

**University Enrichment Committee
End of Year Report 2018-2019**

MEMBERSHIP:

Faculty: Roger Allen (Chair), Luc Boisvert (fall only), Lisa Johnson, Isha Rajbhandari, Renee Simms (fall only), Tanya Stambuk, Linda Williams, Bianca Wolf

Students: Cole Tomkins and Olivia Wilhite

Ex Officio: Renee Houston (Associate Dean)

Senate Liaison: Andrew Gardner followed by Bryan Thines

MEETING DATES:

Fall 2018: September 5, October 17, November 14, and December 5

Spring 2019: February 9-12 (via email 2^o to snow), March 13, April 22, and May 13

GENERAL UEC ACTIVITY: The UEC has successfully completed, or will have completed by the end of the spring 2019 semester, all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding student research proposals in the fall (October and November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding faculty research proposals in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Regester Lecture (November), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (March), and the evaluation of nominations for the purpose of selecting the 2020 Regester Lecturer (May).

SENATE CHARGES: The UEC has the following **standing charges** set forth in The Faculty Bylaws:

The duties of the Committee shall be:

1. To promote the professional growth of the Faculty by seeking and receiving funds for research and travel, to budget and allocate such funds, and to receive and approve research and travel reports.
2. To seek and allocate funds for student research.
3. To seek nominations and select the Regester lecturer.
4. To support Faculty leaves such as sabbaticals, grant-assisted leaves, and exchanges.
5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

The Senate's **additional charges** ("such other duties as may be assigned to it") to the 2018-2019 UEC, as provided by Senate liaison Andrew Gardner were:

1. Evaluate the process for professional school student research award submissions including consideration of holding information sessions for all interested students to clarify the evaluation process.
2. Review committee documents to ensure consistency between evaluation rubrics and submission guidelines.

3. Consider establishing a fall information session for faculty openly reviewing the professional development opportunities available and the procedures and expectations for application.

UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO STANDING CHARGES: Over the course of the academic year, the committee reviewed faculty research funding proposals, student research funding proposals, and faculty proposals for release time. Faculty proposals were submitted and reviewed in both the fall and spring semesters, while student proposals were reviewed in the fall and spring, with an additional early-bird submission opportunity for student proposals offered in September 2018. The committee did a considerable amount of work revising evaluation rubrics for assessing submitted funding proposals, so as to increase transparency of evaluation process, ensure coherence with published application guidelines, and provide consistency for comparison across reviewers. This work and the revised rubrics have greatly aided the committee's subsequent review work this year.

The committee recommended funding for a total of 11 faculty research proposals across the academic year. A single faculty release time application was reviewed early in the spring semester and it was recommended for approval at regular 1.0 release unit. 2 student fall early-bird proposals, 4 regular fall deadline proposals, and 30 spring student proposals were recommended for funding.

Both student and faculty conference travel requests were handled by Associate Dean Renee Houston's office. For efficiency were not subject to review and recommendation by the full committee.

Expenditures for the above items, for this academic year were as follows:

Student Travel	\$16,960
Student Research	16,226
Faculty Travel	105,292
Faculty Research	19,257
TOTAL	\$157,735

In addition to reviewing research proposals, the Associate Dean's office UEC hosted the 46th Regester Lecture and reception in the Tahoma Room of Thomas hall on November 8, 2018. The lecture, "*Democratic Vistas: Re-viewing Western History Impressed in Landscapes*," was delivered by Professor of History, Doug Sackman. Although the lecturer has traditionally been introduced by the chair of the UEC, this year we felt it would be appropriate to ask the lecturer if he would wish to have one of his nominators deliver the introduction. It was our feeling that a nominator would have a more direct and intimate understanding of the significance and context of the lecturer's work. Professor Sackman agreed and his introduction was delivered by Professor Nancy Bristow. The committee felt this was a practice that we would like to continue in the future.

From among the nominations from faculty for the 2020 Regester Lecture, three nominees consented to be considered and supplied supporting materials for the UEC to review. The committee met for deliberation on May 13, 2019 and selected one of the three nominees to be

invited to deliver the 2020 Regester Lecture. The official announcement of the 2020 lecturer will be made by the Associate Dean's Office in October 2019.

The Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Research Award winner was selected by the UEC from among faculty research proposals submitted during the academic year (including 12 submissions for either research funds or release time). This year's recipient is Professor and Chair of Theater Arts, Sara Freeman, for her project, "*Encyclopedia of Modern Theatre: Development and Expansion.*"

UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO ADDITIONAL SENATE CHARGES:

1. Evaluate the process for professional school student research award submissions including consideration of holding information sessions for all interested students to clarify the evaluation process.
2. Review committee documents to ensure consistency between evaluation rubrics and submission guidelines.
3. Consider establishing a fall information session for faculty openly reviewing the professional development opportunities available and the procedures and expectations for application.

The additional Senate charges were presented by Andrew Gardner at our initial September 5 meeting and discussed by the committee. Prior UEC members Houston, Boisvert, and Allen (chair), shared that charge 2 was crafted in response to difficulties encountered by last year's committee, and previous committees, in evaluating student and faculty applications. Some of these difficulties arose from some inconsistent or unclear guidelines in UEC documents, and from the difficulty to uniformly apply UEC evaluation guidelines to a broad range of departments and disciplines. During the discussion, it was concluded that this revision of documents (charge 2) would be the most efficacious way to address the issues that led last year's committee to propose charges 1 and 3. By consensus the committee proposed dropping charge 3 and incorporating its intent into an assessment and revision of UEC evaluation rubrics and published submission guidelines to ensure consistency. This motion was accepted by the Senate liaison as a reasonable substitution for separately addressing the intent of charge 3.

Regarding charge 1, in the fall 2018 semester information sessions were held for interested research advisors and student applicants from the graduate professional schools regarding submission guidelines, proposal preparation, and evaluation process/criteria to help students better prepare their applications so that they adequately address all of the essential elements proposal elements required for UEC review.

Regarding charge 2, the committee revised scoring rubrics for both faculty and student proposal evaluations, to ensure consistency with submission requirements and guidelines. The revised rubrics were then used for all evaluations during the 2018-2019 academic year. The revised guidelines and rubrics are now available on-line for any applicant to review prior to submitting their proposals at the following locations:

For Faculty

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/faculty-professional-developme/research-funding/faculty-research/>

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/faculty-research-guidelines-form-2019-rev-aug-3.pdf>

For Students

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/academic-resources/student-research-travel-award/student-research-awards/>

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/evaluation-of-student-research-proposals.pdf>

SUGGESTED SENATE CHARGES FOR NEXT YEAR'S COMMITTEE:

1) While this is not specifically cited as a standing charge to the UEC in The Faculty Bylaws, selection of the recipient of the annual Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Research Award is selected by the UEC. The February 26, 1999 Memorandum of Understanding that established the award specifically states:

Recipients should be tenured and have at least 10 years of service with the University. They should be chosen by the University Enrichment Committee and be selected on the quality of their teaching and their plan for the travel year. Recipients should submit a report to the Enrichment Committee by the beginning of the semester immediately following their return.

It is recommended that, beginning next academic year, UEC standing charges in The Faculty Bylaws be revised to specifically cite the committee's role and obligations in reference to this annual award. Next year's standing charges to the UEC from the Faculty Senate should include selection of the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Research Award. This request was previously made in the 2016-2017 end of year report to the Senate from the UEC, but not acted upon.

2) This year, a number of student research proposals were missing required elements (e.g. a faculty advisor letter, narrative on how findings from the study will be communicated to the professional or campus community, a title, etc.) The committee had some disagreements on how to handle a proposal that seemed otherwise meriting funding, yet was lacking part of the proposal as outlined in the submission guidelines. It is recommended that next year's committee be charged with developing a policy regarding eligibility of proposals for funding consideration that are missing required elements. This policy should then be posted on the website describing submission guidelines and requirements.

3) As stated above, the committee struggled this year with proposals that were missing required elements, as well as significant difficulties in having all of the documents we needed uploaded for access and review by the Associate Dean's staff to the SoundNet site. We strongly recommend that next year's committee be charged with implementing an on-line submission system for student proposals that has fillable fields for each required proposal component (with

an automatic character limit on each field) and a separate submission portal for the faculty advisor's letter.

CONCLUSION: Although we had salient struggles getting access to all the documents we needed for reviewing student research proposals, the work of the University Enrichment Committee itself this year was collegial, focused, efficient, and productive. In addition to handling the regular duties assigned, the committee completed all work on the new Senate charges for this year, selected the 2018-2019 Phibbs Award recipient, hosted the Register Lecture, and selected the 2020 Register Lecturer.

It was both an honor and a pleasure to serve with this group of faculty colleagues and students in supporting faculty and student scholarship, creativity, and innovation.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Allen, PhD, PT - UEC Chair 2018-19
Distinguished Professor of Physical Therapy