CR COMMITTEE
AMENDED MINUTES – 27 FEB 2014

Location: SA 4350

Members present: Sarah Taylor, Jenny O, Jeff Seitz, Khal Schneider, Ekin Alakent, Charlton Hua, Stephanie Couch, Lynn Eudey, Roger Doering

Guest: Brad Wells

Members absent: Kate Bell, Gretchen Keer

Meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

1. Introductions

2. Approval of the agenda
   • Motion – Seitz; 2nd Schneider

3. Approval of the minutes 2/13/14
   • Motion – Seitz; 2nd O
   • 1 abstention

4. Report of the Chair
   • CR1 document did not get reviewed at Ex Com
   • Sarah cannot make Ex Com next week (Tues Mar 4); Would like a fill in
     • Seitz could go if given a time certain
   • Continued orientation of new members Couch and Hua; Review of CR mandate, review of CR tasks undertaken to-date
   • Discussion about CSUEB and FRESCA Faculty profiles – perhaps CR should support it as it does not appear that faculty are not aware/do not update them (with research information)
   • Discussion of CR Policies and Procedures item 1a. – is it accurate/does it need to be updated?

5. Report of the Presidential appointee
   • Stephanie Couch
   • Discussion of her perspective of research needs and current conditions at CSUEB
• Main focus in next three months will be on External grantees and making the grant holding process easier for PIs.

6. Old Business:
   a. Updating the CR Policies and Procedures
      • Adding representative(s) from Administration and Finance and/or ORSP (Brad Wells)
         • Explained current state of the Foundation (dissolved, but people that did the Foundation work are still on campus, just located in different Departments)
         • Noted that he perceives staffing in ORSP is low, supports hiring of more staff in ORSP
         • Two National Science Foundation audits in the last 2.5 years. Wells is held accountable, so has a strong interest in compliance to grant administration protocols (so does have some limitations on what can be done with the grant administration process).
         • Seitz – Gave example of challenges of getting contractors paid – hold up/disappears once the request leaves ORSP
         • Wells – noted a ‘how to’ document/resource does exist as an ORSP resource (for ORSP staff). Will check and make sure it gets to departments.
         • Submit purchase requests (to get grant people paid) electronically – not check requests. Using the purchase request creates an electronic paper trail – check requests result in a piece of paper floating around between Departments.
         • Steps to getting people paid:
            1. Sub-award contract (to formalize costs/how much) to ORSP. If the payee is not an ‘entity’ it can be problematic (e.g., private citizen).
            2. Get invoice (request for payment) from payee to ORSP.
            3. ORSP checks against the original sub-award contract. If it’s an allowed expense (consistent with contract), it gets submitted to Finance for payment.
            4. Payment should take approximately 1 week.
      • Couch suggested that these guidelines should be made more transparent to grant holders. Flowchart?
      • ‘How-To’ Guide exists (not online; hard copy only) to help ORSP staff manage grants and grant funds. Should this be made available to PIs?
Discussions about specific grant contractor/community partner payment problems
Regarding addition of A&F or ORSP non-voting seat: Wells thinks ORSP is the most appropriate choice as they are the go-between for PI and A&F

b. CSU Student Competition Review Process and Rubric
   - Rubric based off of RFP for Competition
   - **Action Item:** O will come up with operational definitions for the scale #s
   - **Action Item:** Taylor will divide proposals among the CR and assign via email
   - Proposals must be evaluated over the next two weeks

c. Draft report – survey of first-year faculty
   - Fourteen respondents. We will close the poll now. Information will be sent to the Provost.
   - CR felt wording was generic enough so as not to divulge any identities.
   - O noted that one variable that may influence perception of support is knowledge of the ability to negotiate start up funds at hire
   - Seitz suggested tracking first-year (2013-2014) over a number of years to see if perceptions/realities change
   - Couch suggested we ask those first year faculty that reported feeling positive support to share their thoughts with other faculty in some format
   - Seitz suggested that the questionnaire should be appended to document for Senate.
   - CR agreed to send forward to Senate as information item.
   - **Action item:** Taylor will create narrative for the data

7. New Business:
   a. Search Committee for AVP of Research – tabled due to time

   b. Possible Research Grants proposed by the Provost – tabled due to time
      - First-Year Faculty
      - Collaborative Research

8. Adjournment at 4:00p.m.