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COUNCIL CHARGE
The Council’s charge is to promote an optimal research and educational environment, to manage Senate resources and provide advice in a manner that fosters quality and diversity of research and instructional programs, specifically:

1. Formulates a Senate position on all matters pertaining to research and teaching in the Division.
2. Determines policy pertaining to research funds allocated to the Council; administers and allocates its funds according to established policy; determines recipients of faculty research grants and recommends the recipients of major instructional improvement/assessment grants.
3. Advises the Chancellor and informs the Division of budgetary need for support of research and research travel and of the development, budgetary needs and management of instruction and information technology for instruction and research in the Division.
4. Makes recommendations on the regularly scheduled reviews of organized research units; reviews and makes recommendations on proposals regarding organized research units.
5. Acts for the Division in all matters of Library policy and administration and advises the Chancellor and the Division accordingly; reviews and makes recommendations concerning the print, electronic, space and growth needs of the Library; participates in administrative reviews of the Library and formulates recommendations to the Chancellor, the Division and the Council on Planning and Budget as appropriate.
6. Participates in reviews of units administering computing and instructional resources and makes recommendations accordingly; maintains liaison with the Office of Information Technology.
7. Maintains liaison with the University-wide Committees on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy, Library, and Research Policy; coordinates with the Council on Planning and Budget where annual budgetary and resource allocation issues are concerned.

COUNCIL FUNCTION
Generally the Committee on Faculty Grants met independently, while the Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources and the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures met jointly throughout the year. This practice of joint meetings was initiated at the time that the Senate reorganized because the council did not have enough members appointed to handle the workload, and attrition of committee members early in the Academic year was a problem for several years. As a result, we did not have enough members for all three standing committees. One way we attempted to alleviate this problem, was by staffing the Grants Committee with two committee members and additional ad hoc members enlisted by the Council Chair.

In 2005-06 the members of the CLIIR and CRPP worked on several faculty surveys that cut across the purview of the two committees. This allowed the two committees to continue to meet jointly. The current plan for 2006-07 is to have these two committees meet separately, with additional meetings of the entire council occurring as needed. With the number of members appointed to the CLIIR and CRPP for 2006-07, it is envisioned that the two committees can meet in this manner for the entire year.

In the past, the workload of the council has been burdened with frequent demands to review system-wide programs and other initiatives of various sorts. Although participation in these activities is important, we have found that the number of such requests and the short deadlines often associated with them has impeded our ability to perform our core function of formulating Senate positions on all matters pertaining to research and teaching in the Division. As a result, in
consultation with the Senate Chair, we have adopted the practice of, when necessary, passing on without review systemwide assignments not directly related to the core charge of the Council.

COUNCIL ACTIVITY
The Council met ten times in the academic year 2005-06 and reviewed matters forwarded from systemwide and well as local business dealing with research policy, instructional resources, scholarly communication, the Library, and information technology. The highlights of these activities are discussed below.

Systemwide Research Policy

UC Draft Guidelines on Non-Competitive Funding
The CRIR discussed and provided input to UCORP on the draft guidelines on non-competitive funding (earmarking of funds in the Federal budget) that were circulated to UCORP and UCPCB for comment. CRIR members agreed strongly with the principle that Federal extramural funding should be the result of free and fair competition using peer review, and supported UCORP in its pursuit of a policy for the growing practice of earmarking of federal funds. The draft plan included transparency to this process by requiring notification at each campus. However, CRIR members were concerned that the scope of the criteria proposed for determining whether a project can pursue non-competitive funding was too broad and CRIR suggested that the criteria be tightened.

Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)
UCORP responded to a June 2005 charge from the Academic Council to study and report on a concern raised by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) that campus Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) may have been applying federal guidelines in ways that hindered faculty research programs, or may have imposed changes to faculty research protocol. To accomplish its review of the IRB process on UC campuses UCORP developed a list of questions for each UCORP campus representative to ask the IRBs at their individual campuses, and of faculty on their campuses.

The research environment is changing and as with other campuses, compliance is a growth industry on this campus. Privacy and informed consent to use data are examples of some of the more common issues that the UCSB IRB deals with. There are only a few clinical trials at UCSB through partnering with other institutions or organizations. However, there were some concerns raised by campus faculty who were experiencing some difficulties with the process.

Review of Multi-Campus Research Units
CRIR reviewed the report on the 15-year review of a Multi-Campus Research Unit (MRU), the UC Committee on Latino Research. In this process CRIR does not review the MRU itself, but rather the review committee’s report, with an eye to its fairness and the appropriateness of its recommendations. Overall CRIR was impressed by the work done by the review committee.

Campus Research Policy

Draft Policies and procedures for Non-ORU Centers
CRIR reviewed a draft of the Policies and Procedures for Non-ORU Centers that was drafted by the campus policy workgroup. CRIR’s comments on the proposed policy was that it did not define the distinction between a center and an ORU, it did not outline the types of centers that are in existence now, and it does not specify how the policies and procedures would apply to centers that are already in existence. CRIR members felt that subsequent drafts of the document should specify to whom the centers would report.

Draft Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, or Discontinuance of a Graduate or Undergraduate Program Leading to a Degree or Certificate
The Campus Policy Workgroup also requested that CRIR review the draft Policy on Transfer, Consolidation, or Discontinuance of a Graduate or Undergraduate Program Leading to a Degree.
or Certificate. The CRIR gave initial input to the policy committee that is revising the 1970s protocol on this matter. The policy workgroup will refined the draft and formally submit for Senate comment in the near future.

Proposals for New Graduate Programs and Research Initiatives
CRIR did not receive any proposals for new graduate programs or research initiatives at UCSB for evaluation in 2005-06. As is noted below, a recurrent problem with the proposals that we have reviewed in the past is a lack of any mechanism to insure long-term Library funding sufficient to guarantee the success of the program or initiative. In future proposals, the CRIR will expect to see sufficient funds allocated to maintain the Library collections needed for the program, in addition to the one time funds that are necessary the initial collection. CRIR will also recommend that no subscriptions be initiated unless and until a permanent budget for a program collection is available.

Reviews of Campus Centers and ORUs
The Center for Chicano Studies underwent a Program Review in 2005. As with systemwide MRUs, the CRIR charge is to assess whether the review process was followed conscientiously. We found the review to be useful, but note that there were disagreements over the factual basis for some statements such as those that the Center’s Director and its Executive Committee argue are untrue.

Draft Academic Plan
The CRIR reviewed the draft Academic Plan and provided its comments to Senate Chair Yuen. Some of the key points made are: (1) there is no clear justification for the proposed growth rate (1% per year) and the discussion on the constraints to growth needs to be more extensive across campus; (2) faculty housing is likely to be a major issue and needs to be taken into consideration more explicitly even in the Academic Plan; (3) overall staffing is low and there is a need to recognize that the growth in student numbers should come with a reasonable proportional growth in staffing; (4) instructional and common research resources such as the library are already under funded, and the Academic Plan seems to overlook the role of the infrastructure in achieving the vision outlined in the draft Academic Plan.

Library

Library Survey
To assist us in formulating Senate recommendations concerning the operation of the UCSB library, the CRIR developed an online survey that members of the campus community were asked to respond to. The goal of the survey was to obtain information that would help the CRIR articulate faculty views on how the Library should prioritize its expenditures on print and electronic collections, as well as the other services needed for teaching and research. The council is currently analyzing the results of the survey. These data serve as a basis for formulating recommendations that will be forwarded to the Senate for approval and to campus administrators for implementation.

Library Budget and Unfunded Mandates
The budget memo that was submitted to the EVC by the Library indicates that, in response to its budgetary problems, the Library will continue to hold the line on the purchase of new serials, reduce its monograph purchases, and permanently eliminating several FTE that were held vacant the past year. Erosion of the library budget is a serious problem has long-term negatives impacts on research and teaching. It poses problems not only for the adequacy of our collections but also for library services (e.g., desk hours, computer programming to deliver electronic resources, subject specialized librarians). These budgetary issues are a serious campus concern that has elicited faculty requests to the CRIR for the exploration of remedial actions. The formulation of recommendations regarding the library budget will be integrated into our library survey report.
Proposals for new programs have without exception expected the Library to function with "unfunded mandates", resulting either in insufficient resources for new programs or loss of resources from existing programs. The CRIR is deeply concerned that this policy will undermine UCSB’s ability to maintain and improve its standing in the world of Universities. In academic year 2004-05 the CRIR forwarded a letter to the Chair of Santa Barbara Division urging that “There needs to be more direct and explicit coordination among the deans, the EVC and the University Librarian to make an analysis of the resource gaps and needs, and where needed, to propose a mix of one-time (for retrospective monographs and journal back files) and ongoing funds (for scholarly periodicals, databases, and primary resources such as archival collections or distinctive software).”

The CRIR recommends that a clear policy for financing the library needs of new programs be developed that avoids the deleterious effects of such unfunded mandates. Such a policy is absolutely necessary in a world of disproportionately increasing costs of library resources.

Scholarly Communication
Even though there is a separate committee for this area, the issues are so wide-ranging and complex that they need as broad awareness and support as possible. There are several sub-topics including faculty retention of copyrights, support (whether policy or technical) for new forms of scholarly communication, ways to limit price increases on large publisher packages (e.g., Elsevier). See more at http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/scholarly/

Library Building
Two major risks loom for the Library building in the short run: the voter bond could fail in November 2006; and even if it passes, the building could be seriously delayed (and thus the scope of work reduced due to intervening inflation, overlap with other costly projects, contractor changes, etc.) because UCOP has told UCSB to submit its Five-Year Plan with a much lower ceiling for this coming year. That lower ceiling was because OP already gave UCSB money to cover cost overruns in the new ESSB. The Chancellor’s cover memo to UCOP with the Library’s proposed 5-Year plan submitted two versions, the reduced one and one that shows the library building staying on schedule. The Chancellor’s cover letter indicated the campus’ support for the latter. The CRIR will consult with Senate Council on Budget and Planning concerning financial issues relevant to the Library building.

Growth of Faculty “e-science” and Needs for Archiving of Scientific and Similar Research Data
The Library started exploring this topic a couple of years ago with its “Informatics” grant from the Mellon Foundation. It has become a major concern throughout the country and most of the big granting agencies (NSF, NASA, and NIH) have emerging forms of requirements that faculty archive their data in some way. This is not referring to the requirement to deposit grant-related publications in open access repositories, which is related but not the same issue. The Library and the campus’ Office of Research need to work together to develop consultation and technical support for faculty as they are preparing grants: how to respond, what the archiving options are, roles of the campus/scholarly society/consortium, difference between true reliable archiving and just a back-up disk in the department office, and so on.

Changes in the Senate Structure
The changes in the Senate structure have not been as beneficial to Library issues and policies, despite everyone’s best intentions at the time that the reorganization was planned. It was thought that Library issues would get better integrated into all of the councils (CPB, GC, UGC, CRIR) but it has not been the case overall. The Library has to compete as a main item on CRIR’s agenda with many other issues that are brought up by systemwide as well as local entities. CPB has not interfaced with CRIR on the Library budget issues and the Library has not been on the agenda of other Senate Councils as was planned. Major policy issues that affect the ability of the entire campus to do teaching and research (e.g., library budget to buy books and databases) do not come to the fore effectively.
Information Technology

There were no specific initiatives that dealt with information technology during the 2005-06 academic year; however, there was some overlap with instructional resources issues in the Instructional Resources Survey that was conducted by CRIR. The CRIR closely monitored the search for a campus CIO through the participation of the CRIR chair in the Information Technology Planning Group.

Instructional Resources

Last fall the Academic Senate Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR) asked for your participation in a web survey about your instructional resources needs. The CRIR is in the process of finalizing the report and recommendations it has formulated based upon this survey.

Other CRIR Business

CRIR also dealt with matters of lesser scope, including: (a) Received the Workload Implementation Report for discussion, and appointment of a CRIR member to a campus workgroup to formulate implementation of recommendations; (b) Appointment of a campus representative for the 2005-06 systemwide ITTP Committee meetings; (c) Discussion of Ted Bergstrom’s open letter to all university provosts and presidents as background for the scholarly communication questions presented in the Library survey; (d) Updates from Chair Walker on the campus Academic Technology Planning Group (ATPG); (e) Reviewed and commented on the Systemwide UCPB Report "Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California"; (f) Received a number of updates from Vice Chancellor for Research Michael Witherell on current Office of Research topics.

Committee on Faculty Grants

Summary of Faculty Research and Travel Grants

Travel grants awarded during the 2005-06 fiscal year totaled $225,310. A total of $473,165 was awarded for the research grant programs in the spring of 2006 for the 2006-07 year. The funds for these awards are made available to grant recipients at the start of the 2006-07 fiscal year. The total is summarized by field below, and is further detailed in the attached graphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>No. of Requests</th>
<th>No. of Awards</th>
<th>% Budget Awarded</th>
<th>Average Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$20,363</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Arts</td>
<td>$255,235</td>
<td>$164,056</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$4,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Life/Phys Sci/Bren/Engineering</td>
<td>$266,021</td>
<td>$193,817</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$5,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>$192,781</td>
<td>$102,792</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$3,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$734,400</td>
<td>$473,165</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$4,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Grants Committee Participation in the Instructional Development Grant Proposal Reviews

The Office of Instructional Development issued calls for proposals for the Instructional Improvement Grant (IIG) program, and the Teaching Assistant Instructional Grant (TIAG) program. The Faculty Grants Committee reviewed the applications for both programs. In 2005-2006, 31 proposals were submitted for the IIG program, and 21 of those received at least partial funding. Award amounts ranged from $2,000.00 to $13,000.00. Each IIG proposal was evaluated by two committee members, and was subsequently discussed by the entire committee. The Committee provided comments for applicants on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed projects, and provided suggestions to the Office of Instructional Development on ways in which the program could be strengthened. Though final award and funding decisions were made by the Office of Academic Programs, the decisions generally followed the recommendations made by the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Members, 2005-06
Gerardo Aldana, Chicano and Chicana Studies
Kevin Almeroth, Computer Science
Anne Barnhart, Associate Librarian, Library Representative
Edwina Barvosa-Carter, Chicano and Chicana Studies
Steven Buratto, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Joao Camilo Dos Santos, Spanish and Portugues
Shivkumar Chandrasekaran, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Dana Driskel, Film Studies, Non-Senate Academic Representative
Roger Ingham, Speech and Hearing Sciences
William Kaska, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Arturo Keller Bren School, Vice Chair, Representative to UCORP
Leroy Laverman, College of Creative Studies
Youli Li, Materials Research Laboratory, Professional Researcher Representative
Fernando Lopez-Alves, Sociology
George Michaels, Executive Director of Instructional Development, Consultant
Sarah Pritchard, UC Librarian, Ex-Officio
Geoffrey Raymond, Sociology
David Siegel, Geography
Ronald Tobin, Associate VC for Academic Programs, Ex-Officio
Phillip Walker, Anthropology, Council Chair, Representative to UCOL
Michael Witherell, Vice Chancellor for Research, Ex-Officio
Brian Awe, AS Representative
Lamia Youseff, GSA Representative