

DRAFT Minutes
Committee on Research
October 11, 2011

The Committee on Research met at 2:00 pm on Tuesday, October 11, 2011 in 307 Kerr Hall.

Present: Scott Oliver (chair), Elisabeth Cameron, Nathaniel Deutsch, David Koo, Sri Kurniawan, Debra Lewis, Deborah Letourneau, Hamid Sadjadpour, Kim Smith (ASO), Stephanie Casher (ASO).

Guest: VCR Margon

After introductions, the Chair reviewed the COR charge and confidentiality statement with the committee. The Chair also described the interaction with the Vice Chancellor of Research, Bruce Margon, and his weekly consultation with COR (which apparently is not standard procedure at all campuses).

Chair's Announcements

Last year, COR consulted with ITS to talk about divisional faculty liaisons. ITS wondered why faculty did not utilize their divisional faculty liaisons more, and COR replied that they had not been aware of these divisional liaisons. To help increase the visibility of their services, ITS created a website for faculty (<http://its.ucsc.edu/faculty/index.html>). COR will check in with ITS again later in the year.

There is a meeting being planned with Chief Information Officer (CIO) and ITS to discuss a "Vision for the Future."

Carryover issue from 2010-11 – Regional Data Center funds. One million dollars was set aside (250K/year for five years) to fund racks at the Regional Data Center. COR questioned if this money could be used for another purpose. VCIT Doyle is investigating the status of the funds and will report back.

Chair Oliver gave a brief update on the Student Affairs realignment.

Chair Oliver met with Provost Pitts about the Online Education Project. Some funding was secured via a grant, and there are currently 25-30 courses being offered in a pilot program.

The UC Discovery Program has been eliminated.

UCSC has been ranked third worldwide in research rankings.

Course Time Slot Changes

COR discussed the Course Time-Slot Changes proposal. There is a concern that this is a back door way of increasing the amount of classes faculty are expected to teach. Also, the reworking of syllabi and reformatting of courses to accommodate reduced class times will require a considerable amount of faculty time which would cut into research time. There was also concern that in many cases, the syllabi/curriculum cannot be addressed in a shorter time frame. Also, who is going to be reviewing these revised syllabi?

One member did point out that the lack of large classrooms IS an issue, and did not feel that the proposal necessarily was conceived with ill-intent toward faculty.

The committee felt that a change of this magnitude really should be run by the entire campus, because it impacts everyone. A decision on this issue should be tabled until wider campus consultation can be sought.

“While COR understands the scheduling difficulties, and agree that it needs to be solved, a solution of this magnitude really needs to go out for wider campus consultation. It would be helpful if COT could provide some analysis on the impact on teaching.”

ITS External Review

COR discussed the ITS External Review. ITS seems to have a large number of FTE, roughly two per faculty member.

One member felt the COR should not be commenting on the External Review Report, but on IT's *response* to the External Review report. COR will write a letter to the Senate Chair to this effect.

COR also needs to select an ACIT representative at the next meeting.

Consultation with VCR Margon

COR asked VCR Margon if he had any information on the status of the Regional Data Center funds. VCR Margon suggested COR write to the EVC with their suggestion on how that money should be spent.

On November 8th, there is going to be a summit between all VCRs and CIO, and one of the topics is the San Diego Supercomputer Center.

One member asked why COR isn't involved (per their charge) in the review of and advocacy for on campus Centers such as CAFAS?

VCR Margon provided an update on Stanford v. Roche case. Every faculty member when they were hired signed a patent agreement. The court has ruled in favor of Roche, that the Stanford patent agreement did not say what they think it says. All current faculty members are going to have sign new agreements. There is also a slight concern that it may call into question all past agreements, and third parties may try to go back in and revise royalty agreements that have been in place for years.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

So Attests,

Scott Oliver, Chair
Committee on Research (COR)