Meeting Topics

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. COR Representatives
   - UCORP: Janet Foley
     - The chair had two big questions: how each campus deals with centers, ORUs (whether COR reviews, whether administration listens to COR, whether ORUs are ever sunsetted, how many there are etc.); and how each COR deals with its grants program (how much money we have, what rules we use, whether faculty have other funds for travels etc.).
     - Presentation on a policy that will be reviewed this year: will the system approve restrictions on nationalities/citizenship status of workers in some areas and will the system allow faculty to agree to non-publish in some cases. Currently UC cannot take some kinds of research funding such as funding that requires security clearance, because we don’t allow for restrictions on nationality (e.g. Iran, Libya etc.). Also if research can’t be published because of national security or trade secrets, UC faculty are not allowed to accept the funding. Some Vice Chancellors and others are asking that campuses reconsider/modify this policy. This discussion will be ongoing for quite a while this year.
     - The new Vice President for Research and Graduate Programs described a new push to involve undergraduate students in active research. It helps those students gain experience and it helps UC’s image.
   - Chemical and Lab Safety (CLSC): need representative
     - Delmar Larsen agreed to stay on as the CLSC representative.
   - Research Core Advisory Council (RCAC): need representative
     - Nick Curro agreed to serve as the COR representative on the RCAC.
   - Provost/Senate Chairs: Diana Davis
     - COR will partner with the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs on the COACHE survey. COR will send forward three names to serve on the COACHE Advisory Committee.
   - Academic Senate Representative Assembly: Diana Davis
     - No report – first meeting 10/27.
   - Academic Senate Executive Council: Diana Davis
     - The COR Faculty Morale/Effectiveness Survey was presented to the group. The survey had a response rate of 10-15%. There were some questions regarding the demographics of the data.
3. COR grants program:
   a. Brief introduction - Kimberly
   b. Obligation to review and conflict of interest
   c. We may solicit ad hoc reviewers from Committee on Committees
      i. The committee agreed that COC should be asked to appoint ad hoc reviewers as necessary during the review of 2017-18 large grant proposals.

4. Requests for Consultation and Comments
   a. Institute for Transportation Studies ORU Five-Year Review
      **ACTION:** COR members will submit comments via the ASIS whiteboard and then response will be drafted and submitted.
   b. Presidential Policy on International Activities
      **ACTION:** COR members will submit comments via the ASIS whiteboard and then response will be drafted and submitted.

New Business
1. Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) – COR members would like to invite Craig Allison to a future COR meeting to discuss GLP.
   a. **ACTION:** Post previous questions and responses.
2. 2012 COR Grant Report
   a. **ACTION:** Post to whiteboard.