




MEETING DATE: Thursday, November 9, 2023, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom
[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#)

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Michelle Gravier, Ram Kandasamy, Lan Wu, Chandra Khan, Wallis Adams, Susi Ferrarello

Guests: Mark Robinson, Jeanne Dittman

Absent: Linda Dobb, Alex Sumarsono, Shannon Webb

1. Approval of the agenda
 - a. Adams motioned/Wu seconded. Approved.
2. Approval of [10/26/23](#) minutes
 - a. Wu motioned/Adams seconded. Approved as amended.
3. [Land Acknowledgement - short version](#)
 - a. Read by Gravier.
4. **Reports**
 - a. Report of the Chair
 - i.  23-24 CR 5: RSG Call for Proposals
 1. Gravier: RSG Call approved by ExCom. It moved to an information item at the last Senate meeting and was approved.
 2. Gravier will meet with Mark from ORSP to set up RSG on InfoReady.
 - a. Khan: Releasing the call next Friday (11/17) will give faculty plenty of time. Gravier: Only minor updates are needed to InfoReady and the call should be ready by next Friday.
 3. Gravier: CR4 (Amending the appeal process for RSG decisions) was accepted as an information item at the last Senate meeting.
 4. Gravier: Because of updates to CR Policies and Procedures (amendment to University bylaws), this needs to be passed by the Senate as an order of business. This was on the agenda, but not voted on. It may not make it to University-wide election, but the changes may not be able to be formally made until next semester.
 - a. Khan: Can we request to get this done by end of December given increased funding relying on IACUC and IRB.
 - b. Dittman: Under the impression that IACUC and IRB were not operating under CR.
 - c. Gravier: That is happening, but not formalized.





-
- d. Khan: IACUC and IRB are not subcommittees of CR and it would be good to get this officially formalized.
 - e. Gravier: Chin-Newman may initiate an e-mail vote for this to move forward. Gravier will check.
 - f. Gravier: No formal charter/re-charter applications submitted. Jennifer Sherwood will submit a re-charter application for Center for Student Research by final CR meeting. Balvinder Kumar will submit Gallindo Creek charter to CR. Gravier will send these out once received along with suggestions for edits to previous applications.
 - b. Report of the Presidential Appointee
 - 1. Khan: Getting ready for end of year and start of year.
 - 2. Khan: Each semester, ORSP holds a PI meeting where PIs can talk about areas for improvement. Travel was a major pain point.
 - 3. Khan: The university has sent new guidelines on travel. ORSP has asked Accounts Payable to answer questions regarding faculty and student travel.
 - 4. Khan: A Google document has been started to collect questions/thoughts regarding travel.
 - 5. Khan: ORSP Advisory Committee has been seated. This committee will look at IDC return and will meet at the end of January.
 - 6. Khan provided details on how IDC is spent.
 - a. NIH grants negotiated at 47.5%. The PI has to spend and then we recover IDC. Effective recovery rate is 8-10% because many grants come with 0% IDC.
 - b. Cayuse, Hanover, consultants, and some ORSP staff are fully funded by IDC.
 - 7. Khan: IDC Procedure will be implemented. The ORSP Advisory Committee will figure out how to distribute. The Committee has the ability to make changes given this is a pilot program.
 - 8. Khan: Working with Evelyn Buchanan, we have revised definitions of "gift" vs. "grant". A document has been created to clarify these definitions and ORSP will use these definitions to determine what is a gift (to work with Advancement) or a grant (to work with ORSP). Any non-governmental entity will be put through this document to differentiate gift vs. grant.
 - a. Dittman: Any terms and conditions will also help differentiate gift vs. grant.



- b. Gravier: Do gifts need to be submitted on Cayuse? Khan: Cayuse helps ORSP team plan in case it is defined as a grant.
 - c. Dittman: There may be cases where Advancement is already working on something that may not go through Cayuse.
 - 9. Khan: C&I annual reports are still missing. Tina Avilla is following up.
 - 10. Khan: IRB will not be reviewing protocols over winter break and will resume in January.
 - 11. Khan: STEM-NET is a CSU-wide affinity group. The Director will be visiting CSUEB this semester.
 - 12. Gravier: Chair of COBRA and Chin-Newman want to know if IDC distribution will be available to all. Dittman/Khan: It is available on PeopleSoft CFS. Khan will go to CFO and obtain data that is easy to understand.
- c. Report of the Subcommittees
 - 1. None

5. Business

- a. Formation of a RSCA Support Grant (RSG) Committee to review 24-25 RSG Proposals
 - i. Prefer members with grant writing, and/or proposal reviewing experience to provide the expertise for thoughtful reviews of submitted proposals
 - 1. Gravier: A variety of people from Colleges/Disciplines would be good.
 - 2. Dobb, Wu, Ferrarello volunteered.
 - ii. Members of the RSG Subcommittee must: voluntarily agree not to submit a proposal for that year's RSCA Support Grant CFP
 - 1. Gravier: If CR members submit a proposal, they will not be able to attend that portion of the CR meeting where proposals are discussed.
 - iii.  Invitation to Review_24-25
 - 1. Khan: Expecting roughly 40 applications.
 - 2.  RSG Reviewer Survey.pdf
 - a. Khan: Give reviewers more time to review proposals. 2 to 2.5 weeks will give reviewers enough time.
 - b. Khan: Everything is finalized at the end of March and faculty can be notified by early April.
 - c. Wu: Why is the Department or Administrative Unit listed? Gravier: This question is included to get a wider range of reviewers.



-
- d. Wu: Are demographics necessary? Gravier: Some concerns that the review committee may not be representative. These questions are also optional.
 - i. Wu: The purpose of collecting demographics should be used to select review members. Gravier: Optional information cannot be used to select reviewers.
 - ii. Ferrarello: Demographics are important to have reviewers come from different backgrounds. It is essential to have a good representation of people.
 - iii. Khan: One option is to keep it the same as last year, which worked well.
 - e. Wu: Is this a double blind review process? Khan: No, reviewers will have access to CVs. This is challenging on a small campus when implementing an intramural grant program.
 - f. Gravier: Will add a specific prompt about areas of expertise and keywords.
 - 3. Ferrarello motioned, Wu seconded. Approved.
 - b. RSP Subcommittee [nomination reviews](#)
 - i. [23-24 CR 1](#)
 - 1. RSP Subcommittee consists of Dobb, Adams, Khan, Gravier.
 - 2. Gravier: One from CBE, CEAS, CSCI, and Lecturer are needed.
 - a. No one from CSCI volunteered. Webb from CR volunteered and filled out the form.
 - 3. Committee reviewed nominations and voted.
 - a. Kathryn Hayes, Shannon Webb, Ivan Fedorenko elected.

6. Discussion

- a. Wu: Will travel funding change given change in Provost? Khan: Memo sent to faculty is likely still in place.
- ## 7. Adjournment
- a. Adjourned at 2:08 pm.

Minutes submitted by Ram Kandasamy.