APPROVED MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Thursday, March 14, 2019

Present: Jeffra Bussmann, Amy Furniss, Surendra Sarnikar, Douglas Taylor, Natalie Ingraham, Jeremiah Garretson, Katie Strom

1) Approval of the agenda
   a) Motion: Jeremiah, Second: Doug. Approved.

2) Approval of 2/28/19 minutes
   a) Motion: Kate, Second: Jeremiah. Approved.

3) Reports
   a) Report of the Chair
      i) Jeffra reported on the library working to became an institutional member of Dryad. The library is in process of becoming an institutional member of this open source data repository tool. The tool is becoming more accessible and usable and CSUEB will be the first outside institution to join. Once members, our faculty will be able to deposit data with no cost beyond the institutional membership fee paid by the university. Specific date for launch at CSUEB is still uncertain – the library is aiming for summer 2019.
      
   b) Report of the Presidential appointee
      i) Absent. No report.

4) Business
   a) New Center proposal
      i) P&Ps
         (1) Committee spent some time running through the P&P document before the time certain presentations. Guidelines outlined and committee responsibility in review
of charters and centers were summarized by Jeffra, as written in the P&P document.

ii) Charter of the CBE Financial Literacy Center *(2:30pm time certain w/ Eric Fricke & Jagdish Agrawal)*

(1) Introductions of CR members, introduction of Erik and Jagdish

(2) The charter is a renewal from 2013 original submission, aiming to formalize a discussion and opportunities for university faculty, staff and students to learn about saving and investing money for retirement. The center was originally created to enable this sharing via mentoring and seminars. The center wants to educate people, the students faculty and staff, about investment and retirement, making budgets, being fiscally responsible. Often times the center will provide lunch for students/faculty/staff during these seminars. The center has received a lot of positive feedback from students that are taking out loans to pay for college.

(3) The cost is low for this center, but a lot of benefits for those served by the center. Have sufficient finances to do this. The center started with various financial support resources.

(4) The CR referred to the section of the P&P document outlining review of these renewals, where it states that information is required summarizing how the center had reached original goals and objectives, and if these goals and objectives changed over the period of operation. Suggest that representatives pull from the original document in order to address how the center addressed goals, such as starting a general education class on finance.

(5) The CR feels strongly that this center is a great resource for the university and with these updates can make specific recommendation about charter renewal. In reference to the checklist:

   (i) There is need letter of endorsement from dean.

   (ii) There was another academic unit on campus that collaboration was planned, they should provide an endorsement letter.

   (iii) The resubmission should summarize adequate faculty representation.

   (iv) The organizational chart also needs slide modifications for clarity.
The next step for this center renewal is for representatives to make changes to document. They can then send the document back to CR.

iii) **Green Biome Institute (3:00pm time certain w/ Brian Perry)**

1. The CR gave introductions, Brian Perry and Jason Singley also introduced themselves.
2. Brian summarized initial story about the starting of the Institute. The founders want to create institute to take a holistic approach to understanding plants. This institute represents an opportunity and mechanism to bring together experts from various fields to enable a multifaceted approach to this study. The research that will happen within the institute will be funded privately. However, funding is still being sought from other organizations.
3. The CR expressed that the creation of this institute is an incredible opportunity to do something that isn’t being done. It is clear that the intention to involve students in the process aligns well with the overall mission of the university.
4. The CR referred to the checklist for a few questions:
   a. Uncertainty still exists in the identification of advisory board members. It seems that the document does not yet specifically state that a faculty will be represented on the board.
   b. A question was posed about the number of directors for the institute and about the decision making between the director/associate director. These matters should be clarified in the resubmission of the document.
5. Discussion of funding: The initial funds are gift funds, then the rest are foundation funds through ORSP.
6. The CR posted a question about the workshops that the institute will host. It was clarified that faculty within the institute will give the workshops. The work proposed here is a new framework for work that is already kind of happening – already engaging with students in different ways, but the GBI will let faculty build capacity for training students, bringing in equipment, supplies, and make more efficient use of faculty time.
7. Jeffra highlighted that come summer of 2019 we could keep track of the data through Dryad.
(8) The CR suggest that the minor clarifications noted above are made to the document. After this, it can be resubmitted to the committee, who will then, barring no unforeseen problems, approve it and send it to ExCom.

5) Adjournment

   a) A note that Jeffra will be absent for the March 28th meeting and Katie Strom has agreed to lead the meeting in her absence.