

**COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
MINUTES
January 24, 2017**

Present: Steve Whittaker (*chair*), Daniel Costa, Longzhi Lin, Todd Lowe, Gustavo Vasquez, Ahmet Ali Yanik, Daniel Oliver (GSR)

Absent: Karen Bassi, Grace Peña Delgado, Fernando Leiva

Announcement

Chair Whittaker informed members that COR may need to schedule an additional meeting at the end of the quarter due to last week's cancelled meeting. He shared that the Center of Excellence proposal is still on the table for discussion and is proud of the impact the committee had in helping to shape the direction of research on campus.

Member Lowe debriefed members on the recent UCORP meeting he attended in place of the Chair. UCORP members discussed each campus' approach toward seed funding research. UC Berkeley allocates each faculty research funds,

The campus may consider modeling UC Santa Barbara, they are very productive, working closely with their administrators and are transparent; or another model is UC San Diego, research is very active and transparent, faculty contribution are clear. On the other end of the spectrum, UC Berkeley allocates to all faculty a small amount of funding. Members did not agree with this approach, the committee's grant funding program is a sensible process, although member noted there is a fair amount of reviewing by the committee given the relatively small amount.

Center for Research on Cyber-Physical Systems (CRCPS) Proposal

The committee reviewed the CRCPS proposal and agreed that the Center's plan to explore the specific combination of emerging technology is timely. Members noted the proposal could be clearer about how the Center will promote synergy beyond the existing individual research efforts to increase the Center's impact. More information about the competitive edge against other research centers in the same research space, a comparison against other institution may be useful. Members had administrative questions as well, such as the specific criteria or standards for the Center review process (details of how grants, research papers or students will be evaluated). The process, criteria for review and the individuals responsible for the review. It were uncertain how the Center will engage with industry, the proposed consortium mechanism. In the context of industry involvement in sponsoring research, COR would like clarification of how graduate student research will operate as well as how the Center will support the graduate student experience. Additionally, they would like to learn more about the post doctorate position, and how this is intended to be allocated among faculty.

The budget section of the proposal could be more specific information on how the consortium will be put together. The current list of sponsors is rather generic, perhaps the proposal could include detail about which potential sponsors have been approached. Furthermore, there is a request for four new faculty positions, without any real justification for how these positions are crucial for the success of the Center. Members suggest providing more ways to support sponsor funding. At the moment, there is a single way to participate at 100K, but there might be different levels at which sponsors would want to contribute as well as other methods such as sponsoring students. While the committee had some questions, overall member were supportive of the proposal.

Consult with Research Development Director Audrey Levine

Director Levine informed members she is working with the Office for Sponsored Projects to address concerns raised about efficiency and faculty service. Their offices are continuing to define their role and responsibility with a focus on providing quality service and ensuring compliance. The Research Development unit is also collaborating with University Relations division. In the future, she would like to add more content, material repository, and possibly a quarterly newsletter to the Office of Research's website.

The campus largest source of funding is from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Health yet the applications have approximately a twenty percent success rate (the review process are different). Pre-proposals for larger grants have gained more traction across campus as the screening process has been implemented. Referring back to her initial project, they have purchased a grant seeking database called Grant Forward, to provide faculty a development tool. The contract is place for three years and geared toward grant opportunities for U.S based researchers.

Draft Field Research Safety Plan & Policy

The Office for Research has worked with the Environmental Health & Safety Office to create a field research safety plan and drafted a policy for the campus; it addresses personal safety and research in a controlled environment. Director Patrick Goff noted that the impetus to create the field safety plan was due to an unfortunate death of researchers in the field. The pre-risk assessment is required for researchers to complete the field research safety plan itself is not required. EH&S office anticipate reviewing anywhere from twenty to forty field research safety plans; the process of working through the plan is helpful to researchers. One member noted that the most useful training he received from campus was the medical and field research training since he had only previously learned from his professors as a graduate student. Members suggested working with department chairs, especially in programs where field research is routine, provide the information to new faculty at orientation and consider providing first aid or medical training to new field researchers.