

## LAUC-SD R&PD Monthly Meeting Minutes

21 February 2008, 1-2pm, AAL Seminar Room

Present: Ardys K, Dan S, SuHui H, Holly E, Victoria C, Kari L

Absent: Alice P, Katie S

---

Discussions were focused on the 6 proposals received regarding UC Statewide R&PD research proposals

All agreed that names of candidates be omitted in the minutes for confidentiality. Numbers would be used instead. We would give recommendations on the proposals for SuHui to bring back.

### Proposal #1

We found this project to be too ambitious for the timeline. Project results would be good as they would provide useful information on users. We agreed that it would be better to split it into two 1-year cycles. All were in favor with providing feedback to the candidate.

### Proposal #2 Non-union

Candidate has solid subject knowledge, including a doctoral degree in the field. Also s/he has a good track record of publishing and authoring. We found the methodology suggested effective, and all agreed that it should be funded.

### Proposal #3

We found the topic very interesting but we questioned how deliverable the results could be. We would like to support the research and fact-finding, but we would also like to get candidate's feedback with more concreteness and deliverability. And we would also like to point her/him to someplace to publish or deliver results, such as the Japanese American National Museum in LA. We thought it too excessive/expensive to rent a vehicle as there are shuttles readily available in the area where the research would be conducted. We said yes to this proposal.

### Proposal #4

This candidate requested release time in addition to substantial funding. It is an ambitious and interesting project. The topic is trendy, in the realm of freakonomics, with a new look at the economy. The results would be delivered through journal publication and conference presentation. We found the scope too broad, so s/he may want to narrow the focus, do a phased timeline. And perhaps even a 2-year proposal. S/he could re-submit the proposal, or revise it for next year. We felt the turnaround time would be too short to meet the criteria for a successful LAUC research project.

### Proposal #5

This research topic would fill a niche. But we questioned the development and maintenance of the product which is a database, and we also had questions about its ownership and sustainability. We had

issues with the candidate's workload, as s/he proposed doing tasks at her/his own time. We thought the idea was good, but we were lukewarm about the methodology.

#### Proposal #6

Project is based on doctoral research. We questioned why the candidate had not interacted or partnered with CDL as CDL has professionals doing usability testing. We questioned the request for funding presentation trips, as they should come from professional development funds and not from R&PD funds. We also had questions regarding the model of evaluating and methodology. We worried that s/he could be reinventing the wheel. We agreed not to support this proposal.