Minutes
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
April 29, 2014

Announcements and Committee Business
The COR minutes of March 11, 2014 were approved with minor edits.

Chair Habicht Mauche reported that the Office of Research has established an internal Office of Broader Impact to help faculty develop Broader Impact plans and statements into their research proposals. She also commented on the implementation of the Open Access Policy, that it does not mean you have to publish in open access journals, but that faculty just need to tell their publishers that they want to retain the copyright of their work.

Divisional Responses to COR UOF Inquiry
After reviewing the divisional responses to COR's fall 2013 request on use of UOF, the committee had additional questions about using UOF for faculty retention in two divisions. COR found use of opportunity funds for retention cases by the divisions somewhat problematic when used to benefit individual faculty. That some faculty give up their own summer salary to use their grants to pay for GSRs, while those faculty involved in retention cases received GSRs as part of the retention package struck COR as an incentive for faculty to pursue other offers. But retention packages have also been created with opportunity funds by enhancing shared facilities that promote research for a broader faculty base. COR is more supportive of the later use. COR also noted that by using it for enhancing individual faculty research through retention cases, less money was available for bridge funding for those faculty who are active in getting grants, but have a gap. COR is not against retaining faculty, but questions the appropriateness of using UOF to do so. It subverts the transparency of opportunity for faculty to gain access for using these funds. COR discussed this distinction, that there is now, through these divisional reports more transparency in the expenditure of UOF, but there must also be transparency in the opportunities for faculty use. COR understands that there are many competing needs for the limited resource of UOF funds, but believes they should be used to enhance support for research for the greatest benefit, especially with an eye to creating more extramural funds and more UOF.

Another outlier in use of funds was BSOE's practice of using this source of funds to pay the Information User Fee (the IT fee) for researchers.   COR was surprised to see the high amount of spending (about 1/3) used for computer charges. COR was mixed in its reaction to this, and considered posing a broader set of questions to the faculty about desired use of UOF.

Revisions to the Compendium
In its initial discussion, COR identified two issues with the revisions; for MRUs there were concerns about the appointment process for MRU leadership, for MRPs the policy seems to be silent on the decision structure for determining funding and adjudication of MRPI proposals.

While MRUs have always had a high level of engagement of the Senate and its committees in adjudicating proposals, COR noted a lack of faculty engagement process for vetting MRPs. In documenting the process for adjudicating the proposals, this revision to the Compendium should include a clearly articulated role for faculty in determining what proposals get funded. As it

stands now, the Compendium only includes the Senate in developing what criteria are set forth in the call for proposals. This appears to be a diminution of faculty involvement compared to the MRU process, where the administration looks for Senate approval of proposals before funding them. The Compendium clearly articulates a process for vetting MRU proposals and should do so for MRP proposals as well. COR asserts the basic principle that faculty should be setting the research vision of the institution.

COR Agenda for Next Year
COR discussed the following items that need further consideration next year:
-Support for research (infrastructure for admin support)
-Teaching and service (research active faculty have increased responsibility – may have several grants and a dozen people working under them, yet for the personnel process, they have the same teaching and service expectations as less active faculty. COR may want to consider formal mechanisms for supporting this type of faculty.)
-NFRG – reconsider the program, either make it competitive or just give funds to everyone who applies
-Interface with the VCR. – COR needs to work with the VCR to create the most effective consultation strategy.
-Preview Day – used to be an intimate recruiting day to have labs open, faculty showcase their work, etc. but now the number of applicants who attend may have out grown the format. May need to work with CAFA and admissions on this.
-List of Centers/Research Facilities - COR would like to see a centralized list of UCSC research facilities and instrumentation. This will heighten the campus research profile and can be used in faculty recruitments. COR discussed this as a possible joint project with the VCR next year.
-Training courses- COR will explore with the VCR the possibility of creating a small pool of funds for grad students, postdocs and faculty that can be used for taking training/retooling courses.