# Committee on Research (CoR) Minutes of Meeting February 27 2019

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 2:30 pm on February 27, 2019 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Michael Scheibner presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Scheibner updated CoR members on the following:

- Division Council meeting February 20:
  - The EVC/Provost is more confident that state legislators are aware of the UC's budget needs
  - UC libraries are changing to more of a curation role from a repository one.
    A discussion ensued about how to leverage the resources of the UC system to support the libraries' evolving role.
  - There was a discussion about potential changes to the compensation structure for Senate committee chairs
  - Division Council approved the working title change of L(P)SOEs to Teaching Professor. A few Council members supported CoR's memo in which CoR expressed its support for the working title change, but suggested the systemwide Senate should consider further changes to the APM to reestablish the former "Research Professor" title series. (CoR prefers the "Research Professor" title over the current "Professional Research" series under APM 310. In light of the introduction of the Teaching Professor titles, the (re-)introduction of the Research Professor titles would reflect a more balanced representation of the University's fundamental missions: teaching, research and public service.)
- Academic Planning Working Group (APWG) updates:
  - The APWG held town halls with each School's faculty. The main topic of these discussions was reaching R1 status and the utility of using Carnegie indices. Many faculty pointed out that the main index – research expenditures – emphasizes sciences and engineering fields while deemphasizing social sciences and the humanities.
  - o The APWG subcommittees (Criteria, Process, Strategy) are holding meetings
  - CAPRA's traditional role with respect to faculty FTE requests will change beginning next year. The EVC/Provost will allocate a group of lines to each School for allocation. CAPRA will assess whether Schools are using their resources efficiently from an institutional perspective.

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

II. Budget Work Group (BWG) updates

CoR member Subramaniam updated committee members on the February 11 BWG meeting:

- Funding model of the Library. UC Merced spends less per capita on the Library compared to other UCs. UC Merced Librarian Haipeng Li presented on the state of the Library's budget, and discussion in the BWG will continue on how to close the funding gaps.
- Summer session. BWG discussed the fact that summer courses are offered in an ad hoc manner and it is often difficult to plan which courses will need to be held. The BWG wants to develop a summer session course plan and to incentivize the teaching of summer courses. The BWG will continue this discussion at its next meeting.
- The BWG is finalizing its proposed indirect cost return model and it will ultimately be submitted to the Senate for review.

## III. Consent Calendar

**Action:** the January 30 and February 13 meeting minutes were approved as presented. Due to the absence of VCORED Traina, his announcement regarding the COGR Report on Institutional Resources for Promoting Research Quality will be tabled for the next meeting.

IV. ORU Policy

Prior to this meeting, the final draft of the policy was distributed to CoR members.

**Action:** CoR members approved the final draft. The policy will be transmitted to Division Council for Senate committee review.

### V. Limited Submission Procedures

In previous meetings, CoR members, at the request of the Office of Research & Economic Development (ORED), and in conjunction with VCORED Traina, have discussed revisions to the campus limited submission procedures. CoR members agreed with the VCORED's suggested revisions and in today's meeting, discussed the ORED staff's questions/comments:

• Who should review proposals at the Dean/ORU Director nomination stage if the PI/applicant is the Dean or ORU Director?

CoR members suggest that in this instances, the VCORED should select a qualified member of the faculty (e.g. ORU director can be chosen to review a dean's proposal and a dean can be chosen to review an ORU director's proposal) to conduct the review.

• Should we have a more standardized rubric for reviewers to have? Faculty would benefit from having some guidelines. (ORED staff provided a rubric for CoR's review.)

CoR members agreed with the rubric provided by ORED staff.

• For opportunities that have no applicants, might it be helpful for ORED to reannounce these opportunities again? If so, CoR will need to develop an "expedited" review process, because if there are only a few weeks for someone to be selected and develop a full proposal, then Dean and ad hoc review committee stages will take too long.

CoR members suggested that in such cases, applicants should only submit their proposed budgets, space requirements, and cost-sharing needs. If the campus does not have the capacity to support the work proposed by the applicant, then the applicant would not move forward with submitting a full proposal.

**Action:** CoR will discuss the aforementioned revisions in the next meeting with VCORED Traina is present. A final set of revisions/comments will be forwarded by CoR to ORED.

- VI. Campus Review Items
  - Space planning documents

Prior to this meeting, a memo of draft comments was distributed to CoR members. With regard to the document on space allocation, CoR members suggested adding a statement that lab space should be provided to L(P)SOEs/Teaching Professors, given that the recent changes to the APM clearly state that faculty in this series are expected to engage in professional activity.

**Action:** CoR to review and approve the revised memo via email. The final memo will be transmitted to the Senate Chair by his deadline of March 11.

• Online/Distance Education Version of the UC Merced Extension Teacher Preparation Program, Multiple Subject Credential and Single Subject Credential

Action: the Senate Chair will be informed that CoR declines to opine.

### VII. Systemwide Review Items

• UC Transfer Guarantee Proposal

Action: the Senate Chair will be informed that CoR declines to opine.

- VIII. Other Business
  - The CoR chair will continue the discussion at the next meeting of March 13 of potentially converting the current Senate faculty grants program to an incentive program.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Attest: Michael Scheibner, CoR chair