APPROVED MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Thursday, October 25, 2018

Present: Jeffra Bussmann, Reza Akhavian, Amy Furniss, Brian Gonsalves, Natalie Ingraham, Surendra Sarnikar, Jeff Seitz,

Guest: Rafael Hernandez

1. Approval of the agenda
   a. Reza motioned, Amy seconded

2. Approval of 10/11/18 minutes – Jeff motioned, Natalie seconded; Approved.

3. Reports
   a. Report of the Chair
      i. No new items
   b. Report of the Presidential appointee
      i. Forty new FSG proposals were submitted for the second call. One was disqualified, 38 were awarded. Roughly half of proposals were awarded to tenured faculty. Around $212,000 was awarded.
      ii. A new FSG call will likely go out towards the end of 2018, with an April due date.

4. Business
   a. Meeting with Rafael Hernandez re: pilot program (Time Certain 2:30PM)
      i. Dr. Hernandez gave some background on the genesis of the pilot program; it originated as a way to encourage the deans to provide assigned time for scholarly activity, and to provide some support for them to do so. He pointed out that the instructional load has, on aggregate, been lower than might be expected (i.e., lower than 9 units). The pilot program is a way to
meet some of the concerns about faculty workload and time for scholarly activity. The pilot program is a “pilot” because the Provost’s office acknowledges that there are some issues that will need to be worked out going forward, especially departments with 4-unit classes, and the FTES requirement for Spring semester. He noted that the program can never be an across-the-board reduction of teaching load, but must have certain priorities (such as supporting probationary faculty).

ii. Dr. Hernandez went through some of the concerns outlined by CR for the pilot program.

1. FTES as a Spring semester requirement. Initially it was Fall semester as well, and was 20 FTES. This was based on modeling the potential impact on SFR, as well as considering budgetary issues. The concern was the impact that too high an FTES threshold would reduce the number of courses that emphasize more intensive student-faculty interaction. The solution was to give the deans discretion on how to dole out the release time according to the specific teaching emphases of individual programs. One possibility going forward is to consider FTES in an aggregate way, either at the department or college level. More information will come based on observing how the 15 FTES restriction impacts the spring schedule.

2. Differentiation among programs (clinical, doctoral, lab-intensive, etc.). This might be something added going forward, perhaps based on identifying certain “high-impact” courses that might constitute an exception.

3. Questions about how FSG and the pilot program may complement one another, as well as differences between the two.

4. Future plans. Provost’s office will be collecting data on workload and make plans going forward based on what happened in the first year. This will likely be a pilot for only another year, and then the hope is to have it be an institutionalized program by Year 3. There
may be an evaluation of “productivity” as well, to see how the program impacts things like teaching and advising. Jeff asked if there might be a measure of how the program positively impacts research productivity specifically.

5. Possibility of “banking” of release units. This ends up being problematic. Annualizing the release time could solve most of the issues with 4-unit departments. Deans also have wide discretion on how to distribute release time.

b. Faculty Author Rights Retention Task Force draft documents: policy and FAQs
   i. Open Access policy and FAQ documents open for discussion
      1. Jeff questioned the language in Section II of the policy document in which faculty grant an “irrevocable” license to the university, and how this is different from transferring the copyright.
      2. Jeff asked whether and article could go into the PubMed repository, for example, along with the institutional repository. The policy document does not preclude adding the article to an institutional repository along with a sponsor-required repository.
      3. Jeff asked whether the policy should be an “opt-in” policy rather than an opt-out. Jeffra pointed out that the policy would carry less weight with publishers if it were opt-in, such that opt-out makes the policy more viable and effective. There was some discussion of what the paperwork burden would be for faculty who would like to routinely opt-out.
      4. Jeff asked a question about whether there is (or soon will be) an institutional repository that can handle the products of this policy.
      5. Jeff asked if there would be any negative repercussions for those faculty who consistently opt-out.
      6. Jeff suggested forwarding the policy to the University counsel for legal review.

5. Adjournment