As of May 5, 2000, the Committee on Research (COR) met five times during the 1999-2000 academic year.

1. As the first item of business on October 11, 1999, COR adopted a Conflict of Interest Statement by a vote of 8 positive, 0 negative. This statement was the same as the previous year.

2. At the beginning of the year COR decided to discuss several campus research issues over the year, including allocation of computer funds for research purposes, the availability of funds available on campus for faculty to compete that would provide carry-over or bridging funds between grant cycles, and the relation of COR to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research. These items were discussed on various occasions throughout the year. In terms of computer funds, COR reiterated the prior view of the committee that computer replacement funds should not be provided through the funds that COR presently has available to distribute for intramural research support. Regarding bridging funds, COR considers this an appropriate category for funding under the intramural research program (with the same competitive process and cap on funds applicable to this category as they are to any other category in the intramural competition). Finally, further discussion between COR and the Office of the VC for Research is needed in order to establish an ongoing and supportive relationship between these two research components on the campus.

3. In December of 1999, COR reviewed 40 SEED grant proposals for the Office of the VC for Research. COR’s evaluations were used to establish a ranking of the proposals for funding by the VCR, with the final funding decision made by the VCR. Although the process proceeded reasonably well, the deadlines for submission of the proposals and the announcement of the awards were made without consultation with COR. As a result, the committee needed to review these proposals at a very busy time for faculty, namely during exam week and early in winter break. The importance, in the future, of the Office of the VCR coordinating such deadlines with COR was discussed with VCR Green and a resolution was reached to do so.

4. In January and February of 2000, COR reviewed 7 Pacific Rim proposals and provided recommendations to the Office of Research Affairs regarding proposals to send forward to UCOP for this systemwide competition.

5. The Intramural Research Grant process proceeded similarly to last year. The Omnibus Application for Academic Research Funds was again used. A few wording changes were made in order to emphasize some parts of the request for proposals, e.g. that requests should not exceed $2700 as this is the largest amount that will be awarded and the importance of writing the proposal for a broad scholarly audience. This year proposals from 262 applicants were reviewed. $602,927 was requested to support research on the campus and a total of $398,004 Academic Senate research funds was awarded. The
average award was $1520 with a maximum award amount of $2700. The amount of $10,000 was kept in reserve for new faculty members. An increasing number of faculty are submitting their proposals electronically, and this process appears to be working well.

6. The Chair of COR participated in the monthly meetings of UCORP as the campus representative. Activities at UCORP for the year included the review of several MRU's, review of the proposed School of Pharmacy at UCSD, review of the proposed Law School at UCR, discussion of the procedures and activities of COR on all the UC campuses, and discussion and review of the research climate at the national labs in the wake of the Los Alamos security incident. One issue that was discussed extensively at UCORP is the fact that several of the UC campuses assign their COR representation to UCORP for a one-year period, a practice that is followed by UCR. This has the advantage of spreading the responsibility of membership across the campus. However, it has the disadvantage that it does not position representatives from these campuses in line for any leadership roles on the committee. Incidentally, this problem is not unique to this particular systemwide committee. It is the view of COR that participation on systemwide committees by UCR faculty members be reviewed by the Senate, the Advisory Committee, and the Committee on Committees to determine what type of participation would be most beneficial to the UCR campus, especially in this time of rapid growth and change in the system.

7. On April 10, 2000, the systemwide UCORP held its monthly meeting on the UCR campus. Three members of the UCR COR, along with the UCR Chair, met with UCORP to discuss the activities and concerns of the UCR COR.

8. The proposals for Regents' Lecturers for the 2000-2001 academic year were reviewed by COR and recommendations were forwarded to the EVC.

9. On several occasions throughout the year, COR discussed the role and purpose of the committee on our campus. This included discussion of whether this role should remain the same or perhaps change as the campus grows. Issues we discussed included the size of the committee, the duties of the committee, how involved the committee should be in research policy on the campus, and the relation of the committee to the Office of the VC for Research. We were especially interested in the fact that in several of the Vision 2010 reports there is reference to the Committee on Research, and in several instances these imply a changing role for the committee. We found the information provided this year at UCORP regarding the composition, procedures, and activities of the COR's on the other UC campuses extremely useful in this discussion and we encourage the 2000-2001 COR members to continue to examine this issue.
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