

**COUNCIL ON RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES
ANNUAL REPORT: 2014-15**

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

Executive Summary

The purpose of the Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR) is to promote an optimal and educational environment to manage Senate resources and provide advice in a manner that fosters quality and diversity of research and instructional programs.

Highlights:

- The Council followed up on the Open Access pilot project and implementation, and learned that the UC has received little, if any, pushback from publishers following the approval of the policy in July 2013.
- Concerns were raised about deferred maintenance and classroom shortcomings of existing buildings on campus. The Council recommended advocating for re-investment in UCSB's classroom facilities and physical plant for safety measures.
- In an effort to attract more proposals, the maximum faculty research grant amount was increased from \$10,000 to \$20,000 per application for the 2015-16 grant period on a trial basis. This resulted in the number of proposals increasing by 250% and the total requested amount quadrupling.

Council Function

Two of the standing committees of the Council—Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources (CLIIR) and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP)—each met nine times throughout the year, with the chairs communicating regularly on issues of mutual concern.

The Committee on Faculty Grants (FG) met independently of CLIIR and CRPP, as its purpose relates only to the grants program administered by the Academic Senate, and requires action only during the proposal review period. This year the FG Committee was formed in two groups and each group met once during the spring quarter for the grants decision discussion. More about the FG committee and grants program are summarized in later sections of this report.

I. POLICY REVIEWS

- i. **Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 133, 210, 220, and 760 – a Diversity, Tenure Clock**
The Council reviewed the proposed amendments to the APM in Sections 133, 210, 220, and 760, and had no comments on this document.

ii. APM 190, Appendix A-2 – Whistleblower Policy [Final Review]

The Council had no comments on the final revision of the document.

iii. Senate Bylaw 128.8.D.2 (Vice Chairs) – Proposed Amendments

CLIR and CRPP agreed that the vice chairs should ideally have some familiarity with local business, and recommended that the document should be simplified, as the current version is difficult to understand.

iv. Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence – Proposed Revised Presidential Policy – Systemwide Review

After reviewing the proposed amendments, CLIR suggested that the mechanisms for protection with regard to retaliation be addressed in the policy, while CRPP suggested strengthening the language on action once an offense is determined, with an understanding that the response should be proportionate to the level of violation.

v. Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services-Pilot Draft Guidelines

CLIR and CRPP reviewed the document and would like more clarity on how the incubator/accelerator risk management and the assessment of equity value would be handled. CLIR noted that the document addresses physical equipment and lab space but overlooks the non-tangible services, such as online educational tools. CRPP inquired about board representation and voting rights (section D), and how board members would be selected. The committees, in agreement, were concerned about ownership, conflict of interest, and whether lab space would be prioritized for research that may commercialize. The Council would like more information to make further recommendations or comments.

vi. UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use – Final Review

CLIR reviewed the final revisions and confirmed in fact the recommendation from last year's review was addressed and supported the policy.

II. DEGREE PROPOSAL - DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND BRAIN SCIENCES

CLIR considered the proposed changes to the undergraduate programs in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences—proposed B.S. in Psychological and Brain Sciences and modification of the B.S. in Biopsychology—and recognized that the department gave significant thought to the curriculum design and potential issues related to the implementation.

The committee raised concerns about whether all of the course prerequisite details had been fully considered, and inquired about the expected enrollment increases for the applicable prerequisite courses. The committee made several specific recommendations regarding Mathematics courses in the prototype plans and strongly advised additional attention to these issues prior to the approval of the proposal.

III. EXTRAMURAL REVIEW – EARTH RESEARCH INSTITUTE (ERI)

CRPP discussed the extramural review of the ERI and was satisfied with the thorough assessment and constructive recommendations. CRPP shared the concerns of ERI and the external review committee regarding the introduction of numerous new system- and campus-wide enterprise applications, as well as the corresponding time demanded from researchers. The committee concurred with ERI that new campus systems should be undertaken with feedback from faculty and other researchers prior to implementation.

IV. OPEN ACCESS

In winter quarter CLIIR requested an update of the Open Access pilot project at UCSB. Per the Office of Scholarly Communication, the UC has received little, if any, pushback from publishers following the approval of the Open Access Policy in July 2013. The first half of the pilot project (2013-14) involved streamlining the manual deposit process. The second half (2014-15) involved implementation of the publication management system, with the expectation of expanding it to all UC campuses by fall 2015. Departments are encouraged to contact their subject librarian for assistance with Open Access tools and questions.

CRIR provided a one-time \$15,000 funding support to kick off the Open Access pilot year, plus \$1,560 to support Open Access Week hosted by the UCSB Library. It was discussed and agreed that future funding would be reviewed annually or on a case-by-case basis.

V. LIBRARY CONSTRUCTION

In May, Denise Stephen, University Librarian arranged a library tour for CLIIR. The committee was impressed and excited for the expansion and renovation projects, such as the Paseo main entrance, Art Library, graduate study commons, group study rooms, Special Research Collections reading room, 20-foot-high floor-to-ceiling windows, and a new café. The target for opening 150,000 square feet of space is aimed for mid-November 2015 and a ceremonial grand opening is planned for winter 2016.

VI. CLASSROOM FACILITIES – DEFERRED MAINTENANCE SHORTFALLS & CLASSROOM SHORTCOMINGS

CLIIR consulted with managers involved with campus facilities and physical plant regarding the conditions of existing buildings and classrooms at UCSB. The consultations highlighted a critical lack of funding for maintenance and renovation (due to budget cuts in the years between 2006 and 2011, and new building constructions in recent years) in comparison to peer institutions. The consequences of deferred maintenance are not only visually unappealing, they are compromising the teaching/learning environment and are also safety concerns. Such conditions undermine the student experience and campus image. As the campus budget begins to recover, CLIIR recommended that the Academic Senate advocate for reprioritizing investments to maintain and renovate the conditions of existing buildings.

VII. UNIZEN CONSORTIUM

George Michaels, Consultant, Executive Director of Instructional Development introduced the Unizen Consortium to CLIR in spring quarter. The landscape of technology education has changed and the UC is looking into how we can get control of protecting student privacy rights. Unizen currently has ten members (institutions) and is targeting to cap at twenty, with the UC having two seats. Overall CLIR responded positively to the idea that joint membership would give UC access to partnering with other institutions that have excellent computing infrastructure. However, there are cost concerns such as how much Unizen would be used at the UCSB location, and whether the usage is proportionate to the \$1M initial UC membership fee (paid over three years), plus \$100,000 annually per campus for each campus that choose to participate.

VIII. FACULTY GRANTS PROGRAM

In the 2013-14 cycle, the FG committee found that the number of faculty proposals had not rebounded at the same rate at which funding was being restored to the Faculty Grants Program. As an effort to encourage Senate faculty to take advantage of the program, this year two changes were implemented on a trial basis: (1) more widely distributed the call for proposals, which included the Office of Research funding bulletins and emails to all assistant professors, and (2) increased the maximum limit per proposal from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

Effects

The effects of the changes were significant. This year the committee received 168 complete proposals (up from 66 in the prior year, a 250% increase), while the total requested funding amount went up by nearly 400%. The problem introduced by this new demand was twofold: (1) there were far more proposals to review than prior years and (2) the total requested amount far outstripped our significant but more modest increases in funds.

Budgets

The original budget allocation for the Faculty Research grant period was \$627,496 and \$20,000 (approximate interest earnings of the principle) for Dr. Pearl Chase Grants. With this year's significant increase in demand, the Faculty Grants Program fell critically short on available funds. In consultation with the senior management of the Academic Senate, the Senate office adjusted the budget plan and reallocated funds to support the Faculty Grants Program. The new budget allocation for Faculty Research Grants for this cycle was increased to \$850,000 and the Dr. Pearl Chase Funds was increased to \$80,000.

Strategies

To manage the effects of the implemented changes, two Faculty Grants Committees were formed instead of the usual one, with the goal of keeping the reviewer workload to a reasonable level and to increase faculty participation. Additionally, in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee, a funding strategy was decided that roughly $\frac{3}{4}$ of funds would be used to partially support as many strong proposals as the committees could justify, while approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of the funds would provide full support to the most compelling proposals.

Results

Of the 168 complete proposals, 8 of the applications qualified for the Dr. Pearl Chase Grants and 160 were applications for the Faculty Research Grants.

i. Dr. Pearl Chase Grants

All 8 of the proposals in this category were awarded partial or full funding (funding rate 100% by number of proposals). The total requested amount was \$111,233 and the total awarded amount was \$79,664 (funding rate 72% by dollar amount).

ii. Faculty Research Grants

Of the 160 complete proposals in this category, 19 were awarded full funding, 93 were awarded partial funding, and 48 were not funded. While 109 of the proposals asked for more than \$10,000, only 15 applications (approximately 14%) were allocated more than \$10,000 after committee review. Results of the Faculty Research Grant awards by division are summarized in the following tables.

Funding by Number of Proposals

Division	Funded	Not Funded	Total
BREN	3	0	3
COE	4	3	7
GGSE	12	2	14
HFA	42	19	61
MLPS	36	14	50
SS	15	10	25
Total	112	48	160

Rate of Funding by Number of Proposals

Division	Funded	Not Funded
BREN	1.00	0.00
COE	0.57	0.43
GGSE	0.86	0.14
HFA	0.69	0.31
MLPS	0.72	0.28
SS	0.60	0.40
Average Rate	0.74	0.26

Rate of Funding by Dollar Amount

Division	Requested Amount	Funded Amount	Funding Level (%)
BREN	\$48,236	\$31,100	0.64
COE	\$107,103	\$23,450	0.22
GGSE	\$230,516	\$86,500	0.38
HFA	\$740,147	\$283,048	0.38
MLPS	\$759,169	\$289,331	0.38
SS	\$361,978	\$118,730	0.33
Total	\$2,247,149	\$832,159	0.37

IX. CARRY OVER ISSUES

Faculty Grants Program

i. Faculty Research Grant Policy and Guidelines

The guidelines for allowable expenses should be revisited to provide greater clarity and to update some of the outdated values. The new document should bring the policies back in line with the actual practice (such as per diem rules) and ensure that the allowable funds are really of maximal use to the Senate Faculty. Guidance on how to calculate (or find) hourly rates for graduate and undergraduate assistants is also needed.

It was suggested that the new \$20,000 upper limit should be kept for future years with explicit statements in the call that: (1) full funding at that level will be reserved for just a few of the very strongest proposals and (2) “padding to \$20,000” is discouraged, as this is a program among cooperating peers and one should really ask for only what is truly needed.

ii. Faculty Research Grant Review Process

The introduction of two faculty grants committees (and two separate meetings) made conflict management far more consistent, kept discussions to a manageable size, and limited reviewer workload. This was a positive change that was suggested to be kept going forward.

With regards to the distribution of reviews, the co-chairs recommended having three reviewers per proposal rather than the traditional two to help broaden the discussion.

It was also suggested that it may be prudent the co-chairs do not provide explicit scores for any proposals, with the expectation that they review applications where there is not a clear consensus or to break ties, so they may focus on facilitating meetings and ensuring fair and consistent discussion without the conflict of advocating for proposals they particularly liked or disliked.

iii. Faculty Grant Online Application System

The Information Systems team at the Academic Affairs Information Technology office is supporting CRIR in developing an online application system for the Faculty Grants Program. The goal is to pilot the online application for the upcoming cycle. More information and updates will be available in the fall quarter.

Subvention

In recent years, several faculty grant proposals have requested subvention funds; however, because the Faculty Grant Program limits how awards may be used, these needs were not met, which led to ongoing discussions of establishing a subvention program to support publication costs. The suggestion is to form a subvention program using faculty grant funds, with a budget of \$25,000 to \$50,000 for the pilot year. Research in consultation with Senate Analysts across UC campuses resulted in the following:

- Nine out of the ten Academic Senate offices do not have grant programs that allow for subvention, with UCI being the only Senate office that has a special program (Cultural Research Grants) allowing “performance subvention” as an expense in the proposed project budget. However, the organization structure at the UCI Senate office is different than UCSB, and the financial administration aspect is not handled by the Faculty Grants Analyst. Details would require consultation with their financial/budget officer.
- UCD and UCSD have subvention programs administered by the Office of Research, both of which are self-renewing funds or loans that need to be paid back (when royalties are paid to authors).
- There are subvention and/or publication support programs on other UC campuses, but those are administered at the departmental or divisional level using dean’s discretionary funds.

The desire to establish subvention subsidies as grants, rather than loans, was tabled for discussion due to the lack of readily documentation available for access. The outgoing co-chairs have agreed to continue their service in the upcoming year regarding this subject.

Proposal to Establish a Fund for Instructional Transformation (FIT)

The Fund for Instructional Transformation (FIT) was a memo/proposal approved by the Undergraduate Council (UgC) for a new grant program to support pedagogical innovation on campus. The proposed FIT is to complement the existing Instructional Improvement Program (IIP). UgC invited CLIIR to join them in supporting the proposal and recommendations that FIT be administered by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education with an initial funding of \$150,000 per year for a three year period. Details of the proposal can be accessed by logging in to the CLIIR webpage.

At the end of spring quarter, CLIIR was presented with the FIT memo/proposal for review. After discussion, CLIIR members asked for more clarity on why a new program would be necessary

and why it should be administered by the AVC of Undergraduate Education, when the position was still vacant. Due to limited time no conclusion was reached. CLIR and UgC representatives decided the proposal should be tabled for the next year.

X. MEMBERS

Hilary Bernstein

Michael Bowers

Shivkumar Chandrasekaran

Daryl Cooper

Carlos Garcia-Cervera, UCORP Rep

Lisa Jevbratt

Arturo Keller

Maryam Kia-Keating

Philip Lubin

Shelly Lundberg

Dana Mastro

Joseph McFadden

Robert McMeeking

Laurie Monahan

Alice O'Connor

Benjamin Reese

William Robinson

Susannah Scott

Karen Szumlinski

Candace Waid, UCOLASC Rep

Casey Walsh (ended 11/14/14)

Xiaojian Zhao (ended 5/5/15)

Denise Stephens, Ex Officio

Michael Witherell, Ex Officio

George Michaels, Consultant

Jennifer Thompson, Non-Senate Academic Rep

Alexander Pucher, GSA Rep

Daisy Ramirez, AS Rep

Karen Lunsford, Vice Chair of CRIR, Chair of CLIR, Co-Chair of FG

Timothy Sherwood, Chair of CRIR and Chair of CRPP, Co-Chair of FG