To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Annual Report 2009-2010

COUNCIL CHARGE
The Council’s charge is to promote an optimal research and educational environment, 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
Two of the standing committees of the Council, the Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources (CLIIR) and the Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP), mostly met separately throughout the year, but also met jointly once per quarter. The Committee on Faculty Grants meets independent of the two other standing committees as its purpose relates only to the grants administered by the Academic Senate and the Office of Instructional Consultation.

CRIR activities over 2009-2010 are summarized below.
Review of Systemwide UC Issues

UC Commission on the Future
CRIR reviewed an initial outline of issues from the UC Commission on the Future Working Group on UC Research Strategies. A memo providing comments on the process at this stage was included along with other Senate input in correspondence to the systemwide Academic Council.

Upon receiving the subsequent Report on the Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future, CRIR reviewed recommendations from four Working Groups: Size and Shape, Funding Strategies, Education and Curriculum, Research Strategies. Following is a summary of CRIR’s response to the more significant recommendations made by the Working Groups. A detailed response from CRIR and other Senate committees was included in the UCSB Senate response to the systemwide Senate leadership.

Size and Shape Working Group Recommendations
CRIR generally agreed with the recommendation that increasing the number of non-resident students will increase overall quality and bring in additional funds to be spent for all students. Geographic diversity is a must for an internationally renowned research university.

Departments across all campuses should be encouraged to work together to come up with a core curriculum that meets the transfer requirements of all of the schools.

Education and Curriculum Working Group Recommendations
All CRIR members strongly disagreed with a recommendation to allow tuition to be locked in so that a student can finish in three years. There is no pedagogical justification for a 3 year degree program, and it is unclear how this will "improve or maintain undergraduate experience.”

While CRIR agreed that UC needs to pay more attention to online instruction, members think that a systemwide initiative to develop UC-wide online offerings is not the best way to approach this issue. It would be far more efficient and cost effective to make an institutional commitment to aggressively support local (individual campus) experiments and pilot projects in online instruction, tailored to the needs and strengths of each campus.

Funding Strategies Working Group Recommendations
Members took issue with the argument that research projects should be assessed on the basis of full coverage of IDC. The UC should look at all disciplines as a whole and not expect every program in every discipline to cover all of their costs. We underscore the importance of UC discussing this issue with non-federal institutions, particularly private foundations, before any decisions are made.

CRIR favored the idea of a dedicated negotiating team to work with the Federal government in establishing overhead rates for fully recovering research costs. Federal agencies are requiring the research institutions to cover more of the research costs, and reporting on stimulus funds and the lab facilities requirements are increasing administrative costs. Better cooperation across campuses seems likely to pay off well in UC’s interactions with federal agencies.

Tuition uniformity across campuses is one of the reasons campuses other than UCB or UCLA had a chance to establish their reputation and, in some cases, reach a remarkable international
ranking. Implementing differential tuition would jeopardize the effort and achievements of campuses without clear evidence of helping UC's budgetary challenges.

Research Strategies Working Group Recommendations
Increased transparency of the flow of indirect cost recovery (IDC) funds would help UC researchers to understand the need for the increase in cost recovery from sponsors.

One recommendation in this category suggested that "UC should (1) prioritize internal funds to support world-class research in disciplines where extramural funding options are limited; (2) remove any obstacles to the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects to capture new funding streams; and (3) augment and enhance opportunities for graduate student research and support wherever possible." CRIR agreed with the concept behind this recommendation; falling state support has particularly impacted researchers with limited extramural funding. However, the specific wording of the recommendation raised concern. It is unwise to "prioritize" our research based on external factors such as extramural funding. Implementation of this recommendation, as it was worded, implies directing internal funds first to areas that cannot attract extramural funding and leave aside the start-up and other support that has been crucial to build excellence in areas that do attract extramural funding. If we change our research priorities in response to a crisis, we could quickly lose excellence in some fields, but only slowly gain excellence in other fields.

The recommendation would be acceptable if, instead of changing priorities, the emphasis were on striving to maintain excellence across UC's broad spectrum of research, including areas that are particularly threatened by failure of state funding. As funds become available, it should be directed to those areas that have less funding. Sources of funding would need to be identified to make this recommendation implementable. It would be best to leave these decisions to the campuses and UCOP should provide funds to the campuses to support these activities. The current MRPI establishment process was not ideal, and some good MRUs were disestablished without due process. These decisions should not be top down from the administration, but rather made in consultation with the Academic Senate and its corresponding committees (e.g. UCORP and the campus research councils/committees).

CRIR absolutely agreed that risk management practices need to be streamlined to "increase the efficiency of the research enterprise, making optimal use of faculty researchers and administrative staff support". Faculty should not be spending as much as 42% of their time on administrative activities. But before adding staff support - an additional expense - streamlining the process and making risk management services accountable to the local campuses should be the first actions. Reviewing research policies to prevent additional restrictions at the department or college level, as well as the campus level, would reduce the complexity of the process.

We found it surprising that there was no mention of possible actions to increase endowments and alumni donations under funding strategies.

Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force
CLIRR reviewed the UC Report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force and members agreed that there is no evidence that more statistical analysis will convince the public, or the legislature, of the efficacy and quality of education at UC. The report made it abundantly clear, based on the many assessment programs surveyed, that systematic and standardized assessments are not effective.
Report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency

The report “Remote and Online Instruction at the University of California,” presenting the findings and recommendations of the systemwide Academic Senate’s Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency, was reviewed by CRIR. There is strong motivation within the UC system to change the way the UC produces cost saving measures, and many ideas are being generated in this regard. Assuming the report was designed to address these areas, the putative cost savings produced through the ideas in the report were entirely unclear [or "remain unaddressed"]. In keeping with the UC mission on instructional excellence, it would be useful to direct the focus on online instruction toward the improvement of student experience, rather than to cut costs.

UC Planning and Budget’s “Choices” Report

CRIR reviewed the above-referenced report and supported the overall message, though recognized that its proposals were not specific or binding. It was noted that the section on online instruction appeared to overstate the case against such developments. While CRIR faculty oppose any attempts to replace faculty with online courses, they support developing such materials as a supplement to classroom instruction.

CRIR Review of the Draft Revised UC Compendium

CRIR reviewed the Draft Revised UC Compendium and while many of the revisions reflected updated processes there were a few areas of concern to CRIR members including “Five Year Perspectives” and the “MRU/MRPI Process” which are discussed below.

“Five Year Perspectives” refers to the process that collects from campuses plans for degree programs and ORUs in the next five years and comments on these plans from system-wide bodies including the Academic Senate and the Provost, and then the submission of the Five-Year Perspectives to CPEC (California Postsecondary Education Commission). While recognizing the merits of oversight and more systematic evaluations, there is a worry that the proposed oversight by CPEC will impose unnecessary and in some cases potentially damaging restrictions to the review process. Adding a set of governing bylaws may be helpful in some instances, but there has to be room in the system for less developed programs as they progress through any given five-year planning process.

CRIR was disturbed by the lack of reference in the MRU establishment/ disestablishment section of the draft compendium to the MRPI competition, with which MRUs are apparently now deeply entwined. In the case of the MRUs, the document makes no mention of MRPIs, and consequently their status is unclear. This is important, since mostly or only MRPIs are under consideration and it is not clear that they should have a long life. The rules of establishment, review and disestablishment will be quite different for the MRPIs. As indicated in the TF Report, a lot of the “rules” in the Compendium were broken by the administration when the MRPI competition has conducted, with a de facto disestablishment (through the withdrawal of funding) of many of the older MRUs without any review or approval from the Academic Senate. It puts into question the usefulness of the Compendium, if we are not going to follow it when it is most needed.

An important issue that arose with the MRU competition two years ago is one of long term funding for MRUs. The argument for re-competing existing MRUs was that while the MRUs may be doing good research, we should instead decide if we could be doing better research with the same money. As a result of the competition, some MRUs did not have their funding renewed. If they are still reliant on internal funds, then this defunding could result in disestablishment. OP
argues that defunding is not the same as disestablishment and that MRUs are expected to obtain extramural support rather than rely permanently on internal funds. This is implied in the old compendium, though not explicit.

Given all these factors, we think it makes sense to explicitly and clearly specify the temporal extent of internal funding plans when an MRU (or MRPI) is established. Furthermore, a term limit on internal funding should be made explicit at the beginning rather than imposed at a later date.

The current processes on establishment, review and disestablishment of MRUs are clearly defined, rather bureaucratic, but precise on the various steps. What is lacking is agreement on the criteria that will be considered when establishing a new MRU, or MRPI: innovative idea, number of campuses participating, potential for external funding, potential for overlap with existing MRU or ORUs, etc. While the criteria should ensure comparability, it should not be inflexible criteria, though certainly some guidance would be useful. The same kind of guidance is needed for 5-year reviews (e.g., what is needed to "pass"?). It is also unclear who exactly the reviewers are of the ORUs and MRUs, and how specialists are selected for evaluation purposes.

**UC Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) White Paper on the Value of UC as a Graduate Research Institution**

CRIR reviewed the White Paper on the Value of UC as a Graduate Research Institution written by the systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and its appendix which lists the UC research projects that have had an impact on graduate student research. CRIR’s response to the white paper noted that the projects listed for UCSB were primarily in the sciences, and projects from the humanities and arts that have contributed significantly to the campus research portfolio were not included. Furthermore, the choices of projects representing research in the Humanities and Fine Arts and the Social Sciences did not do so particularly well. A number of other HFA or Social Science research projects that could be considered for the list were recommended by CRIR.

**Highlights of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCROP) Business**

UCROP conducted a review of the return of collected indirect costs (IDC) to campuses, primarily to see how IDC is allocated, and to consider the extent to which the cost returns cover the actual overhead costs. UCROP is also reviewing the situations and considering the impacts of agency contracts that do not allow indirect costs to be charged to.

UCROP members had discussions related to the UC Commission on the Future to provide clarity on what the objectives were, and how UCROP could most effectively use the process to increase support for research.

There were discussions of the budget impact on research across UC and at individual campuses, e.g. potential inequities in the implementation of the Furlough Exchange Program among researchers without external funding.

The proposed changes in the patent assignment agreement signed by UC employees were reviewed.

UCROP discussed the revised draft Compendium and, in particular, issues related to Senate input on MRU and MRPI funding decisions.
The impact on research from the recent management changes at LLNL and LANL was considered.

UCORP evaluated the process used for past academic reviews, i.e., QB3 and DANR, and called for using more quantitative analysis and metrics in future reviews.

**Review of Campus Issues**

**Proposals for New Programs and Degrees**

**Instructional Support and Library Resources**
CRIR’s review of proposals for new programs or degrees includes an evaluation of the need for additional instructional support services as part of the cost calculation. New programs could potentially have significant startup costs associated with the development of a whole new curriculum, possibly new course content delivery mechanisms. These costs could also include additional load on existing physical facilities with attendant increased wear and tear on the facilities and equipment, and the need for new staff [or the additional burden on staff] to support the faculty in those venues. An often overlooked cost is that imposed on library resources, including additional collection and journal expenditures. Historically proposals for new academic programs have almost 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.

Currently the guidelines for proposals for degree programs require that proposals specify the Library resources that will be needed for the new program, and require that the proposal indicate the source for the funds. Prior to submitting a proposal, the initiators should consult with the Library on what new resources are needed, and what the costs will be for startup and on-going sustainability.

**Proposal from the Department of Statistics and Applied Probability requesting the establishment of a BS degree in Actuarial Science, and a Proposal for an M.S. in Actuarial Science at UCSB**
Committee members endorsed the proposals for a B.S. and an M.S. in Actuarial Science. CRIR found the proposals to be thorough and well thought out, and they agreed that both would be excellent programs.

**Proposal for a Center for Bioengineering**
While they had confidence in the intellectual strength of this proposed center and agree with it in principle, members raised some questions regarding commitments for on-going funding and space. There were also concerns about the reporting structure being unwieldy. These concerns were outlined in a memo from CRIR and the originators of the proposal satisfactorily addressed these concerns in a memo response.

**Proposal for a Center for Scientific Computing within the California Nano Systems Institute and Materials Research Laboratory**
The CRPP provided a favorable review of this proposal and endorsed it. The few comments offered on this proposal were that the level of staffing seemed to be on the low side, and that there should be some mechanism for bringing in other groups if there is extra capacity, for example, through the recharge process.
Center for Science and Engineering Partnerships (CSEP)
CRIR reviewed this proposal and after receiving responses to a few questions on the proposal, endorsed it.

Proposal to establish Earth Research Institute and Disestablish the Institute for Crustal Studies and the Institute for Computational Earth System Science
CRIR reviewed and endorsed this proposal with several favorable comments.

Procedure for Nominating Candidates
CRPP reviewed the procedure for nominating candidates for the position of Director of the Marine Science Institute as outlined in an October 26, 2009 memo from VCR Michael Witherell to Senate Chair Joel Michaelsen.

Review of Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs)
CRIR received a few requests to review proposed MOUs for partnerships with other research entities. CRIR recommended that MOUs be first reviewed by the UCSB Office of Research and their legal staff prior to a review by CRIR as any initial comments that CRIR may have prior to OR’s review may not be appropriate.

Proposal to Recharge for OISS Services
CRIR learned of a pending proposal from the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) to recharge departments a fee for securing immigration status and employment authorizations for international scholars. CRIR asked that a delay in the implementation of the proposed charges be delayed until several issues could be considered, including whether these services are already factored in the overhead that is charged to agencies. The proposal was withdrawn and it is not known if there are plans to distribute this proposal for review in the future.

Other CRIR Business
CRIR also dealt with matters of lesser scope, including: Updates from Jim Frew on the meetings of the Systemwide Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, updates from Arturo Keller on the meetings of the UCSB Executive Council, regular updates from Vice Chancellor for Research Michael Witherell on current Office of Research topics, and reports on the business conducted at the meetings of the systemwide University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) were regularly given at CRPP meetings by David Stuart, UCSB representative. Reports on business conducted by the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) were regularly given by Martin Raubal, UCSB representative to the committee.

UC Librarian Brenda Johnson gave frequent updates on the Library budget, staffing, building plans, collections and journal pricing. The UC Librarian left her position mid year and one of the acting Librarians, Sherry DeDecker, attended the remaining CLIIR meetings in her stead. CLIIR Library Representative Brian Mathews (Assistant University Librarian, Outreach & Academic Services) also attended CLIIR meetings and gave regular updates on space design concepts, and the redesign of the Library web site.

The members of the CRPP reviewed the Proposed Policy on University Managed Vehicles Used Off-Road and In Mexico and found the policy to be reasonable. CRPP recommended that would this training to be made available at the beginning and the end of the quarter so that it is convenient for all faculty when they need it.
CRIR review the UCSB Draft Policy on General Laboratory Safety Training issued on June 21, 2010 by the UCSB Environmental Health and Safety Department, and suggested some clarifications.

Meredith Murr, Director of Research Development within the Office of Research, attended a CRIR meeting for a discussion that primarily addressed the research development support needed by the humanities faculty.

CRIR reviewed the Course Buy-Out Policies developed by the Deans in the Social Sciences Division and the College of Engineering.

CLIIR received several reports on campus instructional resources budgets and the availability of staff and resources in that area from CLIIR Consultant George Michaels of the Office of Instructional Development.

**Pending Issues for CRIR in 2010-2011**

The Proposal for a Terabit Optical Ethernet Center requires a review by the appropriate Academic Senate committees. CRIR asked that the review of the proposal be postponed until Fall 2010 when committee members are back on campus and can meet to discuss the proposal. At the time of the review it will be important for CRIR to review the budget for the Center, and the sources for the additional resources that will be required for the Center. We will also be interested in seeing an endorsement from VCR Mike Witherell for this Center and the additional resources that it requires.

**Committee on Faculty Grants**

**Summary of Faculty Research Grants Awarded Spring 2009**

Research grants awarded for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, funded with 2009-2010 funds totaled $238,125. These decisions were made in May of 2009 (in Fiscal Year 2008-09). The funds for these awards were made available to grant recipients for the 2009-2010 fiscal year. The total awarded is summarized by division below.

**FISCAL YEAR Funded 2009-2010 Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
<th>Number of Proposals</th>
<th>Number Awarded</th>
<th>Average Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$68,576</td>
<td>$20,662</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Arts</td>
<td>$201,326</td>
<td>$52,410</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$5,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Life/Phys Sci</td>
<td>$214,094</td>
<td>$95,103</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$6,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>$154,696</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$5,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$652,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>$238,125</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,153</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Faculty Research Grants Awarded Spring 2010

Research grants awarded for the 2010-2011 fiscal year, funded with 2010-2011 funds totaled $401,568. These decisions were made in May of 2010 (in Fiscal Year 2009-2010). The total awarded is summarized by division below.

FISCAL YEAR Funded 2010-2011 Awards
Research Amounts Awarded by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
<th>% of Total Funds</th>
<th>Number of Proposals</th>
<th>Number Awarded</th>
<th>Average Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$78,701</td>
<td>$32,310</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$9,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Arts</td>
<td>$227,717</td>
<td>$117,491</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$6,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Life/Phys Sci</td>
<td>$255,484</td>
<td>$121,639</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$9,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>$206,373</td>
<td>$111,607</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$7,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$17,021</td>
<td>$17,021</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>$2,481</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$787,777</strong></td>
<td><strong>$401,568</strong></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75</td>
<td><strong>$2,481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Members, 2009-2010
Arturo A. Keller           Bren School   Chair of CRIR and of CRPP
Laurie J. Monahan         History of Art and Architecture Council Vice Chair, Chair of CLIIR, Grants Committee
Andrew V. Carter          Statistics
Brad Eden                 Library Consultant Librarian
Brenda Johnson            UC Librarian, UCSB Library Ex Officio
Brian Mathews             Library Non-Senate Library Rep
Cynthia S. Kaplan         Political Science
David D. Stuart           Physics       UCORP Rep
Douglas A. Thrower        MCDB
George Michaels           Instructional Development Consultant,
James E. Frew              Bren School   Chair of CLIIR and UCOLASC Rep
Jean-Pierre Fouque        Statistics
Jianwen Su                 Computer Science
John D. Damuth            EEMB         Non-Senate Academic Rep
John W. Du Bois           Linguistics
Libe Washburn             Geography
Marguerite B. Nash        Political Science Non-Senate Academic Rep
Martin M. Raubal          Geography     UCCC Rep
Mike Witherell            VC Research, Physics Ex Officio
Patricia P. Fumerton      English
Ron Tobin                 AVC Academic Programs, French & Italian Ex Officio
Tamara Affifi             Communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol N. Dixon</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer S. Earl</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Jevbratt</td>
<td>Department of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Kyratzis</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley M. Parsons</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin E. Reese</td>
<td>NRI/Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefania Tutino</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>