UCORP members that conveyed the need for increased funding for field stations and to rebuild their deteriorating infrastructure.

The Meeting of the Division was held on November 14. Major topics of discussion included Strategic Academic Focusing, where there is a difference of opinion in the next phase and timeline, and the history, context, and value of general education.

## II. Consent Calendar

**ACTION:** Minutes from the November 5 meeting were approved as presented.

## III. Preliminary Feedback on Strategic Academic Focusing Proposal

Prior to this meeting, the authors of the Entrepreneurship strategic academic focusing proposal asked COR for its informal feedback on whether the proposal has the potential to be transformed into an ORU proposal. COR previously agreed to provide feedback with the caveat that COR input does not constitute Senate consultation or approval.

A COR member assumed the lead on reviewing the proposal and indicated to the committee that the proposal, though brief, contains good concepts. It also contains a significant teaching component which would not be the focus of a

future ORU proposal. Due to the proposal's brevity, it is too difficult to discern whether it could potentially succeed as an ORU proposal. Furthermore, it must be made clear to the proposal's authors that this should not be a means to receive FTE lines, as ORUs do not hire faculty, rather, the hiring process occurs in the Bylaw 55 units. Lastly, the proposal needs to more fully explain its research agenda, identify its intellectual product, and state how it is different from the existing Blum Center.

**ACTION:** The lead COR reviewer will draft a memo with the aforementioned observations and suggestions. The memo will be circulated among the committee for review and approval. A final memo will be transmitted to the proposal's lead author in addition to the approved proposals from SNRI and HSRI to be used as examples of successful proposals.

#### IV. Library Issues

In the last academic year, the Senate-Administration Library Working Group recommended to the Senate Chair and Provost/EVC that the Senate establish a standing committee to address library and scholarly communication issues. This year's Division Council tabled the item at its recent meeting. COR's position is that library issues should not be enveloped into a subcommittee under COR, as the Library's mission is broader than that of research: the library also supports education and deals with resource allocation. Secondly, contrary to Division Council's concern, the resource demand for a new standing committee will not be that onerous.

Prior to this meeting, the COR chair drafted a memo stating COR's position but will now revise the memo to point out that as the campus moves towards 2020, the library's resources must grow commensurate with the growth in student and faculty numbers.

**ACTION:** COR chair will circulate the revised memo among the committee for review and approval. The final memo will be submitted to the Senate Chair in advance of the December 3 Division Council meeting.

V. Limited Submission Proposals

Prior to this meeting, COR members expressed an interest in more transparency in the limited submission process. Ex-officio committee member VCR Traina submitted a document detailing the procedures for the limited submission process. COR members voiced approval of the document but requested that the VCR add the criteria for selecting reviewers of the proposals. In addition, the document should include a statement that for any given limited submission opportunity, a faculty member may only be on one group proposal.

**ACTION:** VCR Traina will revise the limited submission proposal document and circulate among the committee members for approval.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

Prior to this meeting, COR members reviewed a systemwide proposal to extend the existing open access policy for Senate members to non-Senate members. COR members discussed various issues, such as the requirement from some federal agencies that PIs deposit their papers in open access venues, and, the fact that a number of commercial publishers such as Elsevier charges PIs and not all PIs budget for this expense.

**ACTION:** A memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair that COR endorses this proposed policy extension of open access for non-Senate members.

VII. Senate Faculty Grants Program

COR members continued their discussion about the long-term goals of the grants program and the short-term goal of gathering data in preparation for submitting a memo to the Provost/EVC with a justification for increased funding of the program. In the memo to the Provost, COR will explain its clarity of purpose and how it plans to distribute the funds across the four priority areas of juniority, evidence of need, bridge funding, and catalyst

grant funding. This prioritization will be listed in the call for proposals that will be submitted to the faculty in spring 2015.

COR members want to hear from the past award winners whether obtaining these Senate awards led to extramural grants, publications, or graduate student research projects. This information will be included in the memo to the Provost/EVC to convey the efficacy of the Senate faculty grants program and its need for increased funding. Funding has not increased commensurate with the growth in faculty numbers.

**ACTION:** Committee analyst will gather the award winners of the past five academic years, the number of faculty in each of those years, and the budget for the grants program during that time and provide this information to COR for the next meeting. COR members will draft a communication to send to these previous award winners, explaining that the committee is trying to obtain more funding from the Provost/EVC. The communication will ask the aforementioned questions of whether these awards led to extramural grants, publications, or graduate student research and will request that the faculty members provide a one-sentence response on the usefulness of the grant award. This information will be compiled into a graph and a memo to send to the Provost/EVC.

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