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 congratulates the grand opening of the expanded UCSB Library and appreciates the space, data and technological improvements. After consultation with senior administrators, however, the Council grew increasingly concerned that the rapidly growing costs of journals and monographs would have continued negative impacts on the quality of the UCSB Library Collections, which is essential for a research institution. The Council submitted a memo of concern along with recommendations in June.

- In an effort to assess the campus need, the maximum Faculty Research Grant amount remained $20,000 per application for the 2016-17 grant period. The results show that the campus need significantly exceeds the program budget.

- After much deliberation and consideration, publication subvention expenses were allowed up to $2,000 under the Faculty Research Grants Program, effective July 1, 2016. Details and restrictions are added to the program guidelines.

Council Function

The two standing committees of the Council—Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources (CLIIR) and Committee on Research Policy and Procedures (CRPP)—held a joint meeting in October for orientation, then the committees met separately (ten and nine times respectively) throughout the remainder of year, with the chairs communicating 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 met twice during the spring quarter for the grants decision discussions. More about the FG committee and grants program are summarized in later sections of this report.
SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES

I. Disciplinary Processes for Faculty Related to Sexual Violence, Sexual Assault, and Sexual Harassment

Both the CLIIR and CRPP reviewed the report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate and offered the following recommendations.

• On the requirement of faculty and staff mandatory reporting, the CLIIR members deliberated the rights of the victim, specifically in the case of the victim not authorizing the faculty or staff to speak of the issue. Members understood the statements in the policy are to protect stakeholders’ rights and to prevent cover-up of accusations, but there should also be consideration of varying circumstances and standards.

• On the “3-year rule,” the CRPP suggested the policy to include a statement that requires the complainant to be informed of the outcome, and if no action is taken on a particular complaint, the complainant must be notified before the three years expire, so it is clear to the complainant why or when the statute of limitations will begin.

Council members agreed that disciplinary actions ought to be laid out in the policy to provide clarity for stakeholders on what to expect and why, especially when such cases are highly sensitive and confidential. The Council believes such statements will give some guidance and support to the administration in the negotiation process.

II. Open Access Policy Update (Issuance: October 23, 2015)

Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of CRIR were invited to review this document. The council did not have comments to add for consideration.

III. Search Waivers for UC Academic Appointees

Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of CRIR were invited to review this document. The council did not have comments to add for consideration.

IV. Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy Revisions. v.2

CRPP highlighted the importance of this issue and did not have substantive comments about the revisions. However, members noted that adding an easy-to-read, one-page summary for third/reporting parties would be useful. The summary would be similar to Appendix III, but concentrating on information for detecting behavior and the appropriate place to report sexual harassment or sexual violence.

LOCAL ISSUES

I. Proposal to Establish a Fund for Instructional Transformation (FIT)

The CLIIR reviewed the draft proposal that was developed in spring 2015. Members discussed the necessity of establishing a new grant versus the possibility of expanding the current, successful Instructional Improvement Program (IIP) to serve the purposes listed in the FIT proposal. Members also inquired why the proposed new grant would be
administered by the Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education. Although
CLIIR was sympathetic to providing assistance for the development of instructional
transformation on campus, the rationale, degree of specification, mechanism for
evaluation, and the issue of summer salary and TA inclusion raised questions. The
Committee did not wish to endorse the proposal.

II. Red Binder Revisions, Fall 2015
Along with other Senate councils and committees, members of CRIR were invited to
review this document. The council did not have comments to add for consideration.

III. University of California Press Luminos Membership
Early February a joint letter from the Department of History and the Department of East
Asian Languages & Cultural Studies was sent to Denise Stephens, University Librarian, and
copied to the EVC, Deans, and the Chairs of CRIR regarding UCSB Library’s membership for
Luminos. The details of the request are outlined in the letter, which is saved in the CRIR
database.

During the CLIIR meeting it was expressed that scholarly communications issues are
continuous discussions and faculty perspectives are important for the Library when
considering acquisition decisions. However, without alternative funding for the Library
acquisitions budget and no unallocated resources, an annual membership fee would result
in an on-going new commitment that the Library currently cannot take on; additionally,
eBooks are already available through Open Access.

In general the CLIIR members applauded the UC Press for efforts in attempting to provide
more affordable access to academia, but also noted that details of the initiatives were
unclear. Librarian Stephens will follow up with the initiating departments regarding
Luminos and provide more information to the CLIIR should it becomes available.

RESEARCH CENTERS AND UNITS

I. Proposal – Center for Terahertz Science and Technology
The CRPP reviewed the proposal to change the status of the Institute from an Organized
Research Unit (ORU) to a non-ORU. Members agreed that the proposal was well-thought
and did not have additional comments for consideration.

II. Proposal – Center for Mindfulness and Human Potential
The proposal to establish the Center for Mindfulness and Human Potential included two
letters of endorsements from the Divisional Dean and the Department Chair. CRPP
reviewed the documents and supported the proposal.

III. Proposal – Administration of the Orfalea Center
CRPP members reviewed the proposal from Dean Oliver to transfer the administrative
function from the Global and International Studies Department to the Institute of Social,
Behavioral and Economic Research (ISBER), and agreed that the justification for transition
seemed well-thoughtout and supported by relevant parties. The committee supported the
proposal with no additional comments.

IV. Proposal – Ph.D. in Technology Management Program (TMP)
Both the CLIIR and CRPP members considered the proposal to establish a Ph.D. degree in TMP and did not foresee significant issues that would affect library and instructional resources or faculty research, but this conclusion is based on the understanding that Technology Management will continue to fund its own program needs.

FACULTY GRANTS (FG) PROGRAM

I. Faculty Research Grants

Changes
The first significant change for this year’s Faculty Research Grants Program was piloting the online application system developed by the Senate IT. The system includes four parts:

(1) Online applications
Senate faculty can now submit proposals online by logging in to the Academic Senate website.

(2) Webpage for the Committee on Faculty Grants
Reviewers can log in to the committee webpage to access digital proposals and reviewer scoresheets.

(3) Webpage for departmental financial officers
This is a database for dedicated financial personnel to access grant information relevant to expenditures and reimbursements, including budget sheets and grant amounts.

(4) Internal database
The CRIR Analyst acts as the administrator to connect and assign data to the different webpages.

After much deliberation and consideration, the second significant change was to allow publication subvention expenses up to $2,000 under the Faculty Research Grants Program, effective July 1, 2016. Details and restrictions are added to the program guidelines. This year there were 5 applications with requests for subvention support.

Summary
In the 2013-14 review cycle, the Committee on Faculty Grants (CFG) found that the number of proposals had not rebounded at the same rate at which funding was being restored to the Faculty Grants Program. To encourage Senate faculty to take advantage of the Grants program, the maximum limit per proposal was increased from $10,000 to $20,000 during the 2014-15 year. The effects of the change were significant, resulting in the number of proposals increasing by 250%, the total requested amount increasing by
nearly 400%, and the Faculty Research Grants budget fell critically short on available funds. Details of the effects and strategies are outlined in last year’s annual report.

For the 2015-16 application cycle, it was decided that the maximum amount be maintained at $20,000 per proposal in an effort to better assess true campus need. The results consistently showed that the total request significantly exceeded the program budget. In consultation with the senior management of the Academic Senate, the Senate office adjusted the budget plan and reallocated funds to support the Faculty Research Grants Program. The new budget allocation for Faculty Research Grants for this application cycle was increased from $707,496 to $800,000.

Of the 158 activated online applications, there were 133 complete packets and 25 either incomplete or withdrawn before the review deadline.

Of the 133 complete applications submitted for review, 34 projects were awarded full funding, 67 were awarded partial funding, and 28 were not funded. While 62 of the proposals asked for more than $10,000, only 21 applications (approximately 34%) were allocated more than $10,000 after committee review. Results of the Faculty Research Grant awards by division are summarized in the following tables.

### Applications and Funding Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Not Funded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rate of Funding by Number of Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Not Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rate of Funding by Dollar Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Funding Level (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>$58,136</td>
<td>$28,856</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>$78,552</td>
<td>$40,466</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>$456,662</td>
<td>$258,829</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>$555,186</td>
<td>$304,862</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>$312,235</td>
<td>$166,987</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,490,771</strong></td>
<td><strong>$800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. **Pearl Chase Research Grants**
This year there were 3 applications for Pearl Chase Research Grants, all of which were awarded partial or full funding. The total requested amount was $28,994 and the total awarded amount was $23,810. The funding rate by dollar amount was 82%.

### LIBRARY UPDATES

I. **Acquisitions and Collections**
The Council congratulates the grand opening of the expanded UCSB Library and appreciates the space, data and technological improvements. After consultation with senior administrators, however, the CLIIR grew increasingly concerned that the rapidly growing costs of journals and monographs would have continued negative impacts on the quality of the UCSB Library Collections, which is essential for a research institution. In June the CLIIR submitted a memo of concerns and recommendations including:

- the need for a budgetary analysis of the available funds for collections and the growth of acquisition costs; and

- the need to evaluate alternative funding models and new formulas to finance the UCSB Library.

The CLIIR believes in order to train scholars, a new funding mechanism is required to purchase the materials needed for current and future scholarly research.

II. **Regional Library Facility (RLF) Collections Project Proposal – WEST de-Duplication**
Librarian Stephens introduced the document to the CLIIR members for comments. The proposed idea is to remove duplicately held print serials across the two RLFs and the strategy is to help UC libraries make the best use of the high-density print storage space. The committee agreed that as long as the UCSB Special Collections would not be affected, members did not have reservations about the removal of duplicates of at the RLFs.
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT UPDATES

I. Classroom and Facilities

- As of May the General Assignment (GA) classrooms inventory was brought up to 96.

- The Campus Planning Committee for the Campbell Hall Replacement Project will select the architect in the coming months. The preliminary plan is to have 900 seats on the ground floor and 300 seats on the balcony in the new building.

II. Online ESCI Update

The background and history of the Online ESCI Pilot Program was introduced to the CLIIR members, along with the summary and methodology of the response rate. The key findings were: (1) the mean online response rate was 52%, in comparison to the historical average paper response rate of 73.4%; and (2) the variability of department response rates are similar between online and paper surveys.

There has not been a movement to offer ESCIs online as a campus service and no new departments have been added to the pilot group, but Instructional Development will continue to collect data from the pilot departments. Other departments with a desire to use the Online ESCI service may be able to switch, at the earliest, in the fall quarter of 2016 pending ongoing EVC and Senate review.

CONSULTATION WITH THE ADMINISTRATION AND OTHERS

- David Marshall, Executive Vice Chancellor, Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor
- George Michaels, Executive Director, Instructional Development
- Leesa Beck, University Registrar, Office of the Registrar
- Tim Sherwood, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, Office of Research
- Todd Lee, Assistant Chancellor, Office of Budget and Planning

CARRY OVER ISSUES

i. Faculty Travel Grants Program

The guidelines for the Faculty Travel Grants Program were developed many years ago and there have been suggestions to review and update the document to match current practices. The maximum limit and conference registration fees were of significant interest.

ii. Faculty Research Grant Review Process

The application review process and methodology continues to evolve and will be planned for active discussion next year.

iii. Faculty Grant Online Application System

The new online application system was piloted in February and received much positive response from all user groups. The CRIR Analyst and Senate IT will continue to develop the
database and refine the system in the upcoming cycle.

iv. Subvention
Allowing publication subvention up to $2,000 as an expense was also piloted this year. The Council will monitor the need and procedures and adjust as necessary.
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