To be received and placed on file:

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Committee on Research (CoR) met eight times. The Committee reviewed and readopted the prior year’s Conflict of Interest Statement.

Bylaw:
One of the committee’s major goals this year was to expand the committee’s purview to be more in line with other UC campus committees on research. At the May division meeting the committee’s bylaw was revised to expand the scope of its activities to include covering all issues regarding policies, practices, and budgetary needs pertaining to the research mission of UCR. Additionally, the committee will advise UCR administration on policies, practices, and budgetary needs that pertain to that mission.

Space:
At the committee’s second meeting Amanda Hatheway, a planning specialist, gave a guest presentation on how the current facilities services work order system functions and how she would like to change it to make it more efficient. Amanda presented the committee with a new priority assessment system, which would create a layered assessment process that allows facilities management to rank tasks based on cost and estimated completion time. Following the issue of space, the committee was asked to prepare a report on space issues encountered by UCR faculty. The committee decided to conduct a survey in order to document the space problem as it pertains to research. The survey was drafted but not distributed in the 2016-17 service year. It may carried out in the 2017-2018 service year.

Issue Review Items:
CoR reviewed a variety of system wide and campus wide issue. The first of these items was the New Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities. The policy sets forth the underlying principles that should govern activities conducted by UC faculty, students, and staff foreign sties and in furtherance of UC’s global engagement. CoR had one comment regarding a clarification issue between section F and the documents FAQ and one content suggestion in regards to FAQ 5 where it states: “UC Employees and students should comply with the stricter laws of the non-US country in which they are conducting the activity”. The committee felt that “should” was too ambiguous and that more definitive language should be used when it comes to obeying the laws of other sovereign countries.

At their December meeting, the committee reviewed two items: 1. VPUE proposal to allow enrollment in research and internship courses for zero units and 2. Teaching credit for faculty-led Internship courses. The committee supported item 1 but had one comment regarding item 2. Given the max unit graduation requirement, the committee felt that a new policy where units are given based on targeted job experience might take away from a student’s formal education.

Next, the committee reviewed the Proposed G-28 travel regulations and reviewed the revised APM 210-6 Health Science Clinical Professor Series. All members were in full support of the systemwide policy becoming more “family-friendly”. In addition, the committee supported the revisions made to APM 210-6.
During the committee’s February meeting the committee reviewed two items. The first was the Draft Presidential Unmanned aircraft system UAS policy where the committee decided not to opine. Second, was the request for Input regarding Visiting Dignitary Protocol. The committee felt that the proposed protocol’s complexity would discourage inviting dignitaries. CoR suggested that there should be centralized process for coordinating these visits. The next review item, Campus Guidelines regarding including specialization on UCR diplomas, the committee chose not to opine because it was outside of their purview.

At the following meeting, the committee discussed two more review items: 1. Proposed policy on Export controls and 2. Proposed Revisions to APM – 285, 210-3, 133 and 740. The committee had two suggestions for the Export control policy. First, the committee felt that the policy should be managed at the system wide level rather than at a campus level in order to ensure consistent application of the policy. Additionally, they suggested that there should be an appeals process to help manage any exceptions to the policy. In regards to the second item, the committee supported all of the proposed changes

Lastly, the committee reviewed the Draft Revised Presidential policy on Electronic Information Security and chose not to opine.

Grant Applications:
CoR’s primary activity is to administer intramural grant competitions. The committee further clarified the applications guidelines and spending limitations.

Research Grant Applications received for 2017-2018 funding included:
Total Applications: 506
Total Funded Applications: 412

Grant Type + Scoring Breakdown: (Total Funded / Total Received)
- Omnibus (337/363)
  o Travel Only = (263/287)
  o Research and Travel = (74/100)
    ▪ Score 3 awarded $1700 (24)
    ▪ Score 2.5 awarded $1400 (36)
    ▪ Scored 2 awarded $1100 (14)
- CoR (26/54)
  o Score 5 awarded $7000 (8)
  o Score 4.5 awarded $5500 (20)
  o Score 4 awarded $4500 (8)
- Regent Faculty Fellowship (26/43)
  o Score 5 awarded $6000 (7)
  o Score 4.5 awarded $4000 (8)
  o Score 4 awarded $3000 (11)
- Regent Faculty Development (13/22)
  o Score 5 awarded $6000 (5)
  o Score 4.5 awarded $4000 (4)
  o Score 4 awarded $3000 (4)

Total Research funds awarded for 2017-18 was $736,600. The committee received an additional SIF, which allowed them to award more grants than originally anticipated.
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