

**COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
MINUTES
March 14, 2017**

Present: Steve Whittaker (*chair*), Karen Bassi, Grace Peña Delgado, Fernando Leiva, Longzhi Lin, Todd Lowe, Ahmet Ali Yanik, Daniel Oliver (GSR), Scott Brandt (Vice Chancellor for Research)

Absent: Daniel Costa (*F,W*), Gustavo Vasquez

Standing Guest, Vice Chancellor for Research Scott Brandt

VCR Brandt presented to members on recent changes in the Office for Research. The office is incorporating the feedback to the Center of Excellence's proposal. The new research development unit assist the campus bring in larger proposals. The unit will consist of six positions located in each of the divisions and split funded with the deans. Member were impressed and shared that the new funding resource site, GrantFoward has been useful and suggested sending out a campus message. VCR Brandt assured members that he will follow up with Research Development Director Audrey Levine.

Final Discussion about Research Grants

The committee completed adjudicating the research grant applications for 2017-18 and discussed requesting from VCR Brant additional seed funding for the top collaborative proposals, as in previous year. Chair Whittaker will follow up with VCR Brandt.

The committee debriefed on the process of the collaborative research theme and would like to use the collaborative theme again but the call needs to be sent earlier to draw in faculty. It would give faculty time to discuss and think about possible collaboration earlier in the year to plan ahead. The committee will consult with the incoming COR chair in the spring about a summer call for SRG proposals of collaborative research.

COR could additionally encourage collaboration by creating space, such as workshops or activities like "speed-dating". A member brought up the SSRC- Mellon program to train graduate students in inter-disciplinary research. This type of program has great potential in building relationships to enable faculty collaboration. The committee would like to work with Research Development Director on showcasing the collaborative proposals that seems promising. The committee plans to consult with the Research Development Director on additional ideas to advance collaborative research on campus.

Systemwide Senate Review: Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy

Members discussed the draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System policy. Members noted the necessity for the UC policy to take into account of relevant risk but they are concern about impediments to faculty's research. Research is needed to explore the opportunities and risks of this emerging technology. This issue is further complicated by the fact that UASs are currently a highly underspecified technology where applications might take many possible forms. Members strongly urge prioritizing research.

The draft policy seems to be both restrictive and complex to administer. It is unclear the division of labor between the central UC-UAS administration and the satellite campuses. Which parts of the application process will be handled by each? How will a researcher know when to apply to the Office of the President or to the local campus? The committee recommends a simplify application process for research approval. A useful analogy would be to consider the standard Institutional Review Board (IRB), where low risk projects receive a waiver while high-risk ones undergo a full review. An analogous two-tier system for UAS could be used where low-risk projects (such as control and instrumentation for flights in indoor lab conditions) could receive application waivers. A two-tier approach could streamline the administration and facilitate certain types of low-risk research. The committee urged that local campuses should have the ability to review and approve rather than at the systemwide level, which will ideally decrease faculty wait time for authorization.

Continued to Draft Faculty Research Support Survey

Members suggest reducing the numbers of questions in the draft survey to faculty, perhaps limiting to five to get at the central purpose of trying to understand research culture and to inform the committee's work in being strategic about the improving research culture. Over the break, members will generate and add their questions to review at the next meeting.