Committee on Research APPROVED Minutes
January 14, 2016
SA 4600

Members present: Kate Bell, Jeffra Bussmann, Stephanie Couch, Shubha Kashinath, Jean Moran, Jenny O, Jeff Seitz, Sarah Taylor, and Helen Zong

Guests present: Jeanne Dittman, Mark Robinson, Sean Williams, Michael Hedrick, Nidhi Mahendra, and Holly Vugia

Meeting convened at 2:00pm

1. Approval of the Agenda
   Motion to approve by O and seconded by Moran. Amendments made to move guest agenda items up, unanimously approved.

2. Approval of the 11/12/15 minutes
   Motion to approve by Moran and second by Zong. Approved.

   No report.

   Jeanne Dittman began as Director of Grants Administration. Dittman previously worked at SJSU for over 10 years ago.
   ORSP hired new a temporary worker to help grant preparation with plan to fill the position permanently.
   Using the InfoReady tool and would be good to consider using it for the next FSG call. However, it would be a good idea to have a back-up plan.

5. Referrals:
   a. Review the Appointment Procedures for Membership on the Institutional Review Board (IRB)
      Taylor will draft a response and use Kevin Brown’s information to go back to ExCom.

6. Business:
   a. Teacher Scholar Program (FAC members Dr. Nidhi Mahendra & Dr. Holly Vugia, 2:15pm time certain)
      Taylor drafted a proposal call.
      Issues raised:
      • Is this for new junior faculty or more experienced junior faculty? Can tenured faculty apply?
      • Suggestion to remove sentence about helping junior faculty to meet tenure.
      • Is the goal of this grant to focus on capacity building or individual research strengthening? It can be complementary but are also discrete.
      • Mentoring versus interdisciplinary.
• Proposal to add sections related to prior research results and current and pending research projects.
• How many faculty will be accepted into the program? 30-50 faculty on rolling entrance, so at most 50 in a three-year period.
• There was a suggestion of joint applications for interdisciplinary research team. However, some members believe that interdisciplinary does not necessarily build capacity or mentoring on campus.
• Suggestion to scope the proposal call as individual-focused for the first few years and then revise it after seeing how it plays out.
• This should be seed grant for external grant funding.
• We want model faculty to inspire others to kick up their research.
• Recipients could form a group like an FLC that benefits beyond their own sphere. They would have to give back to the campus, could be a workshop, a program, a resource, or tool.
• Suggestion to review past FSGs who have received time off consecutively quarterly and see how they have performed (do they have external grants?). What are they breeding, incubating?
• Consider PEIL grant experience (having admin support was huge).
• Next steps:
  o FAC visitor members will explain our discussion to their committee.
  o Taylor will convert to Google doc and share for comments. Access for a month and then make some decisions.
  o Couch will gather statistics from previous FSGs.
• Discussion on title and what it means to the scope of the program. It may be possible to change the title to better describe the scope. As Faculty Scholar Program, is it meant to increase research productivity or to improve teaching? Without clear objective or scope, it would be hard to provide feedback.

b. Follow-up from conversation with Provost and FAC re: special registration

i. FAC policy on special registration
14-15 FAC 7 was the last document related to it, but not clear where this document is now. FAC visitor members will check to see what next to do with Jim Murray.

c. Individual FSG call

i. Request for Proposals
Couch brought drafts to review. The budget will be an excel file, while still including a narrative explanation of budget. Updated workshop date.
Questions arose with no clear answer: Should there be overlap in applying and receiving FSG? Are we spreading the wealth? Or are faculty doing discrete research projects? We could take away points for overlap? Should we make it a plus 1 if this is their first or only have one FSG application with current funding? Keep status quo? How do we know that this application is different from previous application? Has the research grown or evolved? Who is tracking this data? Couch will revise and email the RFP to CR members for feedback.

ii. Rubric
Couch will demo the InfoReady tool to anyone interested.
d. CSU Student Research Competition
   Timeline was set. Student research summaries will be submitted to CSR by
   February 16 and then forwarded to CR committee on Feb 18. Students names
   will be submitted to the CSU Student Research competition by March 11.

e. Week of Scholarship.
   Tabled.

f. Animal Care and Use (ACU) Policy (Sean Williams, 3:00pm time certain)
   Working to update this policy (vertebrates). Goal is to align ours to be more
   compliant with the NIH policy. Existing policy dated back to 2008.
   Some Changes include:
   Changed title, referencing NIH language, more clarification of roles, reporting
   language and protocol language. The changes should be shared with Academic
   Senate and Executive Committee, with the marked-up version and summary of
   changes. It will go to Senate as Action Item. Taylor will make a procedures
   document for how to appoint faculty onto this committee. Motion to approve it:
   Seitz and seconded by Shubha. Approved unanimously.

g. Updates to other ORSP policies. No need for further discussion after clarification re:
   CR role in reviewing ORSP policies. CR can give input on ORSP policies if requested,
   but only needs to formally update and vote on official senate policies related to CR.

   i. Cost Sharing/Matching Policy

   ii. Exceptional Co-Principal Investigator Status Policy

7. Adjournment at 4:02pm