The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm

1. Approval of the agenda
   Motion by Zach Hallab; seconded by Ekin Alakent; unanimous approval.

2. Approval of minutes
   Motion by Ekin Alakent; seconded by Maria Ortuoste; unanimous approval.

3. Report of the Chair
   No items to report.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   a. New position: Faculty Associate for Research with ORSP
   b. Attended meetings in different campuses which touched on the role of research on CSU campuses and what can be done to emphasize its important role. They strategized ways to bring this matter to the Chancellor and the Provost.
   c. On RSCA Grants: Provost gave assurance that there will be funds for Faculty Support Grants (FSGs) for the 2012-13 academic year. It was unclear, however, what the specific amount will be and the time frame for the funding.
      i. If new grants are to be funded, it might be for the following year.
      ii. It is uncertain if there would be special funding for new faculty.
      iii. Discussed specific goals with the Provost one of which was including student participation in faculty research projects as part of RSCA grants. It was noted that specific student participation might differ according the specific disciplines.
      iv. The Presidential Appointee hopes to give more specifics in the next meeting.
They have started a Student Research Initiative on campus. Funding is through A2E2 fees ($500 per quarter to work on a research project). The student submits a research proposal which was duly reviewed by a faculty mentor. The student is then expected to write a short report by the end of the quarter. If the student project is successful, they can continue with the grant. There are also possibilities of workshops related to research, graduate school, and preparing for an annual CSU-wide research competition.

i. This applies to graduate and undergraduate students.

ii. There is money for this Initiative and it is hoped that more will be raised through A2E2 fees. There appears to be student interest in becoming more involved in faculty projects.

iii. One of the challenges is building a sustainable model of student participation in the humanities. The central issues are intellectual property and how the project can support faculty rather than giving additional responsibilities to the faculty member.

5. Old Business
   a. No further communication from Carl Stempel regarding his request to modify his grant.
   b. On CRECE
      i. Some questions and suggestions were raised, specifically: connections with the rest of the university community, developing a financial plan to sustain the center
      ii. Motion to approve by Sarah Taylor; Ekin Alakent seconded; unanimous approval.
      iii. The matter will now be brought to the attention of ExComm
   c. On revised provisions on centers and institutes.
      i. Chris Baysdorfer moved to discuss this in the next meeting (1/10/2013); Vahid Fozdar seconded; approved.
      ii. Jason Singley raised the need for recommendations regarding the Centers

6. Other matters: Student representatives on CR
   a. In a previous meeting, Mitch Watnik pointed out that only two other committees were exempt from the requirement of student representation – COBRA and FEC.
   b. Some concerns were raised about the student participation in CR, namely:
      i. Confidentiality issues arising out of faculty applications for grants
      ii. Qualifications to review faculty research proposals
      iii. The creation of “sub-committees” might pose more difficulties in the long run
   c. It was suggested that the committee develop criteria for student participation, for example: the student must at least be a senior
   d. Asked if the committee wants to revisit the previous decision to ask for an exemption to this rule, there was no response.

7. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.