To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Annual Report 2010-2011

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 in the following ways:

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 (ORUs); reviews and makes recommendations on proposals regarding ORUs.
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), met separately throughout the year, and met jointly at least 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.
CRIR activities over 2010-2011 are summarized below.

**Review of Systemwide UC Issues**

**UCOP Project Plan: UC Online Education**

The review of the UCOP “Project Plan: UC Online Education (UCOE)” in March 2011 offered an occasion for the CRIR to express concerns and reaffirm aspects of the project endorsed by the Academic Council, which were in turn based on the recommendations by the UC Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). The following paragraphs are abridged comments from CRIR’s written evaluation of the UCOL.

CRIR recognizes the potential of the UCOE initiative, allowing for the development of innovative classes and pedagogical strategies in new learning environments; enhancing the portability of courses across UC campuses; developing a centrally-maintained, system-wide learning management platform; creating a cross-campus student information system that facilitates cross-campus enrollment; the possibility of a single sign-on system that works across the UC; the opportunity to provide greater access to courses for UC students. CRIR is supportive of such measures and hopes that UCOP will provide assurances that the monies secured for the UCOE will in part be devoted to these essential areas.

At the same time, the Council is very concerned about the changes to UCOE that were announced after the original concept and pilot proposal was endorsed by the Academic Senate. Several new elements were introduced, some that appear linked to funding for the project and some that appear to be embedded in the operation and implementation of the project’s original design. Also of great concern was the failure in the UCOE document to address research on persistence and learning among the named target audiences, which consistently demonstrates significant problems in implementation and outcomes for online learning among these audiences.

CRIR raised a number of procedural issues with regards to the UCOE. Of greatest concern was UCOP’s unilateral changes to the original conditions of the online initiative. These departed in significant ways from the original intent to provide online courses that will be largely or wholly online and designed for UC undergraduates exclusively as regular academic year or summer session courses. UCOP adopted a plan in which on-line courses would almost exclusively be marketed to non-UC students as a revenue-generating tool. UCOP took this action without the approval or endorsement of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. The resultant shift in emphasis is of tremendous concern since the online courses being developed were designed to address some of the most impacted classes on UC campuses and UCOP failed to discuss how the availability of these foundational courses will be prioritized for both UC and non-UC students.

CRIR’s response to the UCOE proposal emphatically recommended that UC students be given priority for these courses as originally proposed in the call for participation (UCOP to EVC and Provosts, October 29, 2010).

The Council noted no plan for cross-registration for students taking courses across campuses and there appear to be no resources or plans that indicate the development or implementation
of new systems essential for conferring course credit at individual campuses, each possessing its own registrar and crediting system.

CRIR raised the following conceptual concerns with regard to UCOP’s revised UCOE plan, pointing to existing research on online learning and pedagogy:

- The draft prospectus of March 30, 2010 makes erroneous assumptions about instructional design and the intersections between instructors’ expertise and their pedagogical practices.
- The UCOE Project Plan of March 24, 2011, states that the targeted audience will include “low and middle income students and language minority students. Research on online learning has consistently indicated that these constituencies in particular have a high failure rate in online courses, and run considerable risk, failing to persist in college courses or degree programs.
- While UCOP argues that non-UC students will enroll in UC online courses, the Council saw no provision to ensure that the courses will be appropriate for those students as well as the UC students. This could affect course- and program-level assessment.
- Logistical challenges of access were not addressed through provisions in the proposal that will assure accessibility for these populations.
- International students, non-native speakers: online courses prepared for students with varied language skills require substantial adjustments. The latest UCOE Project Plan provides no plan to tailor courses for these particular audiences.

CRIR discussed many concerns regarding the UCOP’s discussion of project implementation and intellectual property, including but not limited to the following:

- In the original call for letters of intent, developers maintained copyright over their course materials while UC would have derivative rights. The implication was that those rights would extend for use within the UC. As a condition of the NGLC grant, materials must be open access, available to anyone who wishes to use them at no cost. As such, these materials are subject to modification as any user sees fit. This is a significant shift from the original conditions outlined for the project and contradicts long-standing UC policy to assure faculty control of course-generated materials and intellectual property.
- The UCOE Project Plan makes no mention of access to licensed library materials. Each campus has a slightly different collection profile, as well as means of authentication. Additionally, granting online library access to non-UC students could present legal and logistical issues for the UC Libraries.
- The UCOE Project Plan states that “UCOL is likely to select an external entity to work as service provider and development partner in the structuring of its learning environment.” This statement says nothing about faculty oversight, which is mandated in all matters of instruction.
- The CRIR took issue with UCOP’s assertion that the Academic Senate and its capacity as arbiter of instructional excellence poses a “risk” to the UCOE plan; it is because of these standards that UCOP can lay claim to the excellence of UC education.

UC Library Task Force Report on the Library
CRIR members reviewed the UC Library Task Force Report and found it to accurately describe the state of UC libraries in current and future terms. It was agreed that the proposed solutions were reasonable given the impossible conditions imposed by the budgetary crisis.
CRIR recommended several other areas that require further consideration in the report. There were strong concerns that the faculty role be much more integrated into the process for planning and implementing the measures discussed in the report.

The discussion of the faculty role in the report lists directives to the faculty about copyright and publishing rather than inviting constructive faculty participation. There was no clear indication of faculty participation or shared governance in the report. For example, there was no specific indication of how or in what capacity faculty input will be considered with regard to decisions about deaccessioning and other issues that directly affect research and teaching needs. The Council was also concerned about the timetables presented in the report. According to the proposed calendar, the first phases of the proposal were to be implemented before the Academic Senate’s comments and suggestions could be addressed. The Council reiterated the need for a systematic protocol regarding Senate involvement when a shift in operations is expected, and agreed that this should be included in the report.

While it is difficult to know how publishing costs will turn out and although the implications of furthering open access are very different field to field, CRIR also urged that the UC must consider alternate means of publication in its planning process.

**UCOP Proposal for Changes to Funding Streams**

CRIR discussed the UCOP Proposal for Changes to Funding Streams in some detail with Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning Todd Lee in order to make informed comments on the proposal. Though the changes to funding streams would bring about many positive changes for this campus and add transparency to the UCOP operation, CRIR’s comments on the proposal stressed the importance of creating a structure for UC-wide and individual campuses that provides effective and transparent oversight of the process, the annual review of the basis for calculations, and the revisions to account for changes that are necessitated by the refinement of information or program changes. These kinds of processes and formulas should be reviewed on an annual basis, and annual reviews of the kinds of expenditures UCOP includes in the recharge pool should be established in consultation with all campuses.

In addition, CRIR members were uneasy about what could happen to campus programs that have historically been receiving budgets through a funding stream that has always been a line item originating at UCOP and which may now be directed to a campus pool for reallocation. Instructional resources, research and the Library are in this council’s purview and we are concerned that these areas in particular may be affected by changes imposed by the new funding stream model.

**UCLA Statement and the Systemwide Academic Council's Resolution**

CRIR was asked to review and comment on both of these documents which essentially argued that if State funding continues at present levels, the UC must either downsize or spread resources more thinly to maintain the quality of research and instruction. CRIR responded by noting that the in-state student population needs to shrink to match available State support, and the UC will either shrink in size, or it will increase capacity without State students. State funding is not sufficient to provide research and teaching infrastructure. The State is paying far less per student than ever before, comparing to inflation adjusted dollars, but they are also not paying anything for some portion of students. The State cuts off funding after a certain number of students are funded. The UC needs to express this situation in terms of the slots available to in-state students, and in terms of what the State will pay for those students. UC should make a point of telling the State that if in-state students are subsidized according to a fixed number, that’s what the in-state population should be.
Review of Campus Issues

Library Budget and Resources
UC Library budget reductions in 2011-12 are expected to be at least $500 million, with $39.6 million of that to be assigned to the UCSB Library, and budget cuts will undoubtedly continue for a number of years. In addition, all costs to operate the Library will continue to increase, as for example acquisitions (especially on-line journals) and employer contributions to benefits. UCSB as well as all other UC Libraries have inadequate space and it is expected that the UC Libraries will run out of space in five to seven years.

Proposals for New Programs and Degrees
Currently proposals for new programs and degrees are required to specify the Library resources needed for implementation, and indicate the funding source for the additional resources. Prior to submitting a proposal, guidelines recommend that the initiators should consult with the Library to determine what new resources are needed, and what the costs will be for startup and on-going sustainability.

CRIR’s review of proposals for new programs or degrees recommended an evaluation of additional instructional support services as part of the cost calculation. New programs could potentially have significant startup costs associated with the development of a new curriculum, possibly requiring new course content delivery mechanisms. These costs could also include additional load on existing physical facilities, increased wear and tear on facilities and equipment, and additional burden imposed on existing staff to support the faculty in these areas. New programs are consistently overlook the costs impose 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.

Report for the Online ESCI system
A proposed plan regarding the intended implementation of an on-line ESCI score system was reviewed by CRIR. CRIR members understand that the current ESCI reporting process requires staff time that is in short supply and that the handling of the ESCI scores is currently an inefficient process, but the plan as it was proposed stands to affect faculty in significant ways. Accordingly, CRIR did not agree that the plan should be executed as proposed. Research suggests that the evaluation scores will initially drop when an online version is implemented, and the presence of the person being evaluated during the online survey process produces different outcomes when compared to those evaluations made in her absence. Available research on these aspects of an online evaluation process should be referred to when considering the results of the ESCI online pilot project, and made available to faculty and lecturers during the pilot stage. Any online process implemented should not be at the detriment of the current rate of response, which is 80 to 90%, and it is imperative to allow for simultaneous and synchronous data collection. CRIR was also strongly opposed to asking students to evaluate a course four weeks before the end of the course as discontinuity in the scores from students who complete the evaluation at different times during the course can be expected.
Both ladder faculty and lecturers should be involved in the development of this project and should participate in the task force, as well as in the review of the pilot study results. The Senate should have ample time to review the results of the pilot study before any further implementation is undertaken. CRIR made a number of other recommendations for the project: the cost of security for the project needs to be considered and shared; it should be well publicized that faculty have control over the questions that are used; faculty bio bibs will need to reflect ESCI scores prior to the implementation of the online system, and ESCI scores after the implementation. The variances in the two scores due to the change in the system must be clearly understood within the Academic Personnel process.

Faculty Carrels in the Library
CLIIIR approved of a letter from the Library to faculty regarding faculty carrels. The Library is undergoing major construction to renovate the 2-story section of the Davidson and build a 3-story addition on the north side of Davidson, to be completed spring 2014.

In order to accommodate surge space needs, the Library had to reclaim 34 of the 74 available faculty/doctoral candidate carrels. Faculty were asked to assist by relinquishing their carrels if they were not in use to preserve doctoral candidate spaces since they don’t have campus offices.

Review of Draft WASC Documents
CRIR commented on the drafted WASC documents prepared by the campus WASC Committee, praising them as being well prepared overall, substantive, and specific. The WASC planning and reporting documents appeared to make good use of what faculty already do, and made these more explicit. One of the best things that the WASC program offers is the opportunity to make faculty more aware of the assessment process and the relevant areas of focus.

Revised Proposal for an M.S. Degree in Actuarial Science
In response to a request from the Academic Senate Graduate Council CRIR reviewed the revised proposal from the Department of Statistics to establish a graduate program in Actuarial Science leading to the M.S. degree and approved the proposal without further comment.

Center for Geometric Computation within the Department of Computer Science
CRIR members reviewed proposal Center for Geometric Computation within the Department of Computer Science and endorsed the proposal without further comment.

Review of Proposal to Establish the Leonard and Gretchan Broom Center for Demography
On behalf of the Council CRPP members reviewed the proposal for The Broom Center for Demography within the Institute for Social and behavior Science (ISBER). CRPP had concerns with the proposed operation of the Human Biodemography Lab under the Broom Center within ISBER. While the operation of such a lab has research potential and would benefit research currently in place on this campus, specific planning is required for this type of lab, and it was CRPP’s view that the Broom Center is not the suitable setting for this lab and its requirements for operation. CRPP recommended that the activities that are associated with the Human Biodemography Lab be considered within another organization that has a history of managing campus labs. The collection and testing of samples that are envisioned for the lab should be done under the auspices of a group on campus that has experience with laboratory instrumentation and management. CRPP recommended that the proposal for the Human Biodemography Lab be removed from the Broom Center proposal and submitted separately for
consideration at a later time, and approved the remainder of the proposal. CRPP also recommended that a sustainability analysis be included as a function of the lab's future planning administration.

Proposal for the McEnroe Reading and Language Arts Center
The Council reviewed the proposal to establish the Tina and Paul McEnroe Reading and Language Arts Center (Center). Given the current budget climate, there was considerable discomfort with the limited information provided for the budget and the plans for continued funding. The proposal also lacked clarity on several other topics related to participants and the breadth of involvement of faculty in the training of the Center’s tutors, the faculty role in the work of the Center, as well as what the outcomes are expected to be for both the community student participants and the UCSB students. CRIR recommended that should the proposal be resubmitted with a plan for Center interaction with the community and more specific information on the budget.

Proposal for a Center for California Languages and Cultures (CCCALC) within ISBER
CRIR reviewed the proposal for a Center for California Languages and Cultures (CCCALC) within ISBER and members were in favor of the proposal. However CRIR noted that the proposal did not discuss how the Center was integrated with LMRI and the discussion of integration with the Graduate School of Education was limited. Members’ understanding of the circumstances regarding space and staffing needs was that if the center is successful in obtaining funding it will be ISBER’s responsibility to supply space or staff that may be needed.

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

Proposal for a Center for Marine Assessment and Planning (CMAP)
The CRPP reviewed the Proposal for a Center for Marine Assessment and Planning (CMAP) on behalf of the Council and endorsed it based on the understanding that if resources are needed at some future time, the three proposal co-signers will provide those resources or the funds for them.

CNSI Center for Scientific Computing – Revised Proposal
A revised proposal for the CNSI Center for Scientific Computing was reviewed and approved by CRIR without further comment.

Proposal for the Center for Cyber Security
The CRIR endorsed this proposal with no further comments.

Campus Five Year Perspective
The CRIR reviewed the Campus Five Year Perspective drafted by EVC Lucas and supported it without further comment.

Psychology Department Name Change
CRIR endorsed the Proposal to Change Name of the Department of Psychology to the Department of Psychology and Brain Science.
Center for Geometric Computation within the Department of Computer Science
CRIR endorsed the Center for Geometric Computation within the Department of Computer Science without further comment.

Final Report on Operational Effectiveness Initiative at UCSB
CLIIR commented on the Final Report on Operational Effectiveness Initiative at UCSB, focusing its review on the consolidation of shops, and the IT and Communications Proposal sections as concerns possible impacts to the Library or instructional resources.

There were concerns with the Shop Services section of the proposal, in part due to experiences with other staff consolidations. The current model for campus shop services has worked because it has been in the interest of departments to keep these shops funded, well managed, and operating at optimum levels of service. With no single department responsible for the quality of the service, the retention of staff and other such interests, the funding may not support the same level and diversity of expertise that departments have historically developed on their own. One could envision the services becoming less specialized under a centralized organization such that departments would need to add their own department FTE to replace lost capabilities. Another very real possibility is that under a centralized structure the shop services may by default become the responsibility of a central organization such as the EVC’s office or the Office of Research, an added burden for their budgets and administrative level of effort.

Members were skeptical that some of the proposed consolidations outlined in the report would result in improvement, or even work well. Their view is that some consolidations cannot be analyzed as a question of cost benefit; rather, the analysis should be about personnel. Centralization of staff needs to be managed closer to the ground than it is done through the Operational Effectiveness Report. In the final analysis if the proposed reorganization results in losing specialized skills that are highly advantageous and competitive, reorganization will be a losing proposition.

Other CRIR Business

CRIR also dealt with matters of lesser scope, including: Updates from CRIR Vice Chair Laurie Monahan on the meetings of the Systemwide Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication and UCOLASC, updates from Chair Jim Frew 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 (UCROP) were regularly given at CRPP meetings by Jianwen Su, UCSB representative. Reports on business conducted by the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) were regularly given by Sreenivasa Jammalamadaka, UCSB representative to the committee.

Acting co-University Librarians Sherry Dedecker Lucia Snowhill gave frequent updates on the Library budget, staffing, building plans, collections and journal pricing. UC Librarian Brenda Johnson left the UC Librarian position in the previous year (2009-2010) and CLIIR meetings were attended by the above librarians to maintain active communications between the council and the Library on all matters that may impact or fall under the Library’s purview. 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. Librarian Brad Eden updated the council as a consultant to CRIR, particularly on topics in the area of data repository needs, Library technology, and faculty
Copyrights. Should our participation in the search for a new University Librarian be included? Members met with all candidates.

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**

- Budget and cost allocation methods for State funded funding streams to campus, rebenching
- Progress and outcomes of the UCOP and campus on-line instruction project activities
- UCOP Working Smarter Initiative and considerations involving Indirect Cost Recovery, and research administration
- Consultation regarding the impacts of campus budget reductions on the Library and instructional resources, supporting new UC Librarian in establishing a long range plan
- Campus Operational Effectiveness and actions involving staff and shop consolidations.
- Review of status of online the ESCI Proposal/Process and evaluation of the pilot study progress and results.

**Committee on Faculty Grants**

**Summary of Faculty Research Grants Awarded Spring 2011**
Research grants awarded for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, totaled $214,601. These decisions were made in May and June of 2011 (in Fiscal Year 2010-11). The funds for these awards were made available to grant recipients for the 2010-2011 fiscal year. The total awarded is summarized by division below.

**FISCAL YEAR Funded 2011-2012 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>$14,634</td>
<td>$7,664</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Arts</td>
<td>$147,440</td>
<td>$91,390</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Life/Phys Sci</td>
<td>$92,189</td>
<td>$62,328</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$5,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>$126,742</td>
<td>$48,261</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$6,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$4,958</td>
<td>$4,958</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$385,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>$214,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,675,</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Members, 2010-11

James E. Frew
Bren School
Chair of CRIR and of CRPP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurie J. Monahan</td>
<td>History of Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Vice Chair, Chair of CLIIR and CRIR Grants Committee, UCOLASC Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Affi</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Adler-Kassner</td>
<td>Writing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Eden</td>
<td>Library, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Mathews</td>
<td>Library, Non-Senate Library Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Michaels</td>
<td>Instruction Development, Consultant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianwen Su</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Kyratzis</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Pak</td>
<td>Department of Earth Sciences, Non-Senate Academic Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Parsons</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Reese</td>
<td>Psychological and Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Pierre Fouque</td>
<td>Statistics and Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Furlong</td>
<td>Counseling, Clinical, and School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishnupriya Ghosh</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sreenivasa Jammalamadaka</td>
<td>Statistics and Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCCC Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Kittler</td>
<td>Germanic, Slavic, and Semitic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Lunsford</td>
<td>Writing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mayer</td>
<td>Psychological and Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Siegel</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianwen Su</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCORP Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libe Washburn</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Witherell</td>
<td>VC Research, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Officio member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>