Committee on Research

Approved Minutes for October 24, 2013
N Sci 119

Members Present: Sarah Taylor, Ekin Alakent, Roger Doering, Lynn Eudey, Gretchen Keer, Jenny O, Khal Schneider, Jeff Seitz, Jason Singley.

Members Absent: Katherine Bell, Thomas Duffy

Guests Present: Stephanie Couch, Jane Lopus

Meeting was called to order at 2:05.

1. Agenda Approved

2. Minutes Approved

3. Report of the Chair

   • Wanted to know if using email to have committee discussions between meetings was OK. Everyone agreed that this was fine.
   • Provost responded via email to request for more funds. We may need to clarify policy on start-up funds (amounts and allowable uses). Consider asking Provost to come to a future meeting.
   • Several committee members commented that the Provost did not respond directly to the specific request in the CR memo.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

   • Will attend a meeting of Presidential Appointee’s with the President tomorrow. Planning for the search for a new AVP of research is ongoing.

5. Old Business

   a. AVP of Research and Professional Development – The survey about the AVP position has only been completed by 15 faculty. Committee members will ask colleagues to complete it and the Senate office will be instructed to send it out to all faculty again. There was a group discussion of what the job description of the AVP of research should include and what qualifications the individual should have. Comments include:

      • Is this person going to be a compliance officer or go out and bring in dollars?
• Will the AVP oversee the Director of ORSP?
• Compliance is an important responsibility of the position.
• Need someone who can see the big picture of research on campus.
• ORSP needs more grants analyst.
• ORSP does not understand faculty needs.
• AVP should represent the University externally. Looking for private grants. Write institutional level grants.
• One faculty member mentioned that she now runs collaborative grants through other universities because of present grant management problems at CSUEB.
• Other institutions have more staff support for paperwork. Paperwork makes it discouraging to pursue grants.
• Agree we need faculty support first (grants management). Advocacy for research is a longer-term goal.
• External multi-institutional grants are available, but not being pursued by CSUEB.
• Moving grants to state side finance has impacted future role of AVP.
• Where should AVP be placed in the organization? Finance or Academic Affairs? Need a strong leader that can bridge this divide.
• Look for other models of operational structure within the CSU.
• Perhaps the new AVP could help lead the campus to develop a new strategic plan
• VP of Academic Affairs and Finance should both have a voice in the hiring and play a part in the review of the AVP of research.
• AVP should report to the Provost.
• AVP needs to mentor new faculty and help with grant development.

Discussion of qualifications for the position:
• Being assertive, able to work with senior administrators from other divisions
• Track record of funded research – has been a PI.
• Someone from a similar type of University
• Experience in writing grants, managing grants and reviewing grants.
• Someone that could be a mentor to other faculty.
• Have a passion for the institution, students, and faculty at CSUEB.
• Experience working for a grant giving organization (NIH, NSF, etc)

Discussion of search strategies:
• Senior faculty with department administrative experiences. Not necessarily someone that has been a dean or has university wide administrative experience.
• CSU East Bay faculty should be recruited to contact colleagues at other intuitions and look for qualified applicants.
b. Recommendations of the 2011 Research Strategic Planning Task Force - Very little has changed since the document was written. Some things have changed, some have gotten worse. The committee agreed to draft a document as an informational item to the Senate that gives an update on the progress on the Task Force recommendations. Committee members will use Google docs to start drafting the document and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

c. Review of CR Policies and Procedures; any suggested changes? – Committee members discussed adding a non-voting member to the committee from Administrative and Finance. It was argued that this would open the lines of communication and potentially initiate a process where the committee could help solve some of the problems facing faculty in regards to grant management. There was concern raised that the committee was too focused on grants management rather than supporting research among all faculty, the majority of which are not grant funded.

Motion (Seitz/Eudey) – The Vice President of Administration and Finance, or designee, shall be appointed to the Committee on Research as a non-voting member. Passed unanimously.