FMEETING DATE: Thursday, September 22, 2022, 12:45-2:30pm via Zoom
PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK

APPROVED MINUTES

Members Present: Jennifer Sherwood, Ram Kandasamy, Chandra Khan, Divya Sitaraman, Michelle Gravier, Lan Wu, Linda Dobb

Guests: Mark Robinson, Jeanne Dittman, Sarah Nielsen

Members Absent: Juleen Lam, Susi Ferrarello, Katrina Nicholas

Call to order: 1:17

Land Acknowledgement - short version

1. Approval of the agenda - motion and seconded. None abstained. Approved by unanimous consent.
2. Approval of 9/8/22 minutes - motion and seconded. No discussion, none abstained. Approved by unanimous consent.
3. Reports
    a. Report of the Chair
        i. Intellectual policy went through first reading of academic senate. There were questions about how open access policy applied to syllabi. Clear that there needs to be more education on campus about OA policy (doesn't apply to syllabi, only to publications). Second reading is Sept. 27th at next meeting.
            1. Linda Dobb noted the syllabi are declared as property of the faculty member. However, course outline need to be retained indefinitely in department. University has the right and obligation to do this according to CSU policy. This doesn't mean that others have the right to reuse them.
            2. Sarah Nielson asked if department chair shares a syllabus without faculty permission, is that a reason for grievance. Linda noted that it's best policy to ask faculty, but there may be situations where faculty is not available. Syllabi can be shared to ensure that there is consistency, others should know how the course was taught in the past. Sarah asked if this needs to go in IP policy, but Linda noted that it doesn't.
            3. Lan Wu shared that a lecturer used her syllabus basically word for word and just changed the instructor name. Linda responded that it needs to be made clear that the syllabus should be used for reference but each instructor is responsible for creating their own syllabus.

4. Sarah Nielson noted that sharing syllabi is in the new syllabus policy as a requirement.

ii. ExCom is in the process of seating the RSCA faculty and student assessment committee which was approved on 9/6 with a friendly amendment from Provost Jacobs to make an attempt to include members rom all colleges as they're available. During ExCom meeting on 9/20 Stephanie Zelesky from College of Science was approved to be on the committee.. Jennnifer Sherwood asked that CR members share opportunity with faculty who are not from CEAS, College of Science, Library to encourage them to join.

iii. Excom has seated the joint subcommittee on centers and institutes. Jason Daniels from Sustainability, Somak Paul from FDEC, Chandra Khan, Shubha Kathinath, and Jennifer. Met yesterday and began to modify the centers and institute policy. Next meeting scheduled for Oct 11th.

iv. CR subcommittee to promote open access (OA) policy is Jennifer Sherwood, Michelle Gravier, and Linda Dobb. First meeting scheduled for Sept. 29th.

v. Haven't yet called the meeting for subcommittee working on CR policies and procedures but will do so soon. Subcommittee members include Jennifer, Divvya, and Juleen Lam.

vi. Will be reviewing STEM institute charter renewal at next meeting.

b. Report of the Presidential Appointee - Chandra Khan

i. Chandra has been working with leadership including CFO for summer pay for grants. Just saw email that will go to faculty stating that payroll is working with state controller's office to make sure that payment is coming through soon. No set date for payment, but paperwork has been processed on campus side.

ii. Chandra has been meeting with cabinet level leadership including Advancement to figure out pot of money for faculty travelling to banned states, so work is beginning on that. Also trying to think about creating personnel positions for RSCA (ordering, hiring, etc) state-side since we don't have a foundation.

iii. Upcoming ORSP events: Tomorrow ORSP open house since it's national research administrator's day this weekend. RSCA awardees meeting over Zoom tomorrow to update on project progress, challenges, etc.

iv. Acknowledge support for student research on campus - CSR has ½ million set aside to engage students. Faculty leaders Ram Kandasamy and Jenny O will be implementing this. 130 students admitted already who will have access to travel money. Great to have this high-impact practice and thank the faculty for mentoring students.

1. Jennifer asked whether there will be another call for CSR students this year. Chandra and Ram said probably yes. Chandra said CR can bring comments to Ram about need for summer student funding.

v. Ram submitted Beckman fellowship application, passed first round and is in top 25. Chandra voiced need to go after large-sale grants like this and also international mentoring/research opportunities.

c. Report of the Subcommittees Chairs

i. IRB - Jennifer spoke with Vanessa, chair of IRB, who said that she is working with Jeanne regarding simplifying IRB process and educating faculty about IRB (e.g., need to submit even exempt studies so IRB can make that determination).

ii. IACUC - no update

4. Business

a. RSCA call

i. Subcommittee should streamline process, write call, send out call, and do reviews.

1. Linda asked why Libraries was not included in the subcommittee. Michelle clarified that Section 3.B.iii notes that "while not required, it is desirable for the RSCA Grant Subcommittee to also include a representative from the University Libraries"

b. RSCA seating of subcommittee - motion and seconded, none abstained, none opposed. Pass with unanimous consent.

i. Michelle asked whether all members of CR were not eligible to apply. Jeanne noted that for anyone who can approve who gets the awards (including ratification), that would be a conflict of interest. Linda mentioned that a CR member who applied can abstain. Anyone on the subcommittee can definitely not apply. Jeanne will double-check about policy and will report back.

ii. Lan Wu asked about timeline. Chandra noted that we want to leave time for faculty to write, so it needs to be done as soon as possible. Hopefully release in November, deadline around February/March for announcement of awards in April to allow time to plan for teaching release for the following year. Lan agreed to be on the subcommittee.

iii. Next step will be to send resolution to ExCom. Jennifer requested that CR members disseminate opportunity.

c. Motion to talk about elements/items they would like to see in the call this year in the RSCA call, seconded

i. Chandra - increasing amount to 10K, streamlining for release, materials, and students only. If release time is used, there is still a little funding left for students. This will cause success rate to come down since there will be fewer awards (15 awards). Half of the funding will come from Chancellor's office, and half from elsewhere. Subcommittee work will be more meaningful if not all applicants are awarded. Add FAQ to website as well as streamlining guidelines and template.

ii. Divya questioned need for facilities document. Chandra said we should mirror CSUPER. Divya suggested adding examples for less experienced/new faculty writers. Chandra mentioned that examples from prior years might be misleading if the call changes, although maybe there can be a disclaimer. She's willing to run workshops as she did last year to help with for instance, writing in plain language.

iii. Lan Wu asked how the proposals are rated. Jennifer mentioned that there is a rubric, some weren't funded but success was high, over 80 possibly up to 90%. Chandra noted that the rubric was shared with applicants last year. Linda noted that once the rubric is shared for an application cycle, it cannot be changed.

iv. Jennifer asked whether anyone had opinions about student funding through CR. Chandra noted that she thinks it should be up to the faculty. Michelle noted that it's different because CSR is tuition stipend. Divya noted that she has non-CSR students who she needs to support with grants, for example. She added that student support for federal work-study students can go a long way.

v. Divya asked if the call can be a range of funding, not just $10,000 since some faculty depend on this as a source of research funding. Chandra suggested the floor be $7000 and ceiling at $10,000 but not to have it be open for any amount because it's so much work to review submissions. She added that there will be other sources of intramural support coming in the future (IDC returning to PIs, colleges and provosts may have their own stimulation because a priority of academic affairs for strategic planning and future directions is building RSCA capacity on the campus).

vi. Jennifer added that it would be helpful to have the timeline posted somewhere and have it be consistent from year-to-year. Chandra added that Long Beach has a table like this (e.g., sabbatical table, CSR, RSCA, etc). Maybe have this be a project of CR Research Subcommittee and ORSP will host the table.

vii. Ram would like that more reviewers are recruited. He noted that he found it difficult to review applications from areas that he had no specific knowledge about, and it would be helpful for reviewers to also learn about what research was going on on campus. Lan asked it we can base number of reviewers on number of applications in prior rounds. Jennifer noted that there have been 45-60 applications in prior years, but that $10,000 might increase the number of applications. Lan suggested at least 9 reviewers so that there are about 5 applications per reviewer, but that there might need to be more from colleges that submit more applications. Ram suggested that prior awardees should be invited or mandated to reviewer pool, if they are not applying this year. Divya expressed concern that there is a pattern of the same people applying so there might not be a large pool. Chandra suggested that it be added to the call that awardees will automatically be added to the reviewer pool, or ask Dean to nominate two people from each college. Linda suggested that when CR asks ExCom for subcommittee members add for 2 people from each college to be on the review team.

viii. Lan Wu asked that people who are awarded a RSCA grant not be allowed to apply the following year and be required to review. Jeanne clarified that the Chancellor's office CBA RSCA funding precludes this (stipulates that all faculty are eligible). Chandra noted that CR would need to run separate calls for the separate pots of money if this was desired, which is a possibility but would be too much work at this point.

5. Discussion

   a. 22-23 CR Priorities- motion to table until next meeting, seconded. Jennifer added that she emailed new CFO to invite her to a meeting but hasn't yet received a response so is still working on this. Also invited Evelyn Buchanan, Vice President for Advancement and the President of the Foundation, to meetings and she's scheduled to attend November 10th to ask about funding to restricted states. Chandra said she meets with her regularly. Recognized Jeanne to add a comment. Jeanne added that there are two foundations; the Educational Foundation, and the CSU East Bay Foundation that receives grants, and contracts back to "state-side."

      ~~i. Future Directions - Streamlining RSCA processes, invitations to CR meetings & other?~~

      ~~ii. Code of Conduct?~~

6. Adjournment - motion and seconded, none abstained. Adjourned at 2:30.